

cannot obtain a licence from the prior patentee to use his invention, it is competent for him to petition for a compulsory licence (see p. 102, *supra*).

Incorporation of Patented Article in Another Article.—It follows that, as an improvement upon a patented article cannot be used otherwise than independently without the sanction of the patentee, the making or user of an article in the manufacture of which a patented machine or product is incorporated, amounts to an infringement (*Saccharin Corpn. v. Anglo-Continental Works* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 319).

Infringement of a Combination Patent.—A combination is the use of certain things in connection with others to produce a machine (*per* Cotton, L.J., in *Proctor v. Bennis* (1887) 4 R. P. C. at p. 352) or a certain result. By far the largest proportion of patents taken out are for new combinations or arrangements; and the majority of actions for infringement brought are in respect of combination patents.

THE PRINCIPLES OF CURTIS *v.* PLATT AND PROCTOR *v.* BENNIS.—In determining whether a combination patent has been infringed, it must first be ascertained to what class the patented combination belongs. Does the combination consist in the putting together of well-known things to produce a known result, or does the combination produce a result never before achieved? The answer depends, of course, upon the evidence as to what was the state of knowledge at the date of the patent, and it materially affects the question of infringement.

If the combination produces no new result, the principles laid down in *Curtis v. Platt* (1863) 3 C. D. 135, *n.*) apply: the patentee is tied down strictly to that which he has described and claimed (*Curtis v. Platt, supra*; *Gosnell v. Bishop* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 156; *Dunlop Co. v. New Lamb Tyre Co.* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 389; *Sutcliffe v. Abbott* (1902) 20 R. P. C. at p. 58); his monopoly cannot be permitted to exceed the exact terms of his specification (*Brown v. Jackson* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 324; *Tweeddale v. Ashworth* (1892) 9 R. P. C. at p. 128); and the doctrine of mechanical equivalents does not apply (*Curtis v. Platt, supra*; *Tweeddale v. Ashworth, supra*; *Gosnell v. Bishop, supra*; *Ticket Punch Co. v. Colley's Patents* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at 185; *Brown v. Jackson, supra*; *Chamberlain v. Mayor of Bradford* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 508; (1903) 20 R. P. C. 673). But it is not a true proposition of law to say that the doctrine of mechanical equivalents can *never* apply in the case of combinations

producing old results (see *per* Vaughan Williams, L.J., in *Bunge v. Higginbottom* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 196). For instance, if the invention consists of a dumb-bell made resilient by means of *metal* springs, another person would not be permitted to use a dumb-bell made resilient by means of *whalebone* springs (see *Sandow v. Szulay* (1904) 21 R. P. C. at p. 343). And the substitution of a hinge for a slide would not constitute such a difference in a combination of this type as that the substitution would negative infringement (see *Bunge v. Higginbottom* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 196). The variations must be *bonâ fide* ones (*Curtis v. Platt* (1863) 3 C. D. at p. 137, *n.*).

If the combination provides a new result, the case of *Proctor v. Bennis* (1887) 4 R. P. C. 333 applies; the patentee is not tied down to the exact terms of his specification, and a person who attains the same result by the use of mechanical or chemical equivalents infringes (*Proctor v. Bennis, supra*; *Gosnell v. Bishop* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 156; *Sutcliffe v. Abbott* (1903) 20 R. P. C. at p. 58; *Automatic Weighing Co. v. Knight* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at 304; *Automatic Weighing Co. v. National Exhibitions* (1892) 9 R. P. C. at pp. 44, 46; *Thomson v. Moore* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at pp. 447, 448; *Chamberlain v. Mayor of Bradford* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 508).

WHETHER TAKING PART OF A COMBINATION IS AN INFRINGEMENT.—Where a patent is taken out for a combination merely, nothing is protected by it, and consequently nothing can be an infringement, but the use of the entire combination (see *per* Lord Chelmsford in *Harrison v. Anderston Foundry Co.* (1876) 1 A. C. at p. 581; *Gwynne v. Drysdale* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at pp. 67, 68; *Dunlop Co. v. New Lamb Tyre Co.* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 389); and it is therefore no infringement to take one or some of the component parts unless that part forms the subject of a separate claim (*Davies v. Townsend* (1899) 16 R. P. C. 497; and see *Wardroper v. Gibbs* (1903) 20 R. P. C. at p. 360). But a person will not be permitted to merely omit some immaterial part, or substitute a known equivalent for some immaterial part, if he appropriates all the *essential and characteristic* features of the combination (*Gwynne v. Drysdale, supra*). “The essential nature of the invention will be regarded; and . . . there may be cases in which, though the patent is for an entire combination of numerous parts, a collusive imitation of that invention may be effected though some detail of the combination is omitted or changed, which is a doctrine familiar enough in Patent Law” (*per* Lord Penzance in *Harrison v. Anderston Foundry Co.*,

supra, at p. 593). “If the instrument patented consisted of twelve different steps . . . an infringer who took eight, or nine, or ten of those steps might be held by the tribunal judging of the patent to have taken in substance the pith and marrow of the invention, although there were one, two, three, four, or five steps which he might not actually have taken” (*per* Lord Cairns in *Clark v. Adie* (1877) 2 A. C. at p. 320).

On the question whether a defendant has taken the substance of a combination, although omitting an element of it, it is not necessary that he should show that the omitted part was an essential element in the sense that the machine could not work without it, but it must be a material element for the successful working of the machine (*Consolidated Car Co. v. Came* (1903) 20 R. P. C. 745).

Where, however, the patentee claims not only the combination as a whole, but also the parts or integers, or some of the parts or integers, which enter into the whole combination, the use of one of those parts or integers may be an infringement of the patent. For instance, the patentee's invention may be for a combination of parts A. B. C. and D. He may claim that combination as a whole and then proceed to claim, as a separate invention, part D. In such a case, provided that D. is itself a matter which ought properly to form the subject of a patent (see Chapter I., *supra*), its appropriation, *per se*, will be an invasion of the patentee's monopoly (see *per* Lord Cairns in *Clark v. Adie*, *supra*, at pp. 321; and see, further, pp. 75, 76, *supra*).

Infringement of a Patent Involving a New Principle.—A principle, *per se*, cannot be the subject of valid letters patent (see p. 6, *supra*); but there may be a valid patent for a principle coupled with a mode of carrying the principle into effect (see p. 6, *supra*).

In *Jupe v. Pratt* ((1837) 1 W. P. C. at p. 146), Alderson, B., said that when you have invented a mode of carrying a principle into effect, you are entitled to protect yourself from *all other* modes of carrying the same principle into effect. But, as was pointed out by Cotton, L.J., in *Automatic Weighing Co. v. Knight* ((1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 304), this expression was used by Baron Alderson during the discussion, and probably did not express his full opinion. “You can,” said Cotton, L.J., in the same case, “prevent anyone from using the same method of carrying that principle into effect, and you can prevent anyone from using only the same thing with a colourable difference”; but you cannot prevent anyone from carrying the principle into effect by

substantially different means. In *Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Tubeless Tyre Co.* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at pp. 79, 80), Lord Halsbury said: "That a principle which was applied in the former case exists here I do not deny—I think that is true; but that there is any principle which can be claimed as a principle, as distinct from the application of it to the particular machine, is of course quite outside the region of Patent Law. You cannot appropriate to yourself a mere principle; you can only appropriate the application of the principle. . . . Although the same principle is made use of here it is not made use of in the same way, nor is it, nor could it be, gravely represented as being the same application of the same principle—although I admit the principle to be the same." And see *Tweeddale v. Ashworth* (1892) 9 R. P. C. at p. 126; *cf. Chamberlain v. Mayor of Bradford* (1903) 20 R. P. C. at p. 684; *Edison-Bell v. Smith* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at pp. 397, 398.

But "where there is a principle first applied in a machine capable of carrying it into effect, the Court looks very 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" (*per* Cotton, L.J., in *Automatic Weighing Co. v. Knight* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 304; and see *Tweeddale v. Ashworth* (1892) 9 R. P. C. at p. 126; *Consolidated Car Co. v. Came* (1903) 20 R. P. C. at p. 767). And the consideration of the principle sought to be applied is material in determining the essence of the invention (*per* Pales, C.B., in *Thomson v. Moore* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 450; affirmed (1890) 7 R. P. C. 325).

Manufacture.—A person who manufactures (*Muntz v. Foster* (1844) 2 W. P. C. at pp. 100, 101), or procures to be manufactured by others (see *per* Tindal, C.J., in *Gibson v. Brand* (1842) 1 W. P. C. at p. 631; *Incandescent Co. v. Brogden* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at p. 184), a patented article, without the sanction of the patentee, commits an act of infringement. But a person who manufactures an article, which is an infringement, at the instance of the patentee's agent, is not liable (*Kelly v. Batchelor* (1893) 10 R. P. C. 289; *cf. Dunlop Co. v. Neal* (1899) 16 R. P. C. 247). And if a patented article is made merely by way of *bond fide* experiment, there is no infringement (see *per* Jessel, M.R., in *Frearson v. Loe* (1878) 9 C. D. at pp. 66, 67; *Muntz v. Foster, supra*).

User.—The mere use in this country of a patented article, without licence, constitutes infringement (see *Betts v. Neilson*

(1868) 3 Ch. at p. 439). It is no answer to an action for infringement to show that the user was only *in itinere* (*Betts v. Neilson*, *supra*, at p. 437) or consisted merely in transportation (*British Motor Syndicate v. Taylor* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at pp. 193, 194, 723; and see *Washburn Co. v. Cunard Co.* (1889) 6 R. P. C. 398). But if any person who, directly or indirectly, had anything to do with the means by which goods get from one place to another, were to be held liable as an infringer, it would injuriously encourage idle and vexatious litigation (see *per James, L.J.*, in *Nobel's Co. v. Jones* (1881) 17 C. D. at p. 743). Hence, Custom House agents, as such, are not liable in an action for infringement (*Nobel's Co. v. Jones*, *supra*; (1882) 8 A. C. 5).

It is no defence to show that the patented article was used for a different purpose (see *per Stirling, J.*, in *British Motor Syndicate v. Taylor* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 194). "A man who finds that a patented invention can be used for a new purpose cannot justify his user of the invention for that purpose without paying for it, merely because the patentee had not contemplated originally that his invention could be so applied" (*per Romer, J.*, in *Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. East London Co.* (1896) 14 R. P. C. at p. 103; and see *per Lord Westbury* in *Cannington v. Nuttall* (1871) L. R. 5 H. L. at p. 230; *cf. Fletcher v. Glasgow Commissioners* (1887) 4 R. P. C. 386; *Edison v. Holland* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 482; *Re Cutler's Patent* (1839) 1 W. P. C. at p. 427).

It is immaterial, it seems, whether the user is active or passive (see *Betts v. Neilson* (1868) 3 Ch. at p. 439).

User by way of *bonâ fide* experiment does not constitute infringement (see *per Jessel, M.R.*, in *Frearson v. Loe* (1878) 9 C. D. at pp. 66, 67; *Muntz v. Foster* (1844) 2 W. P. C. at p. 101). *Secus*, where the use results in a pecuniary advantage, however indirectly, to the user, or where it prejudicially affects the patentee (see *Frearson v. Loe* (1878) 9 C. D. at pp. 66, 67). Thus, if a man uses an infringing article for the purpose of instructing his pupils (*United Telephone Co. v. Sharples* (1885) 29 C. D. 164), or for the purpose of reducing the cost of manual labour at his works (*Proctor v. Bailey* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 109), the plea of experimental user is not available.

Importation.—The importation of an infringing article, made abroad, for sale or use in this country (*Elmslie v. Boursier* (1869) 9 Eq. 217; *Von Heyden v. Neustadt* (1878) 14 C. D. 230; *Saccharin Corpn. v. Anglo-Continental Works* (1900) 17 R. P. C. 307), or merely for transshipment here for exportation (*Nobel's*

Co. v. Jones (1879) 17 C. D. at p. 724; *United Telephone Co. v. Sharples* (1885) 29 C. D. 164; and see *British Motor Syndicate v. Taylor* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at pp. 193, 194, 723), amounts to an infringement. But an English merchant who contracts, in this country, for the sale of an infringing article to an English firm, the infringing article being made abroad and delivered to the purchasers at a foreign port, is not an importer and does not infringe, although he is well aware that the article will find its way into this country (*Saccharin Corp'n. v. Reitmeyer* (1900) 17 R. P. C. 606).

A foreigner, who, by himself or his agent, imports an infringing article into this country is liable as an infringer (*Badische v. Johnson* (1897) 14 R. P. C. at p. 415). But he is not liable if he sells the article outside the United Kingdom to an English importer, or his agent (*Badische v. Johnson, supra*, at p. 414). In this case, B., living in England, wrote to A., domiciled abroad, ordering five pounds of dye to be sent to him by post. A. wrote back, enclosing an invoice, and on the same day sent the dye to N., who forwarded it by post to B. in London. It was held, although the dye was admitted to be an infringement, that A. was not liable, as he had not by himself or by his agent imported the dye into England. And see *Saccharin Corp'n. v. Reitmeyer* (1900) 17 R. P. C. 606.

USE OF PATENTED ARTICLE ON FOREIGN VESSEL IN BRITISH WATERS.—A patent does not prevent the use of an invention for the purposes of the navigation of a foreign vessel within British waters, nor the use of an invention in a foreign vessel within British waters, provided the invention is not used in connection with the manufacture or preparation of anything intended to be sold in or exported from the United Kingdom or the Isle of Man. But this privilege does not extend to vessels of foreign States where like privileges are not afforded to British vessels (s. 43 of the Patents Act, 1889).

Sale.—The grant of letters patent includes a monopoly of the sale in this country of articles made according to the specification, whether the articles be made in the realm or elsewhere (see *per James, L.J.*, in *Von Heyden v. Neustadt* (1880) 14 C. D. at p. 233; *Elmslie v. Boursier* (1869) 9 Eq. 217).

Hence, the sale of infringing articles affords good ground for an action for infringement, however small the sale, and however trivial the value of the articles sold (see *Cole v. Saqui* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 493; *Badische v. Dawson* (1889) 6 R. P. C. 387).

The mere offering or exposure for sale of an article made in accordance with the patentee's specification is an invasion of the patentee's rights; for, although it may not be considered "vending" (see *Minter v. Williams* (1835) 1 W. P. C. 135), it is a "user" which is prohibited (*Oxley v. Holden* (1860) 8 C. B. (N. S.) 666; *Dunlop Co. v. British Car Co.* (1901) 18 R. P. C. 313; *British Motor Syndicate v. Taylor* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 729).

SALE OF COMPONENT PARTS.—It is no infringement to sell some of the component parts which go to make up a patented combination, even though the seller knows that the parts are intended to be used in infringement of the patent (*Dunlop Co. v. Moseley* (1904) 21 R. P. C. 274; *Townsend v. Haworth* (1875) 12 C. D. at p. 831, n.; *Sykes v. Howarth* (1879) 12 C. D. at p. 833; and see *Savage v. Brindle* (1896) 13 R. P. C. 266). But a person infringes if he sells *all* the parts manufactured so as to be adapted for putting together (see *per* Vaughan Williams, L.J., in *Dunlop Co. v. Moseley*, *supra*, at p. 280; *per* Pearson, J., in *United Telephone Co. v. Dale* (1884) 25 C. D. at pp. 782, 783), or some of the parts *in conjunction* with some other person who sells the remaining parts (*Incandescent Co. v. New Incandescent Co.* (1898) 15 R. P. C. 81; *Dunlop Co. v. Moseley*, *supra*). And a person is liable if he invites his customers to use articles sold by him in an infringing manner (*Innes v. Short* (1898) 14 T. L. R. 492).

In *Dunlop Co. v. Cresswell* ((1901) 18 R. P. C. 473) the owners of a patent for improvements in cycle tyres granted a licence to a company to make the tyres in accordance with a deposited tyre. C. sold to the company canvas strips to which the company affixed wires (in accordance with those in the deposited tyre) and re-sold the strips and wires to C., who then added the outer rubber and sold the tyre. Held; C. had not infringed.

INFRINGEMENT BY PURCHASERS.—If a patentee has licensed the manufacture of articles under his patent, purchasers from the licensee, or from his vendees, may use or resell the articles without the patentee's consent (*Thomas v. Hunt* (1864) 17 C. B. (N. S.) 183). But this implied licence to the purchaser may be limited by terms imposed on the sale. Thus, in *Incandescent Co. v. Brogden* ((1899) 16 R. P. C. 179), the plaintiffs had printed on every box containing the patented article words to the effect that neither the purchaser nor any person into whose hands the patented article should come should use or sell the article except in connection with another article supplied by the plaintiffs. It

was held that any person buying with notice of the condition was bound by it, and if he disregarded it he was liable as an infringer. If, however, a person buys *without* notice of such a condition, he will not be bound by and may disregard it, although he becomes aware of it shortly after the purchase (*Incandescent Co. v. Cantelo* (1895) 12 R. P. C. 262).

On the sale of an infringing article there is no implied warranty that the purchaser will be able to make use of it; the purchaser may be sued for infringement by the patentee and yet be liable to the vendor of the article for the price of it (*Mouferts v. Marsden* (1895) 12 R. P. C. 266).

Repairs.—Any simple repairs may be done by a person without any licence from the patentee (see *per* North, J., in *Dunlop Co. v. Neal* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at p. 250; and see *Savage v. Brindle* (1896) 13 R. P. C. 266). But infringing articles will not be allowed to be made under guise of repairs; if the result of the repairs is, in effect, a new article, the repairer is liable as an infringer (*Dunlop Co. v. Neal, supra*; and see *United Telephone Co. v. Nelson* W. N. (1887) 193; *Dunlop Co. v. Excelsior Co.* (1901) 18 R. P. C. 209; *Dunlop Co. v. Holborn Co.* (1901) 18 R. P. C. at p. 226; but see *per* Cozens-Hardy, L.J., in *Dunlop Co. v. Moseley* (1904) 21 R. P. C. at p. 282).

Possession.—The mere possession of an infringing article is sufficient ground for granting an injunction; actual user or sale need not be proved (*United Telephone Co. v. London & Globe Co.* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 119; and see *Adair v. Young* (1879) 12 C. D. 13; *British Motor Syndicate v. Taylor* (1900) 17 R. P. C. 189, 723; *Dowling v. Billington* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 201; *Dunlop v. British Car Co.* (1901) 18 R. P. C. 313). Where a person is in possession of a thing it cannot be assumed that he is in possession of it for no purpose at all (see *Proctor v. Bailey* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 112; but see p. 538); and if it is not his intention to use the thing, then an injunction can do him no harm (*per* Bacon, V.-C., in *United Telephone Co. v. London & Globe Co., supra*; but see *Proctor v. Bailey* (1889) 6 R. P. C. 538).

The fact that the article has only been lent to the possessor would, it is submitted, be no defence; but whether there would be any infringement in merely testing an article sent on approval only, is not, having regard to the decision in *United Telephone Co. v. Henry* ((1885) 2 R. P. C. 11), quite clear.

Threatened Infringements.—A patentee need not wait until infringement has actually been committed. If he has reasonable

ground to apprehend that a man will infringe his rights he can go to the Court and obtain an injunction to restrain him from carrying out his intention, provided that it is made clear that the act, if carried out, would be an infringement (*Dowling v. Billington* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 201; *F'rearson v. Loc* (1878) 9 C. D. at p. 65).

Offer to Make Similar Articles.—If a person merely offers to make an article of the same class as the article patented, and no actual infringement is proved, the assumption is that the offer related to articles which would not be infringements; “the presumption is always in favour of innocence” (*per* Lord Maclaren in *Gwynne v. Drysdale* (1885) 2 R. P. C. at p. 164; affirmed (1886) 3 R. P. C. 65).

THE ACTION FOR INFRINGEMENT.

When a patentee considers that his monopoly has been invaded, he may bring an action for infringement wherein he can, if successful, obtain—(1) an injunction, (2) damages or an account of profits, and (3) delivery up or destruction of the infringing articles. Proceedings for infringement cannot be instituted until the patent has been granted (s. 15 of the Patents Act, 1883); and if proceedings are taken after failure to make any renewal payment within the prescribed time, and before enlargement thereof, the Court may refuse to award any damages (s. 17 (4), *ibid.*).

Course to Pursue where Several Infringers.—It often happens that a patent is being infringed by several persons at the same time, and the question then arises as to what course to adopt. To take action against one only is not sufficient; for the others are not bound by the result, and, when themselves sued, may charge the plaintiff with laches (see the curious position of the plaintiffs in *Acetylene Co. v. Giffre* (1903) 20 R. P. C. 286). In these circumstances the proper course is to proceed to obtain an interlocutory injunction against one infringer and to write to the others and say: “Are you willing to take this as a notice to you that the present case is to determine yours? Otherwise I shall proceed against you by way of interlocutory injunction; and if you do not object on the ground of delay, I do not mean to (issue writs) against all of you at once” (*per* Wood, V.-C., in *Borill v. Crate* (1865) 1 Eq. at p. 391). If there are no answers, and if the infringers are all desirous of throwing obstacles in the patentee’s way, the patentee must issue as many writs as there are infringers (*North British Co. v. Gormully* (1894) 12 R. P. C. at p. 21).

Notice of Intention to Commence Action.—The patentee is not bound to give the alleged infringer any notice before commencing action; nor is he bound to discontinue upon the defendant admitting the infringement and promising not to repeat it (see *Losh v. Hague* (1837) 1 W. P. C. 200; cf. *Proctor v. Bailey* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at pp. 543—545). But if the defendant admits infringement, and offers to submit to an injunction, he will not be ordered to pay the costs where the value of the infringing articles is trifling (*American Tobacco Co. v. Guest* (1892) 9 R. P. C. 218; cf. *Upmann v. Forester* (1883) 24 C. D. 231). Where only one infringing article was in the possession of the defendant, and he offered, before action brought, to give an undertaking not to use it during the existence of the patent, a motion for an interlocutory injunction was dismissed with costs (*Lyon v. Mayor of Newcastle* (1894) 11 R. P. C. 218; see also p. 212, *infra*).

Actions Against Small Retailers.—These are not encouraged: an endeavour ought to be made to sue those who set the articles upon the market. Although the plaintiff is entitled to an injunction, the defendant will not, as a general rule, be fixed with the costs of the action, provided he has acted innocently and does not deny the infringement (see *American Tobacco Co. v. Guest* (1892) 9 R. P. C. at p. 220).

Action for Infringement of Several Patents.—It is essential, in some cases, to sue on several patents. In *Saccharin Corpn. v. Quincey* ((1900) 17 R. P. C. 337) several patents were sued upon and infringement was found, although it was impossible to say which particular patent had been infringed; had the plaintiffs brought separate actions in respect of each patent they must have failed in each action (see *per* Cozens-Hardy, J., at p. 339).

But it is a mistake and highly inconvenient, as a general rule, to sue the defendant in one action for infringement of several patents (see *per* Smith, L.J., in *Brooks v. Lamplugh* (1898) 15 R. P. C. at p. 47). If any of the patents are not relied upon at the trial (see p. 219, *infra*), or if infringement of all of them is not proved (*British Motor Syndicate v. Universal Motor Co.* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at pp. 134, 135; cf. *Saccharin Corpn. v. Jackson* (1903) 20 R. P. C. 611; *Saccharin Corpn. v. Quincey, supra*), the question of costs will be materially affected (see *Brooks v. Lamplugh, supra*: and see p. 219, *infra*). Moreover, the defendant may apply to have the action limited to only one or two of the patents. In *Saccharin Corpn. v. Wild* ((1903) 20 R. P. C. 243), where the

plaintiffs sued upon twenty-three patents, the Court of Appeal ordered that the action should be confined to three. In *Saccharin Corpn. v. White* (1903) 20 R. P. C. 454, the plaintiffs were allowed to sue on seven patents, but on special terms as to costs. Whether the plaintiff would be limited as to the number of patents alleged to be infringed where the defendant does not deny their validity, *quere* (see *Saccharin Corpn. v. Jackson* (1903) 20 R. P. C. at p. 616).

The Court.—The action may be brought either in the King's Bench Division or in the Chancery Division; but it is now almost invariably brought in the latter Division. If trial with a jury is desired, the action must, of course, be brought in the King's Bench Division; but the action must be tried *without* a jury unless the Court otherwise directs (s. 28 (1) of the Patents Act, 1883).

The Palatine Court of Lancaster has jurisdiction to try patent actions (the Chancery of Lancaster Act, 1890 (53 & 54 Vict. c. 23)). The County Courts have no jurisdiction to try actions for infringement where the validity of the patent is in issue (*R. v. County Court Judge of Halifax* [1891] 2 Q. B. 263).

The Court may, and must on the request of either of the parties, try and hear the case with the assistance of an assessor (s. 28 of the Patents Act, 1883).

The Parties.

Plaintiffs.—All persons claiming any interest in the patent should be made plaintiffs (see *Bergmann v. Macmillan* (1881) 17 C. D. 423). But one of several co-owners may sue alone for an injunction, delivery up or destruction of the infringing articles, and an account of profits (*Sheehan v. G. E. R. Co.* (1880) 16 C. D. at p. 63; *Dent v. Turpin* (1861) 30 L. J. (N. S.) Ch. 495; *Anderson v. Patent Oxonite Co.* (1886) 3 R. P. C. 279; but as to an account, see *Bergmann v. Macmillan, supra*). And the owner of a separate and distinct part of a patent may sue alone for damages in respect of an infringement of that part (*Dunnicliff v. Mallet* (1859) 7 C. B. (N. S.) at p. 227).

A mortgagor may sue alone for infringement: he need not join his mortgagee (*Van Gelder v. Sowerby Bridge Society* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 208).

A legal assignee may sue for infringement of the patent assigned (*Walton v. Lavater* (1860) 8 C. B. (N. S.) 162); but the assignment should first be registered (see *Chollet v. Hoffman*

(1857) 26 L. J. (N. S.) Q. B. 249; *Bowden's Patents v. Smith* (1904) 21 R. P. C. 438; *cf. Hassall v. Wright* (1870) 40 L. J. (N. S.) Ch. 145).

An equitable assignee cannot sue alone (*Bowden's Patents v. Smith, supra*); but the assignee or trustee of a bankrupt patentee may (*Bloxam v. Elsee* (1827) 6 B. & C. 169).

A mere licensee cannot sue for infringement in his sole name, whether the licence be exclusive or not; he must join the patentee (*Heap v. Hartley* (1889) 6 R. P. C. 495; *Derosne v. Fairie* (1835) 1 W. P. C. at p. 155). But where the licence is coupled with a grant, the licensee can probably sue alone (see *Heap v. Hartley* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 501).

A mere agent for the sale of a patented article cannot sue infringers (*Adams v. N. B. Rail. Co.* (1873) 29 L. T. (N. S.) 367).

Where a patent is assigned to two persons as tenants in common, and one dies, the right of action in respect of infringements committed after the assignment and before the death of the deceased assignee survives to the other, who may recover the whole amount of the damages sustained by him and his late co-assignee (*Smith v. L. & N.-W. Rail. Co.* (1853) Macr. P. C. 203). Where a patent, by virtue of the grant or otherwise, is vested in two persons jointly, and one dies, the interest passes by survivorship to the other (*National Co. v. Gibbs* (1899) 16 R. P. C. 339; reversed on appeal on other grounds, 17 R. P. C. 302).

If the Judge thinks that an action is defective for want of parties, it is his duty to join the necessary parties himself in order to cure the defect (*Van Gelder v. Sowerby Bridge Society* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 208).

Defendants.—As to what persons are liable as infringers, and may be made defendants, see p. 153, *supra*. The manufacturer or importer should be sued in preference to the retailer (see *American Tobacco Co. v. Guest* (1892) 9 R. P. C. at p. 220), although, of course, both are equally liable to be restrained by injunction.

The manufacturer of an infringing article and the purchasers from him may be made defendants in the same action (*Proctor v. Bennis* (1887) 4 R. P. C. 334). The plaintiff may have an account against the manufacturer and damages against the purchasers (*Penn v. Bibby* (1866) 3 Eq. 308). An account against the manufacturer does not licence the use of the infringing articles in the hands of all the purchasers; the article may be followed into every man's hand until the infringement is

got rid of (see *per* Wood, V.-C., in *Penn v. Bibby*, *supra*, at p. 311; *Dunlop Co. v. Rimington* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 668; *cf.* *Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Goodman* (1896) 13 R. P. C. 723).

If the infringer has sold his business to a company after action brought, leave to add the company as a defendant will not be granted (*Briggs v. Lardner* (1885) 2 R. P. C. 13).

The directors of a company should not be made co-defendants unless it can be proved that they are personally liable (see *Leeds Forge Co. v. Deighton's Co.* (1901) 18 R. P. C. at p. 240).

Where the plaintiff sued the user of a certain machine, and the manufacturer of the machine applied to be made a defendant under R. S. C. Ord. 16, r. 11, alleging that his presence before the Court was necessary, the application was refused (*Moser v. Marsden* (1892) 9 R. P. C. 214).

The Writ.

The writ is usually endorsed for an injunction (see p. 203, *infra*); an account or damages (see p. 206, *infra*); and delivery up or destruction of the infringing articles (see p. 206, *infra*). A claim for passing off is sometimes included (see *Hewitt v. Nurse* (1900) 17 R. P. C. 264; *Poulton v. Kelley* (1904) 21 R. P. C. 392).

If an interlocutory injunction is desired, leave to serve notice of motion with the writ is granted almost as a matter of course. Interlocutory injunctions are dealt with later (see pp. 184—192).

Service out of the Jurisdiction.—Service out of the jurisdiction may be directed (R. S. C. Ord. 11). Order 11 does not enable the Court to direct service out of the jurisdiction of a writ claiming damages for infringement of a patent which has expired, although an injunction is also sought in respect of another patent (*Badische v. Chemische* (1904) 21 R. P. C. 345). As to the evidence necessary to obtain leave or to discharge the order granting leave, see *Badische v. Thompson* (1903) 20 R. P. C. 422; *Badische v. Chemische* (1903) 20 R. P. C. 413.

Where a foreign company exhibited motors at the Crystal Palace, and had a stand but no office there, service of a writ on a person in charge of the stand was held good service (*Dunlop Co. v. Actien Gesellschaft* (1902) 19 R. P. C. 46).

The Pleadings.

Statement of Claim.—In the statement of claim the grant of the patent should be set out, and if the plaintiff is not himself the patentee the derivation of his title should be shown.

The infringement need only be alleged in general terms, as

particulars thereof must be set out in the particulars of breaches (see pp. 175—177, *infra*).

Where the action is based, not on actual but on *threatened* infringement, the pleadings should be so framed; the two actions are distinct in themselves, though they may be combined in one. If threatened infringement is alone relied upon, of necessity there can be no particulars of breaches; but care is always taken that the defendant shall have fair notice as to the nature and particulars of the special infringement he is alleged to be contemplating (*Shoe Co. v. Cutlan* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at pp. 357, 358; *cf. Dowling v. Billington* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 191). The only remedy where no actual infringement has been committed is an injunction (*Dowling v. Billington, supra*).

Costs need not be claimed; but if in a previous action a certificate that the validity of the patent came into question has been granted, that fact should be pleaded and costs as between solicitor and client should be claimed (see *Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Chisholm* (1896) 13 R. P. C. 488).

It is not necessary to allege that the patent is valid or subsisting (see Form 6, Appendix C., R. S. C.) or that the invention was new (*Amory v. Brown* (1869) 8 Eq. 663).

No part of the specification need be set out (see *Kay v. Marshall* (1836) 2 W. P. C. 39; Form 6, *ibid.*).

If the specification has been amended, this fact, with the date, should be stated; and the plaintiff should plead that the original claim was framed in good faith and with reasonable skill and knowledge, if he seeks to recover damages in respect of infringements committed before the amendment (see *Kane v. Boyle* (1901) 18 R. P. C. at pp. 337, 338).

The statement of claim must not, of course, introduce a cause of action different from that disclosed by the writ (see *United Telephone Co. v. Tasker* (1888) 6 R. P. C. 38).

Motion for Judgment in Default of Pleading.—If the defendant makes default in delivering a defence, the plaintiff may set down the action on motion for judgment (R. S. C. Ord. 27, r. 11). But where there are several defendants, some of whom deliver a defence and some do not, the Court will refuse to order judgment to be entered against those in default, as the others might upset the patent at the trial (*Actien Gesellschaft v. Remus* (1895) 12 R. P. C. 94). If, however, there are only two defendants, and one delivers a defence but does not set up validity of the patent and the other defendant does not deliver a defence, judgment will

be ordered to be entered against the one in default (*Dunlop Co. v. Fulton* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 319).

Defence.—The defendant may deny infringement, or he may allege that the patent is not valid, or he may avail himself of both grounds of defence. He may also plead that the plaintiff has no title to the patent sued upon; or that the patent has ceased through failure to make the prescribed payments within the prescribed times (s. 17(2) of the Act of 1883; see p. 38, *supra*); or that the infringement was committed prior to the grant of the patent (s. 13, *ibid.*; see p. 36, *supra*); or that the infringement was committed prior to amendment of the specification and that the original claim was not framed in good faith or with reasonable skill and knowledge (s. 20, *ibid.*; see p. 89, *supra*). Every ground on which a patent might, at the commencement of the Act of 1883, be repealed by *scire facias*, is available by way of defence to an action for infringement (s. 26 (3), *ibid.*; see pp. 114, 115, *supra*, and p. 178 *infra*).

If the defendant pleads that the patentee was not the true and first inventor, the plaintiff is probably not entitled to particulars as to who the first inventor was (see *Russell v. Ledsam* (1843) 11 M. & W. 647; but see *Morgan v. Windover* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 449). The plea is distinct from the issue as to novelty (*Househill v. Neilson* (1843) 1 W. P. C. at p. 689; *Thomson v. Macdonald* (1891) 8 R. P. C. at p. 9), or invention (*Thomson v. Macdonald, supra*); and it should never be pleaded unless the defendant is prepared to bring evidence to show that the patentee was not really the inventor (*Thomson v. Macdonald, supra*; *Morgan v. Windover* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 449).

Where the defendant decides to dispute the validity of the plaintiff's patent, the usual practice is, now, simply to state: "The plaintiff's patent is not valid for the reasons given in the particulars of objections delivered herewith" (see *Sandow v. Szalay* (1904) 21 R. P. C. at p. 336).

A plaintiff *may* be ordered to give discovery before delivery of the defence; but the defendant must make out a very special case before such an order will be made (see *Woolfe v. Automatic Picture Gallery* (1902) 19 R. P. C. 161).

Particulars of Breaches.

The plaintiff must deliver with his statement of claim, or by order of the Court or the Judge, at any subsequent time, particulars of the breaches complained of (s. 29 (1) of the Act of

1883); and at the hearing no evidence can, except by leave of the Court or a Judge, be admitted in proof of any alleged infringement of which particulars are not so delivered (s. 29 (4), *ibid.*). On taxation of costs, regard is had to the particulars delivered; and no costs are allowed in respect of any particular unless the same is certified by the Court or a Judge to have been proven or to have been reasonable and proper (s. 29 (6), *ibid.*; see p. 214, *infra*).

The object of particulars of breaches is to tell the defendant what the plaintiff says he has done in infringement of the patent; their office is not to answer an interrogatory (*Wenham v. Champion Gas Co.* (1891) 8 R. P. C. 22; and see *Cassella v. Levinstein* (1891) 8 R. P. C. 473) or to disclose evidence (*Mandleberg v. Morley* (1893) 10 R. P. C. at p. 260).

The particulars are sufficient if, taken together with the pleadings, they give the defendant full and fair notice of the case to be made against him (*Needham v. Oxley* (1863) 1 H. & M. 248; and see *Petman v. Bull* (1886) 3 R. P. C. 391; *Church Co. v. Wilson* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 127).

A person who merely sells infringing articles is entitled to more detailed particulars than a person who infringes by manufacturing (*Mandleberg v. Morley* (1893) 10 R. P. C. 256).

The particulars should state specifically how the patent has been infringed; if infringement by use is alone complained of the Court will not consider whether there has been an infringement by manufacture (*Henser v. Hardie* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 427).

If two distinct processes are described in the specification, and the defendant's process may be an infringement of one but not of the other, the defendant is entitled to know which he is alleged to have infringed (see *per* Jervis, C.J., in *Talbot v. La Roche* (1854) 15 C. B. at p. 320; *cf.* *Moseley v. Victoria Rubber Co.* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 357).

Where there is more than one claim, the particulars should state whether all or only some and which of them are relied upon (*Haslam v. Hall* (1887) 4 R. P. C. at p. 206) unless the particulars refer to pages and lines of the specification (*Elsey v. Butler* (1884) 1 R. P. C. 187).

If certain claims are referred to, and certain articles are referred to as infringing those claims, the particulars need not, as a general rule, state what portions of the specification are alleged to be infringed by reference to pages and lines of the specification (*Church Co. v. Wilson* (1886) 3 R. P. C. 123; *Cheetham v. Oldham* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 624).

Where the specification described thirteen different kinds of pens, referring to them by numbers, the Court ordered the plaintiff to give particulars, by the number of the pens, on which the infringement was based (*Perry v. Mitchell* (1840) 1 W. P. C. 269).

If the defendant is alleged to have made certain machines with the plaintiff's invention applied, particulars should be given as to the portions of the machines to which the invention has been applied; and inspection of the machines for this purpose may be ordered (*Jones v. Lees* (1856) 25 L. J. (N. S.) Ex. 241).

Instances of Infringement.—Specific instances of the infringements complained of must be given (*Tilghman's Co. v. Wright* (1884) 1 R. P. C. 103); if infringement by sale is complained of, the names and addresses of the purchasers should be specified (*Murray v. Clayton* (1872) 15 Eq. 115).

But the plaintiff has in some cases been allowed to add general words so as not to be confined at the trial to the instances given (*Tilghman's Co. v. Wright, supra*; *Haslam v. Hall* (1887) 4 R. P. C. 203). The instances given must, however, be specific. The plaintiff will not be allowed to mention them "by way of example only" (*Patent Type-Founding Co. v. Richards* (1860) 2 L. T. (N. S.) 359; *cf. Talbot v. La Roche* (1854) 15 C. B. 310), or "in particular by way of illustration" (*Church Co. v. Wilson* (1886) 3 R. P. C. 123; *Haslam v. Hall, supra*).

Where the plaintiff is unaware at the time of the names of the persons to whom the alleged infringing articles have been sold, he may, it seems, state that he is unable to give further particulars until he has obtained discovery (see *Russell v. Hatfield* (1885) 2 R. P. C. 144; and see *Woolfe v. Automatic Picture Gallery* (1902) 19 R. P. C. 161).

Application for Further and Better Particulars.—If the defendant considers that the particulars furnished by the plaintiff are not sufficiently full, he should apply for further and better particulars.

The plaintiff may be ordered to give better particulars although the action has been set down for trial (*Mandleberg v. Morley* (1893) 10 R. P. C. 256).

Where the plaintiff alleged that he was unable to give better particulars until he had interrogated the defendant, no order was made, but the defendant was given leave to apply again at a later stage (*Russell v. Hatfield* (1885) 2 R. P. C. 144).

Particulars of Objections.

The defendant must deliver with his statement of defence, or, by order of the Court or a Judge, at any subsequent time, particulars of any objections on which he intends to rely (s. 29 (2) of the Patents Act, 1883). On taxation of costs regard is had to the particulars delivered; and no costs are allowed in respect of any particular unless the same is certified by the Court or a Judge to have been proven or to have been reasonable and proper (s. 29 (6), *ibid.*; see p 213., *infra*). At the hearing no evidence can, except by leave of the Court or a Judge, be admitted in proof of any objection of which particulars are not so delivered (s. 29 (4), *ibid.*). But the objections delivered by one defendant may be relied upon by another in the same interest (*Smith v. Cropper* (1885) 10 A.C. 249).

If the defendant disputes the validity of the patent, the particulars delivered by him must state on what grounds he disputes it; and if one of those grounds is want of novelty, the *time and place* of the alleged previous publication or user must be stated (s. 29 (3), *ibid.*).

The object of particulars is to prevent surprise (see *per* Lindley, L.J., in *Holliday v. Heppenstall* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 328), to limit the scope of the inquiry, and to prevent expense (*Nettlefolds v. Reynolds* (1891) 8 R. P. C. at p. 417).

An objection should not be raised unless it is intended to be relied upon at the trial (*Allen v. Oates* (1898) 15 R. P. C. 303; *Phillips v. Ivel Cycle Co.* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 85; *Hattersley v. Hodgson* (1903) 20 R. P. C. at p. 598); and a long list of anticipations, of which only two or three will be mentioned at the trial, should not be put forward (*Thomson v. Butty* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 97).

The defendant may rely upon any ground on which a patent might, at the commencement of the Patents Act, 1883, be repealed by *scire facias* (s. 26 (3); see pp. 114, 115, *supra*). The grounds most commonly raised are:—

- (a) That the patentee was not the true and first inventor.
- (b) That the invention was not new.
- (c) That the thing patented involved no invention or ingenuity.
- (d) That the invention is not useful.
- (e) That the complete specification claims an invention different from that disclosed by the provisional specification.
- (f) That the specification is insufficient.
- (g) That a prior patent for the same invention has been granted.

(a) **Objection that Patentee was not the True and First Inventor.**—This objection does not raise the issue of novelty or invention (*Thomson v. Macdonald* (1890) 8 R. P. C. at p. 9; *Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Casswell* (1896) 13 R. P. C. at p. 187), but only whether the patentee or someone else invented the patented article (*Thomson v. Macdonald, supra*); and the objection should never be taken unless the defendant intends to rely upon it at the trial (*Morgan v. Windover* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 449; *Thomson v. Macdonald, supra*). When the objection is raised, the defendant need not state who the first inventor was (*Russell v. Ledsam* (1843) 11 M. & W. 647; but see *Morgan v. Windover* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 449).

(b) **Objection that Invention was not New.**—If one of the grounds of objection to the patent is want of novelty, the time and place of the alleged previous publication or user must be specified (s. 29 (3) of the Act of 1883). An invention may be lacking in novelty by reason of (1) prior publication (see p. 8, *supra*); (2) prior user (see p. 14, *supra*); or (3) the state of common knowledge at the date of the patent.

(1) **PRIOR PUBLICATION.**—The particular specifications, books, or documents relied upon must be specified; the defendant should state what the alleged anticipation is, and where it is to be found (*Holliday v. Heppenstall* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 327).

In the case of a book, the defendant must not refer generally to the book, but must specify what part he relies upon (*Harris v. Rothwell* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 246; *cf. Holliday v. Heppenstall, supra*).

In the case of specifications, if these are simple, or the whole of the specifications are *bonâ fide* relied upon, the defendant need not specify what parts he relies upon (*Siemens v. Karo* (1891) 8 R. P. C. 376; *Edison-Bell v. Columbia Co.* (1900) 18 R. P. C. 4; *Sidebottom v. Fielden* (1891) 8 R. P. C. at pp. 270, 272; *Holliday v. Heppenstall, supra*; *Nettlefolds v. Reynolds* (1891) 8 R. P. C. 410, 417). But if the specifications are very numerous (see *Sidebottom v. Fielden, supra*, at p. 272; *cf. Nettlefolds v. Reynolds, supra*), or are intricate (*Heathfield v. Greenway* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 19; and see *Fowler v. Gaul* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 250; *Harris v. Rothwell* (1886) 3 R. P. C. 243), or the whole are not *bonâ fide* relied upon (*Heathfield v. Greenway, supra*; *Nettlefolds v. Reynolds* (1891) 8 R. P. C. at pp. 417, 418; *Harris v. Rothwell, supra*), the defendant *may* be ordered to state, by reference to pages and lines, the parts of the specifications he relies upon.

Where the plaintiff's specification is a complicated one, and contains several claims, the defendant should state by reference to the claims which part of the plaintiff's invention is anticipated by the respective specifications referred to in the particulars as anticipations (*Boyd v. Farrar* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 33; *Harris v. Rothwell* (1886) 3 R. P. C. 243; and see *Fowler v. Gaul* (1886) 3 R. P. C. 247).

(2) PRIOR USER.—The particulars must state the time and place of the alleged prior user (s. 29 (3); *Smith v. Lang* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 148), and the names and addresses of the users (*Birch v. Mather* (1883) 22 C. D. 629; *Alliance Syndicate v. MacIvor's Patents* (1891) 8 R. P. C. 321). If the names and addresses of the alleged users are not given, the plaintiff may apply for better particulars; or he may interrogate the defendant as to names and addresses, and the defendant will be bound to answer the interrogatory (*Alliance Syndicate v. MacIvor's Patents, supra*; *General Electric Co. v. Safety Co.* (1903) 21 R. P. C. 109). If the defendant, before obtaining discovery, does not know, but believes the plaintiff's books show the time and place of the prior user, he may say that the time at which and the place in which the prior user took place are to be found in the plaintiff's books (see *Woolfe v. Automatic Picture Gallery* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at pp. 162, 163); but he should amend when he has obtained discovery.

A statement that the invention was published by manufacture by W. "from 1832 to 1862" is not a sufficient statement as to the time of the user (*Smith v. Lang* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 149).

The particular article relied upon as an anticipation should be so described as to enable the defendant to identify it (see *Scott v. Hull Steam Co.* (1896) 13 R. P. C. 206). It is not enough to say that an article made according to the supposed invention was used "at the works of H." in a certain year; for that might mean any article used at H.'s works in that year (*Boyd v. Farrar* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 35).

But the defendant need not state what part of the invention the article relied upon anticipates; once the article is pointed out the patentee must understand his own specification well enough to be able to judge how far it is or is not an anticipation (*Boyd v. Farrar, supra*).

(3) STATE OF COMMON KNOWLEDGE.—If the defendant intends to rely upon general public knowledge as distinguished from

anticipation, he should raise that objection distinctly (*Phillips v. Ivel Cycle Co.* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 77).

When this ground is relied upon, it is neither necessary nor proper to give particulars of the documents or publications by which the general knowledge is intended to be proved. All the defendant need do is to say that the state of knowledge was such that there is no novelty in the patent; having said that he need not go on, in support of that, to give the evidence he intends to adduce to prove it (*per Lindley, L.J.*, in *Holliday v. Heppenstall* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 326; and see *English Machinery Co. v. Union Boot Co.* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 374; *Siemens v. Karo* (1891) 8 R. P. C. at p. 377). But of course, if the defendant relies on publications as *anticipations*, he must state what those publications are; and he must indicate that he relies upon them as anticipations, and not as showing the state of general public knowledge (see *per Cotton, L.J.*, in *Holliday v. Heppenstall, supra*; *per Wills, J.*, in *Solvo Laundry v. Mackie* (1893) 10 R. P. C. at p. 70; see p. 179, *supra*).

Where, however, the defendant intends to refer to a single specification as evidence of common knowledge, it should be mentioned in the particulars (see *per Lindley, L.J.*, in *English Machinery Co. v. Union Boot Co.* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 374).

In *Solvo Laundry v. Mackie* ((1893) 10 R. P. C. at p. 70), Wills, J., said that specifications do not show common knowledge, and he rejected them as evidence thereof. But in *Sutcliffe v. Abbott* ((1903) 20 R. P. C. at p. 55), Buckley, J., permitted specifications to be referred to as evidence of common knowledge (and see *Castner-Kellner Co. v. Commercial Corpn.* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at p. 276; *English Machinery Co. v. Union Boot Co., supra*; *Holliday v. Heppenstall, supra*).

(c) Objection that the Thing Patented Involved no Invention or Ingenuity.—No further particulars are necessary (see *Morris v. Young* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 460); and it may be that the objection of want of novelty is sufficient to cover the objection of want of invention (see *Electrolytic Co. v. Holland* (1901) 18 R. P. C. 521).

(d) Objection that Invention is not Useful.—Further particulars are unnecessary (see *Morris v. Young, supra*).

(e) Objection of Disconformity.—Particulars must be given as to how and in what respect the invention described in the complete specification differs from the invention described in

the provisional specification (*Anglo-American Brush Co. v. Crompton* (1886) 4 R. P. C. at p. 28; *Heathfield v. Greenway* (1894) 11 R. P. C. 17).

(*f*) **Objection that Specification is Insufficient.**—How the specification is insufficient must be detailed. For instance, it is not enough to say: “The specification does not sufficiently describe and ascertain the nature of the invention and the manner in which the same is to be formed”; the plaintiff is entitled to know in what respect the specification fails to sufficiently describe the nature of the invention or the mode of performing it (*Heathfield v. Greenway* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 20; *Crompton v. Anglo-American Brush Corpn.* (1887) 4 R. P. C. 197). Nor is it sufficient to say merely: “The specification is ambiguous and framed in a manner calculated to mislead”; the defendant must show in what respect it is ambiguous or misleading (*Heathfield v. Greenway, supra*).

In *Crompton v. Anglo-American Brush Corpn.* (*supra*) the defendant stated that the specification was insufficient, “inasmuch as it does not contain a sufficient direction to enable a workman skilled in the manufacture of electrical machinery to make” the invention; Held, that the defendant must, if possible, give further particulars.

Although the defendant must particularly state how the specification is defective, he need not point how it is to be put right (*Crompton v. Anglo-American Brush Corpn., supra*, at p. 200).

(*g*) **Objection of Prior Grant.**—The plea of prior grant has only recently been raised in patent cases. The issue raised by it is want of validity, but not of novelty. Hence, the particulars need not be as full as where the patent is attacked on the ground of prior publication (see *Birmingham Tyre Co. v. Reliance Co.* (1900) 17 R. P. C. 278).

Application for Further and Better Particulars of Objections.—If the plaintiff is not satisfied with the particulars delivered by the defendant he may apply for further and better particulars; or he may acquire the further information he desires by means of interrogatories (see *Alliance Syndicate v. MacIvor's Patents* (1891) 8 R. P. C. 321; *General Electric Co. v. Safety Co.* (1904) 21 R. P. C. 109).

The plaintiff should always obtain better particulars where the particulars delivered are vague; for he cannot, at the trial,

resist the admission of evidence which is within the literal meaning of the particulars, on the ground that the statement is too general (*Hull v. Bollard* (1856) 1 H. & N. 134; *Sugg v. Silber* (1877) 2 Q. B. D. 493). But s. 29 (4) (see p. 178, *supra*) has probably made a difference in this respect.

Amendment of Particulars.

Particulars of breaches and of objections may be from time to time amended by leave of the Court or a Judge (s. 29 (5) of the Patents Act, 1883). Application for leave to amend may be made by summons at chambers or by motion; if made pending an appeal it should be made by motion in the Court of Appeal.

The application may be made at any time; leave has been granted to amend particulars of objections on the eve of the trial (*Otto v. Sterne* (1885) 2 R. P. C. 139; *Parker v. Maignen's Co.* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 207), and even at the trial itself (*Blakey v. Latham* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 36; *Allen v. Horton* (1893) 10 R. P. C. at p. 413; *Westley v. Perkes* (1893) 10 R. P. C. at p. 186; *Badische v. La Société Chimique* (1897) 14 R. P. C. at p. 881). And leave to amend may be given by the Court of Appeal after the hearing and pending an appeal; but the Court of Appeal will exercise its jurisdiction, with regard to particulars of objections, with considerable caution, and leave will not be granted unless some very special case is made out (*Shoe Co. v. Cutlan* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 534).

Leave to amend at the trial will not generally be granted unless it is shown that the new matter has only been recently discovered and could not, with reasonable diligence, have been discovered before (see *per* North, J., in *Moss v. Malings* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 375; *Shrewsbury v. Morgan* (1896) 13 R. P. C. at p. 76); but where the matter has only recently been discovered, leave will usually be granted (*Pirrie v. York Street Co.* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 431; *Parker v. Maignen's Co.* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 207).

Terms on Allowing Amendment.—As a general rule leave to amend is granted only on terms.

The party applying for leave will usually be required to pay the costs of and consequent on the amendment (*Otto v. Sterne* (1885) 2 R. P. C. 139; *Parker v. Maignen's Co.* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 208; *Ehrlich v. Ihlee* (1887) 4 R. P. C. 115). But there is no settled rule as to this; and the writer is aware of cases recently decided in chambers where the costs have been made costs in the action.

An amendment of particulars of objections will generally only be allowed upon the terms that the plaintiff shall be at liberty within a certain period to elect to discontinue the action, and that if he so elects all costs incurred after delivery of the original particulars shall be paid by the defendant (*Edison v. India-Rubber Co.* (1881) 17 C. D. 137, following the order made in *Baird v. Moule's Co.* (1876) 17 C. D. 139, *n.*; *Ehrlich v. Ihlee* (1887) 4 R. P. C. 115; *Solvo Laundry v. Mackie* (1893) 10 R. P. C. 68; and see *Badische v. La Société Chimique* (1897) 14 R. P. C. at p. 881). But the Judge has an absolute discretion in the matter which cannot be fettered by any rule of practice; and leave to amend may be given unconditionally (*Woolley v. Broad* (1892) 9 R. P. C. 429; *Pascall v. Toope* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 125; and see *Wilson v. Wilson* (1899) 16 R. P. C. 315; *Allen v. Horton* (1893) 10 R. P. C. at pp. 413, 416).

Interlocutory Injunction.

The plaintiff commonly applies to the Court for an injunction to restrain the defendant committing further acts of infringement until the trial or further order.

Application for an interlocutory injunction is made, in the Chancery Division, by motion in Court. An appeal against the refusal to grant an interlocutory injunction lies direct to the Court of Appeal (*McHarg v. Universal Stock Exchange* [1895] 2 Q. B. 81).

An *ex parte* injunction will only be granted in special circumstances and on special terms (see *Moser v. Jones* (1893) 10 R. P. C. 368), and the application must be made at the earliest possible period (*Greer v. Bristol Tanning Co.* (1885) 2 R. P. C. 268). It is incumbent on the party making an application for an injunction, *ex parte*, to swear as to his belief that he, or the patentee, is the original inventor (see *per* Lord Eldon, L.C., in *Hill v. Thompson* (1817) 1 W. P. C. at p. 231), and that the patent is valid (*Gardner v. Broadbent* (1856) 4 W. R. 767); and he must exercise perfect good faith, and put the Court in possession of all material facts (see notes to Order 50, rule 6, in the Annual Practice).

Leave to serve notice of motion for an injunction with the writ is granted almost as a matter of course; but where leave to serve short notice is required special reasons must be stated.

When Interlocutory Injunction will be Granted.—When a *prima facie* case of infringement is made out, and there is a

presumption in favour of the validity of the patent, an interim injunction will be granted; but however clear the infringement may appear, an injunction will not be granted unless the plaintiff's patent must be assumed to be valid (*Jackson v. Needle* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at pp. 176, 177), or the defendant is estopped from denying its validity (see p. 187, *infra*) or does not in fact do so.

A presumption in favour of the validity of the patent arises (1) where the validity of the patent has been supported in previous litigation, or (2) where the patentee has been in long and undisturbed enjoyment of it (see *per* Jessel, M.R., in *Dudgton v. Thomson* (1874) 30 L. T. (N. S.) at p. 244).

(1) WHERE VALIDITY OF PATENT HAS ALREADY BEEN SUPPORTED.—If the plaintiff's patent has been upheld in previous litigation, the plaintiff is entitled to an interlocutory injunction once a *prima facie* case of infringement is made out (see *per* Lord Romilly, M.R., in *Borill v. Goodier* (1866) 35 L. J. (N. S.) Ch. at p. 435; *Edison-Bell v. Bernstein* (1897) 14 R. P. C. at p. 158; *Brooks v. Lyceum's Saddle Co.* (1903) 20 R. P. C. at p. 577; *cf.* *Welsbach Co. v. General Co.* (1901) 18 R. P. C. 533). And the fact that an appeal against the decision in favour of the validity of the patent is pending (*Moser v. Sewell* (1893) 10 R. P. C. 365; but in this case the *bona fides* of the defendant in the second action was questionable), or that a fresh fact is brought forward by the defendant tending to impeach the novelty of the invention (*Heine Solly v. Norden* (1904), not yet reported; *Newall v. Wilson* (1852) 2 De G. M. & G. 282; *Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Marwood* (1896) 13 R. P. C. 347), or that in the former action the services of an eminent expert could not be obtained (*Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Marwood, supra*), makes no difference.

Where the defendant in the second action was really the defendant, or indemnified the defendant, in the former action, the reason for granting an injunction is all the stronger (*Farbenfabriken v. Dawson* (1891) 8 R. P. C. 397; *Moser v. Sewell* (1893) 10 R. P. C. at pp. 367, 368).

A certificate that the validity of the patent came in question is not of the same force and effect where judgment is given for the plaintiff in default of appearance (see *per* Chitty, J., in *Edison-Bell v. Bernstein* (1897) 14 R. P. C. at p. 158, *cf.* *Welsbach Co. v. Vulcan Co.* (1901) 18 R. P. C. 279); but where two actions have been brought and in each the defendant has not appeared, the presumption is in favour of the validity of the patent (*Edison-Bell v. Bernstein, supra*).

The fact that the patent has been upheld by the Scotch Courts is sufficient *primâ facie* evidence of the validity of the patent (*Dudgeon v. Thomson* (1874) 30 L. T. (N. S.) 244; *United Telephone Co. v. St. George* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 37); and the award of an arbitrator in favour of the plaintiff's patent has been held sufficient proof (*Lister v. Eastwood* (1855) 26 L. T. 4).

(2) WHERE PATENTEE HAS BEEN IN LONG AND UNINTERRUPTED ENJOYMENT OF THE PATENT.—In the case of a new patent, the validity of which has not been established in prior litigation, an injunction will not be granted (*Spencer v. Holt* (1903) 20 R. P. C. at p. 144; *Wapshire Tube Co. v. Hyde Co.* (1901) 18 R. P. C. at p. 379), unless the validity is not in dispute, or the defendant is estopped from denying the validity, or the Court is not satisfied that the defendant honestly intends to try the question of validity (*Holophane v. Berend* (1897) 15 R. P. C. at p. 19). But where there has been long enjoyment under a patent (the enjoyment, of course, including use), the public have had ample opportunity of contesting its validity; and the fact of their not having done so affords, at least *primâ facie*, evidence that the title of the patentee is good (*Caldwell v. Vanrlessengen* (1851) 9 Hare at p. 424; *Hill v. Thompson* (1817) 1 W. P. C. at p. 231; *Sterens v. Keating* (1847) 2 W. P. C. at pp. 177, 178; *Muntz v. Foster* (1843) 2 W. P. C. at p. 95; *Holophane v. Berend* (1897) 15 R. P. C. at p. 19). In this case an interlocutory injunction will be granted, on a *primâ facie* case of infringement being made out, unless the invention has only been put into practice at a recent date (*Plimpton v. Malcolmson* (1875) 20 Eq. 37; *Caldwell v. Vanrlessengen, supra*), or the patentee's enjoyment has been disturbed or non-exclusive and he has done nothing to vindicate his rights (*Rothwell v. King* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 380).

Where the patent is for an improvement upon the subject of a prior patent, the undisturbed possession does not commence until after the expiration of the prior patent (*Heugh v. Magill, W. N.* (1877) 62).

Six years' undisturbed and active enjoyment is considered sufficient to justify the Court in assuming the validity of the patent (*Rothwell v. King* (1886) 3 R. P. C. 379; *Bickford v. Skewes* (1837) 1 W. P. C. at p. 213); and, under special circumstances, three years (*Wheatstone v. Wilde* (1861) Griff. P. C. 247), or even eighteen months' (*Coles v. Baylis* (1886) 3 R. P. C. 178) possession may be enough. But, in the absence of special circumstances,

e.g., where the defendant by his conduct practically admits that the invention is new (*Coles v. Baylis* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 182), possession of a patent for only three years is probably not sufficient (*Lister v. Norton* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 115; and see *British Tanning Co. v. Groth* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 1). In *Jackson v. Needle* ((1884) 1 R. P. C. 174) the Court of Appeal dissolved an injunction granted in respect of a patent only eight months old. In *Holophane v. Berend* ((1897) 15 R. P. C. 18), Kekewich, J., refused to grant an injunction, although the patent was five years old.

The question of validity will not be considered on the motion (see *Holophane v. Berend*, *supra*; *Shillito v. Larmuth* (1885) 2 R. P. C. 1), unless the patent on the face of it is so irretrievably and hopelessly bad that it is absolutely impossible that it could be supported (*Briggs v. Lardeur* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 128; *Shillito v. Larmuth*, *supra*, at p. 2).

Where the patent is of recent date, and the Court, by reason thereof, refuses to grant an injunction, the defendant is usually required to give an undertaking to keep an account until the hearing (*Jackson v. Needle* (1884) 1 R. P. C. 174; *Holophane v. Berend* (1897) 15 R. P. C. 18; *Actien Gesellschaft v. Temler* (1899) 16 R. P. C. 447; *Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Friswell* (1895) 13 R. P. C. 15).

Even though the patent be a new one, an injunction will be granted if the defendant does not appear, upon the plaintiff producing an affidavit that he believes the patent to be valid and knows of nothing that anticipates it (*Clarke v. Nichols* (1895) 12 R. P. C. 310).

In *British Tanning Co. v. Groth* ((1889) 7 R. P. C. 1), where the patent was of recent date, no injunction was granted, although the defendant refused to give an undertaking to keep an account; but in this case the evidence as to infringement was not strong, and it appeared that the patentees of the plaintiff's process had entered into an agreement with the defendant which went towards negating the right to an injunction.

(3) WHERE THE DEFENDANT DOES NOT DISPUTE OR IS ESTOPPED FROM DISPUTING THE VALIDITY OF THE PATENT.—In either of these cases an injunction will be granted if a *prima facie* case of infringement is made out; the age of the patent is immaterial.

The defendant's conduct may have been such as to estop him, on motion for an interlocutory injunction, from disputing the validity of the plaintiff's patent (see *per* Jessel, M. R., in *Duigcon v. Thomson* (1877) 30 L. T. (N. S.) 244; *Clarke v. Ferguson*

(1859) 1 Giff. 184; *Neilson v. Fothergill* (1841) 1 W. P. C. 287); or the defendant may by his conduct practically admit that the invention is new (*Coles v Baylis* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 182).

A licensee, during the term of the licence, is estopped from disputing the validity of the patent (see p. 99, *supra*); and the assignor of a patent is also estopped from raising the question of validity as against the assignee (see p. 91, *supra*).

Where the patent has been worked by the plaintiff and defendant as partners, under circumstances affording a presumption that the defendant did not, during the existence of the partnership, dispute the validity of the patent, the Court will, upon an interlocutory application for an injunction, assume that the patent is valid (see *per* Knight Bruce, V.-C., in *Muntz v. Grenfell* (1842) 2 Coop. 61, *n.*; *cf.* *Armann v. Lund* (1874) 18 Eq. 330).

When Interlocutory Injunction will be Refused.—An injunction will not be granted—(1) where a *prima facie* case of infringement is not made out; or (2) where the patent sued upon is of recent date and its validity has not been supported in previous litigation (see p. 185, *supra*), unless the validity of the patent is not in issue; or (3) where the plaintiff is guilty of laches; or (4) if the plaintiff has acquiesced in the acts complained of; or (5) if the balance of convenience is against granting an injunction; or (6) if there is no probability of the infringement being continued.

THE CASE OF INFRINGEMENT.—If a *prima facie* case of infringement is not made out an application for an injunction will be refused (see *Lister v. Norton* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 116; *Morgan v. Seaward* (1835) 1 W. P. C. at p. 168; *Muntz v. Vician* (1840) 2 W. P. C. at p. 88; *British Tanning Co. v. Groth* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 1). But an injunction is obtainable without proving actual infringement where there is a deliberate intention to infringe and the plaintiff shows that what is threatened to be done would, if carried out, amount to infringement (see *per* Jessel, M.R., in *Frearson v. Loe* (1878) 9 C. D. at p. 65; *Dowling v. Billington* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 201; *Shoe Co. v. Cutlan* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 357).

LACHES.—The plaintiff must make his application for an interlocutory injunction at an early period; laches is a bar to interlocutory relief (*Bridson v. Benecke* (1849) 12 Beav. 1; *Borill v. Crate* (1865) 1 Eq. 388; *North British Co. v. Gormully* (1894) 12 R. P. C. at p. 21; *Leonhardt v. Kallé* (1894) 11 R. P. C. 534). A delay, after *knowledge* of the infringement (*Crossley v. Derby Gas Co.* (1829) 1 W. P. C. at p. 120; *Osmond v. Hirst* (1885) 2 R. P. C. at p. 267), of ten months (*Leonhardt v. Kallé* (1894) 11

R. P. C. 534), nine months (*Actien Gesellschaft v. Temler* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at 447), six months (*Edison-Bell v. Hough* (1894) 11 R. P. C. 594), or even three months (*Dunlop Co. v. Stone* (1897) 14 R. P. C. at p. 264), may disentitle the plaintiff to an interlocutory injunction.

Where, however, the delay is satisfactorily explained, it is no bar to the relief claimed (*United Telephone Co. v. Equitable Telephone Asscn.* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 233). The plaintiff may wait until a limited company has come into a state in which it is worth his while to institute proceedings against it (*United Telephone Co. v. Equitable Telephone Asscn.*, *supra*, at p. 237). And some time may be spent in making inquiries (*Losh v. Hague* (1837) 1 W. P. C. at p. 201), or obtaining the necessary evidence (*United Telephone Co. v. Equitable Telephone Asscn.*, *supra*), as to the alleged infringement.

The fact that the plaintiff has been guilty of laches against some person who is not a defendant is not a ground for refusing to grant an interlocutory injunction (*Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Warrilow*, (1896) 13 R. P. C. at pp. 287, 288).

ACQUIESCENCE.—Acquiescence in the defendant's acts is also a bar to interlocutory relief. For instance, where the plaintiff was aware that the defendants were at considerable expense in erecting machinery for the purpose of using the invention, and he never interfered to stop them, but permitted them to go on under the expectation that they would pay him a royalty, an interlocutory injunction was refused (*Neilson v. Thompson* (1841) 1 W. P. C. at pp. 285, 286). But a patentee does not acquiesce in the infringement of his patent by omitting to take proceedings to revoke a subsequent patent extending to his invention, unless the subsequent patent is put in practice (*Newall v. Wilson* (1852) 2 De G. M. & G. 282; and see *per* Bacon, V.-C., in *Osmond v. Hirst* (1885) 2 R. P. C. at p. 267). And there is no acquiescence in asking the defendant to use the plaintiff's machine in preference to the infringing machine; for it is not the duty of a patentee to warn persons that what they are doing is an infringement (*Proctor v. Bennis* (1887) 36 C. D. 740).

BALANCE OF CONVENIENCE.—In determining whether to grant or refuse an interlocutory injunction, the convenience or inconvenience to the parties will be considered (see *Thomson v. Hughes* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 71; *Bracher v. Bracher* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 420; *Moser v. Sewell* (1893) 10 R. P. C. at p. 367).

An injunction will not be granted if it would cause serious

injury to the defendant, and no direct benefit to the plaintiff (*Neilson v. Thompson* (1841) 1 W. P. C. at p. 286; *Morgan v. Seaward* (1835) 1 W. P. C. at p. 168; *Thomson v. Hughes* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 76; *Moser v. Sewell* (1893) 10 R. P. C. at p. 367; cf. *Muntz v. Foster* (1843) 2 W. P. C. 93). But the Court will require the defendant to give an undertaking to keep an account (*Thomson v. Hughes, supra*; *Neilson v. Thompson* (1841), *supra*; *Jones v. Pearce* (1831) 1 W. P. C. 121). It is no answer, however, to a motion for an interlocutory injunction that the defendant has volunteered to keep an account (*Read v. Andrew* (1885) 2 R. P. C. at p. 122).

“If the trade of a defendant be an old and an established trade, the hardship upon him would be too great if an injunction were granted. But when the trade of the defendant is a new trade, and he is the seller of goods to a vast number of people,” it is “less inconvenient, and less likely to produce irreparable damage, to stop him from selling, than it would be to allow him to sell and merely keep an account, thus forcing the plaintiff to commence a multitude of actions against the purchasers” (*per* Brett, L.J., in *Plimpton v. Spiller* (1876) 4 C. D. at p. 292).

Where the defendants are a new company, and the patent has been supported in previous litigation, or has been actively enjoyed for a considerable period, the Court will grant an injunction (*Bracher v. Bracher* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 422, 423; *Brooks v. Lycett's Saddle Co.* (1903) 20 R. P. C. at p. 577).

In some cases an injunction will be refused upon the defendant paying a sum of money into Court as security (*Edison-Bell v. Hough* (1894) 11 R. P. C. 594; *North British Co. v. Gormully* (1895) 12 R. P. C. 17); and an injunction may be granted only on the plaintiff's undertaking to supply the defendant with articles in the place of any the injunction prevents him from using (*United Telephone Co. v. Tasker* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 628).

NO INJUNCTION WHERE NO PROBABILITY OF INFRINGEMENT BEING CONTINUED.—Whenever a person has committed an act of infringement, *primâ facie* that is ground for granting an injunction, because when a man has done a wrongful act the probability (unless there is anything which prevents that probability from arising) is that he will continue it (*per* Cotton, L.J., in *Proctor v. Bailey* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 542). But the Court will not grant an injunction where there is no probability of the act being continued (*Proctor v. Bailey, supra*). In this case the infringement had been discontinued for five years, and there had been

no threat of any repetition of the infringement, and there was no evidence of any intention to repeat it.

Undertaking as to Damages.—The plaintiff is usually required to give an undertaking to abide by such order as the Court may make as to damages should it turn out that an injunction should not have been granted; and this undertaking is required on granting injunctions on notice (*Heine Solly & Co. v. Norden* (1904), not yet reported; *Fenner v. Wilson* (1893) 10 R. P. C. at p. 287) as well as on *ex parte* applications (*Moser v. Jones* (1893) 10 R. P. C. at p. 369).

Evidence on the Motion.—A *prima facie* case, at all events, of actual infringement must be made out (*Briggs v. Lardeur* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 128; *Lister v. Norton* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 116); or the plaintiff must show a deliberate intention to infringe, and that what is threatened would amount to infringement (*Frearson v. Loe* (1878) 9 C. D. at p. 65; *Dowling v. Billington* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 201; *Shoe Co. v. Cutlan* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 357).

If an infringing article has been purchased from the defendant, it should, where possible, be made an exhibit to the plaintiff's affidavit.

If the patent has been upheld in a previous suit, that fact should be set out, and a copy of the order made should be exhibited. If the patent has not been previously supported, the plaintiff should state, whether the application be made *ex parte* (*Hill v. Thompson* (1817) 1 W. P. C. at p. 231) or on notice (*Sturtz v. De La Rue* (1828) 5 Russ. at p. 329), that he, or the patentee, is the true and first inventor, and that he believes the patent to be valid (*Gardner v. Broadbent* (1856) 4 W. R. 767; *Sturtz v. De La Rue, supra*; *Clarke v. Nichols* (1895) 12 R. P. C. 310).

Where the plaintiff is not the patentee, how his title is derived should be clearly shown.

The plaintiff should distinctly swear that the article complained of was made neither by him nor his agents (*Betts v. Wilmot*, 6 Ch. at p. 243; and see *Dunlop Co. v. Hubbard Patents* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at pp. 548, 549).

Where an affidavit is made upon "information and belief," the deponent should state what are the sources of his information and belief (*Saccharin Corpn. v. Chemical Co.* (1898) 15 R. P. C. 53; *Read v. Andrew* (1885) 2 R. P. C. at p. 122; *cf.*

Badische v. Thompson (1902) 19 R. P. C. 502). "I believe," without any grounds, is only "I suspect" (*per* Kay, J., in *Germ Milling Co. v. Robinson* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 219).

Costs.—The costs are usually made costs in the action (see *per* Chitty, J., in *Lister v. Norton* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 116; *Brooks v. Lycett's Saddle Co.*, 20 R. P. C. at p. 577). In some cases, *e.g.*, where the defendant is a small and innocent retailer, an injunction will be granted, but no order made as to costs (*American Tobacco Co. v. Guest* (1892) 9 R. P. C. 218; and see p. 213, *infra*). If there is an independent case against the motion, *e.g.*, delay on the plaintiff's part, it is better to order the motion to stand till the trial (see *per* Chitty, J., in *Lister v. Norton* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 116).

* *Order for Inspection.*

In an action for infringement, the Court or a Judge may on the application of either party make such order for inspection, and impose such terms and give such directions respecting the same and the proceedings thereon as the Court or a Judge may see fit (s. 30 of the Patents Act, 1883); and the Court may order samples to be taken (*Germ Milling Co. v. Robinson* (1885) 3 R. P. C. 11; *Russell v. Cowley* (1883) 1 W. P. C. at p. 459), observations to be made, or experiments to be tried (R. S. C. Ord. 50, r. 3).

The application for an order for inspection may be made by motion or by summons in chambers; in a special case the order may be granted on an *ex parte* application (*Hennessy v. Bohmann*, W. N. (1877) 14). The application may be made at any time; even before the statement of claim is delivered (*Drake v. Muntz's Co.* (1886) 3 R. P. C. 43). And the Court may of its own accord, at the trial, order inspection and experiments to be made by an expert (see *North British Co. v. Macintosh* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 487). Application may be made either by the plaintiffs (*Drake v. Muntz's Co.*, *supra*) or the defendants (*Germ Milling Co. v. Robinson* (1885) 3 R. P. C. 11); and the Court may require inspection to be given by both parties (*Germ Milling Co. v. Robinson*, *supra*; and see *Rylands v. Ashley's Patent Co.* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 175).

The application must be supported by affidavit setting forth a *prima facie* case of infringement (*Cheetham v. Oldham* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 617), the grounds upon which an order is necessary (*Piggott v. Anglo-American Co.* (1868) 19 L. T. (N. S.) 46), and

the nature of the invention (see *Meadows v. Kirkman* (1860) 29 L. J. (N. S.) Ex. 205).

No order will be made unless the party seeking it satisfies the Court that there is really a case to be tried, and that inspection is material (*Piggott v. Anglo-American Co., supra*); and the Court is always reluctant to grant inspection where it may be injurious to one side, and where the right depends on a question which has yet to be determined (*McDougall v. Partington* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 473).

Inspection will not be ordered where the articles are not the property or under the control of the other party (see *Garrard v. Edge* (1889) 6 R. P. C. 372; *Sidebottom v. Fielden* (1891) 8 R. P. C. 266; but see *Rylands v. Ashley's Patent Co.* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 175). And no order can be made as against the licensee of either party (*Germ Milling Co. v. Robinson* (1885) 3 R. P. C. at p. 14), or for inspection of articles in a foreign manufactory (*Neilson v. Betts*, L. R. 5 H. L. at pp. 11, 12).

The fact that it is alleged that inspection would expose a trade secret is no ground for refusing an order (*Bovill v. Moore* (1815) 2 Coop. 56, *n.*; and see *Ashworth v. Roberts*, 7 R. P. C. at p. 455). But the Court will sometimes appoint an independent expert to make the inspection and order that he shall not disclose anything arrived at by him without leave of the Court (*Plating Co. v. Farquharson* (1879) Griff. P. C. 187; and see *Flower v. Lloyd*, W. N. (1876) at pp. 169, 230), and that the evidence be taken *in camera* (*Badische v. Levinstein* (1885) 2 R. P. C. at p. 81).

In *Swain v. Edlin-Sinclair* ((1903) 20 R. P. C. 435), the Court made an order for inspection by two experts and refused to allow inspection by the patentees.

Sometimes the Court will order that one party shall allow the other to see their process or machine at work (*Rylands v. Ashley's Patent Co.* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 181; *Russell v. Cowley* (1833) 1 W. P. C. at p. 458). But such an order will only be made in a special case (see *Sidebottom v. Fielden* (1891) 8 R. P. C. at p. 269).

The order will be limited to such of the defendant's processes as to which a *prima facie* case of infringement is made out (*Cheetham v. Oldham* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 617).

Where the defendant has a large stock of alleged infringing machines, inspection of *all* his machines will not be ordered; but he may be directed to verify on affidavit the several kinds of machines that he has sold and to produce one machine of each

class for inspection (*Singer Co. v. Wilson* (1865) 13 W. R. 560; but see *Drake v. Muntz's Co.* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 44, where Bacon, V.-C., said he had no power to order a defendant to make an affidavit).

Laches sufficient to defeat the plaintiff's right to an interlocutory injunction is no bar to an order on the same motion for inspection (*Patent Type Co. v. Walter* (1860) Johnson, 727).

Discovery.

Interrogatories.—The Court has jurisdiction to order interrogatories to be answered notwithstanding the provisions of the Patents Act, 1883, as to the delivery of particulars; and if the interrogatories are properly worded, they may refer to the very matters which ought to have been covered by the particulars (*Birch v. Mather* (1882) 22 C. D. 629; *Alliance Syndicate v. MacIvor's Patents* (1891) 8 R. P. C. 321; *General Electric Co. v. Safety Co.* (1904) 21 R. P. C. at p. 109). As to the rules and practice governing interrogatories generally, the reader is referred to the Rules of the Supreme Court, Ord. 31, and the notes thereon contained in the Annual Practice.

The defendant may ask any question fairly tending to show that the patent is bad (*Hoffmann v. Postill* (1869) 4 Ch. 673).

Where the defendants alleged that the plaintiffs' invention had been anticipated by the manufacture and sale "by white lead manufacturers generally in London and the vicinity thereof continuously from the year 1836 up to the date of" the patent of white lead made according to the alleged invention, the defendants were ordered to answer an interrogatory as to the names of the white lead manufacturers, and the places and dates of manufacture (*Alliance Syndicate v. MacIvor's Patents* (1891) 8 R. P. C. 321).

If infringement is admitted, and the only issue is as to the validity of the patent, interrogatories as to the names of the defendant's customers need not be answered before the trial (*Lister v. Norton* (1885) 2 R. P. C. 68).

Interrogatories are not admissible if their relevancy depends upon the construction of the specification (*Delta Co. v. Maxim Co.* (1891) 8 R. P. C. at p. 171; *Moseley v. Victoria Rubber Co.* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 357). But the defendant may interrogate the plaintiff as to what claims he is alleged to have infringed (see p. 176, *supra*); and the plaintiff may take the defendant step by step through the specification and ask if he has ever used, and if so in what manner, any of the

processes, combinations, or component parts therein referred to (see *Ashworth v. Roberts* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at pp. 452, 453; *Benno Jaffé v. Richardson* (1893) 10 R. P. C. 136).

The plaintiff cannot ask the defendant what an alleged anticipation did (*Delta Co. v. Maxim Co.* (1891) 8 R. P. C. 169). But a defendant may ask in what respects a previous invention differs from the plaintiff's (*Hoffman v. Postill* (1869) 4 Ch. 673).

When infringement is not denied by a defendant, it is no ground for refusing to answer an interrogatory that the answer would expose persons to whom he had sold the infringing article to actions for infringement (*Tetley v. Easton* (1856) 18 C. B. 643). And a mere plea that the process is a secret one is not sufficient to defeat discovery (*per Kekewich, J., in Ashworth v. Roberts* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 455).

Ord. 31, r. 20, is only enabling (*Raues v. Chance* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 275), and a defendant cannot refuse to answer interrogatories merely on the ground that the discovery sought depends on the determination of the question as to the validity of the patent (*Benno Jaffé v. Richardson* (1893) 10 R. P. C. 136).

As to the proper persons to answer interrogatories and the sufficiency of answers in the case of a company, see *Welsbach Co. v. New Sunlight Co.* (1900) 17 R. P. C. 401).

Discovery of Documents.—As to discovery generally, see Ord. 31, rr. 12 to 29, and the notes thereunder contained in the Annual Practice.

One litigant is not entitled to see books or laboratory notes containing the processes of the other litigant unless he wants to see them—and until the time comes in the litigation when he wants to see them—for the purposes of justice.

“What would be the opposite result? Why, that any patentee who is not working himself, might, by bringing an action for infringement against a working competitor, see laboratory processes in the books under the plea that he wanted it to prove infringement” (*per Bowen, L.J., in Raues v. Chance* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 282).

A defendant, who disputes the validity of the patent, is entitled to discovery of all documents relating to former proceedings in which the validity was attacked, except such as “have come into existence merely to be communicated to the solicitor for the purpose of litigation, actual or intended, and either as materials for briefs or for his advice or consideration” (*Haslam v. Hall* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 1; and see *Bown v. Sansom*

(1888) 5 R. P. C. 510; *Thomson v. Hughes* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 187).

A mere plea of secret process is not sufficient to defeat discovery; but the Court will not unnecessarily oblige a defendant to disclose his own secret process (*Ashworth v. Roberts* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 455), and will endeavour to protect him (see *Badische v. Lerinstein* (1885) 2 R. P. C. at p. 81; *Plating Co. v. Farquharson* (1879) Griff. P. C. 187).

Communications between a litigant and a patent agent are not privileged; and where a solicitor is also a patent agent, communications are privileged only so far as they were made to him in his capacity of solicitor (*Moseley v. Victoria Rubber Co.* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at pp. 355, 356).

Affidavits and notes of evidence in former proceedings may be required to be produced (*Bown v. Sansom* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 510; *Thomson v. Hughes* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 187).

Expediting the Trial.

Actions in the Chancery Division entered for trial may be taken out of their turn by order of the Court, on the plaintiff's application, and without the defendant's consent, on a proper ground being stated, *e.g.*, on the ground that the object of the suit will be lost by delay, or to enable a certain witness to attend (see note to Ord. 36, r. 16, in the Annual Practice). The application is usually made by motion (see *Farbenfabriken v. Bowker* (1891) 8 R. P. C. 136).

Where an interlocutory injunction has been granted an application to advance the trial will rarely be granted; and where no injunction has been granted a special case must be made out (see *per* Stirling, J., in *Farbenfabriken v. Bowker*, *supra*, at p. 137).

The fact that owing to fluctuations and changes in taste the market for the patented article may expire in a few months is no ground for expediting the hearing (*Farbenfabriken v. Bowker*, *supra*; *cf.* *Heine Solly v. Conico Co.* (1904) 21 R. P. C. 201).

When leave is given to the plaintiff to apply to advance, the application to advance will be refused if delay is made in making the application (*Heine Solly v. Conico Co.*, *supra*).

Leave to Discontinue.

If, after receipt of the defence, the plaintiff has proceeded in the action, he cannot discontinue without leave of the Court or a

Judge: and in granting leave the Court may impose such terms as to costs, and as to any other actions, or otherwise, as may be just (R. S. C. Ord. 26, r. 1). The plaintiff is usually required to pay all the costs, including the costs of the defendant's particulars, as if the same had been certified (*Boake v. Stevenson* (1895) 12 R. P. C. 228; and see *Bethell v. Gage* (1897) 14 R. P. C. 699). And the Court sometimes grants leave only upon the conditions that the plaintiff undertakes not to bring any other action against the defendant in respect of the same alleged infringement (*Chamberlain v. Mayor of Huddersfield* (1901) 18 R. P. C. 454), and, if the defendant is a person acting in exercise of statutory or public duties (see Public Authorities Protection Act, 1893), that the plaintiff pays the costs as between solicitor and client (*Chamberlain v. Mayor of Huddersfield, supra*).

The Trial.

The action must be tried without a jury, unless the Court otherwise directs (s. 28 (1) of the Patents Act, 1883); it is, now, almost invariably tried without a jury, and in the Chancery Division. The Court may, if it thinks fit, and must, on the request of either of the parties, call in the aid of an assessor specially qualified, and try and hear the case wholly or partly with his assistance (s. 28 (1), *ibid.*).

The Court will not, under Ord. 36, r. 8, try the question of infringement separately from the question of validity of the patent where the issues of infringement and invalidity are set up (*United Telephone Co. v. Mottishead* (1886) 3 R. P. C. 213). But where the defendants denied infringement and alleged invalidity of the patent by reason of prior use by several persons, the Judge at the trial decided to dispose of the alleged evidence of one user before going into the others (*Richardson v. Castrey* (1887) 4 R. P. C. 265; and see *Badham v. Bird* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 240). And where several patents were sued upon, and the only issue was as to validity, the case as to each was heard separately and treated as a separate action (*British Motor Co. v. Sherrin* (1901) 18 R. P. C. 265).

The burden of proof being generally on the plaintiff, he has the right to begin and to reply. But the proof of the issue as to the plaintiff being the true and first inventor is on the defendant (*Ward v. Hill* (1901) 18 R. P. C. 481); and where this is the only issue the defendant must begin (*Pilkington v. Yeakley* (1901) 18 R. P. C. at p. 460).

Evidence.—If the defendant does not appear, the plaintiff is not entitled to judgment without any proof of his case; but it will generally be sufficient to put in the patent and prove the specification and the infringement (*Peroni v. Hudson* (1884) 1 R. P. C. 261). If, however, the specification has been amended, evidence that it was originally drawn with reasonable skill and knowledge must be given (*Brooks v. Lycett* (1903) 20 R. P. C. 390); and if the validity of the patent has not been established before, evidence that the invention is new and useful should be given (*Acetylene Co. v. Midland Syndicate* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 535).

The plaintiff's title must be strictly proved (see *Jandus v. Johnson* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 370). If he is the original patentee, this may be done by production of the letters patent sealed with the seal of the Patent Office (see ss. 12 (2) and 84 of the Patents Act, 1883). If he is an assignee, a certified copy of the entry in the Register of Patents should be produced (ss. 23 (2), and 89, *ibid.*; and see *Jandus v. Johnson, supra*).

Printed or written copies or extracts, purporting to be certified by the Comptroller, and sealed with the seal of the Patent Office, of or from patents, specifications, disclaimers, and other documents in the Patent Office, are admitted in evidence in all Courts, and in all proceedings, without further proof or production of the originals (s. 89, *ibid.*; and see s. 96, *ibid.*, and *Jandus v. Johnson, supra*).

The construction of the specification is for the Court alone; but evidence may be given to explain the meaning of technical or commercial expressions or terms of art (*Hills v. Evans* (1863) 31 L. J. (N. S.) Ch. 457; *Neilson v. Harford* (1841) 1 W. P. C. at p. 370; *United Telephone Co. v. Bassano* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 315), or to explain the state of knowledge at the date of the patent (see *Badische v. Levinstein* (1887) 4 R. P. C. at p. 465; *Sandow v. Szalay* (1904) 21 R. P. C. 333; and see pp. 77, 156, *supra*), or to show that any workman of ordinary skill in the trade would be able to understand and to carry out the invention from the description given (*Edison-Bell v. Smith* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 396; *Badische v. Levinstein* (1885) 2 R. P. C. at p. 112), or to assist the Court in ascertaining what in fact the patentee's invention is (*Badische v. Levinstein, supra*, at pp. 112, 113; (1887) 4 R. P. C. at p. 465).

Although it is not for a witness to construe the specification, he may be asked what he understands by it (see *per* Lord Halsbury, L.C., in *Kaye v. Chubb* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 650), or whether

the invention described involved ingenuity or was obvious (*Fletcher v. Glasgow Commissioners* (1887) 4 R. P. C. at p. 388). But the patentee will not be allowed, where no technical terms are used, to say what he meant by the words he has employed (see *Parker v. Powell* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 375).

If it is alleged that the invention was not proper subject-matter, evidence may be given of experiments leading up to the invention, in order to show that a difficulty had to be overcome (*Thierry v. Rickmann* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 417).

It is not permissible to ask a witness whether he considers the defendant's article is an infringement of the plaintiff's; that is a question for the Court alone (*Parkinson v. Simon* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 506); but he may be asked whether the one device is not a mere mechanical equivalent of the other (*Ticket Punch Co. v. Colley's Patents* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 186).

The opinion of the Law Officer concerning a patent should not be read at the trial (see *per* Cotton, L.J., in *Siddell v. Vickers* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 436).

Models should be properly proved and put in evidence (see *Automatic Weighing Co. v. Combined Weighing Co.* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 125).

If one party is taken by surprise at the trial, or evidence not within the particulars is given, he should ask for an adjournment; for if he does not do so, and judgment is given against him, the Court of Appeal will not grant leave to adduce further evidence on appeal (*Barcroft v. Smith* (1897) 14 R. P. C. 172).

Expert Evidence.—The Judge may, and indeed generally must, be assisted by expert evidence to explain technical terms, to show the practical working of machinery described or drawn, and to point out what is old and what is new in the specification. Expert evidence is also admissible, and is often required to show the particulars in which an alleged invention has been used by an alleged infringer, and the real importance of whatever differences there may be between the plaintiff's invention and whatever is done by the defendant. But the nature of the invention must be ascertained from the specification, and has to be determined by the Judge and not by any expert or other witness; this is familiar law, although often disregarded when witnesses are being examined (see *per* Lindley, L.J., in *Brooks v. Steele* (1897) 14 R. P. C. at p. 73).

The evidence of skilled persons is much the same as that of handwriting experts; they call attention to particular things, and

then the Court has to consider them itself (*per* Lord Herschell in *Boyd v. Horrocks* (1892) 9 R. P. C. at p. 81), but being in no way bound by the witnesses' opinions (*Leadbeater v. Kitchin* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 247).

The evidence of scientific witnesses as to whether there has or not been an infringement ought not to be received (see *per* Lord Wensleydale in *Seed v. Higgins* (1860) 8 H. L. C. 550; *Parkinson v. Simon* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 506); but an expert witness may be asked whether the defendant's variations are not merely mechanical equivalents (*Ticket Punch Co. v. Colley's Patents* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 186).

Evidence of Infringement.—If the action as originally brought is in respect of *threatened* infringement, and, after action brought, the defendant commits actual infringement, evidence of it can be given, as it is evidence to show that the plaintiff was right in his allegation that the defendant was threatening and intending to infringe (see *per* Romer, J., in *Shoe Co. v. Cutlan* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at pp. 357, 358; *cf.* *Dowling v. Billington* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 201). But if the action is based on actual infringement *only*, evidence of acts of infringement subsequent to the date of the writ is inadmissible (*Shoe Co. v. Cutlan, supra*; *Welsbach Co. v. Dowle* (1899) 16 R. P. C. 391; and see *Dowling v. Billington, supra*).

In the case of threatened infringement, the plaintiff must prove that the act threatened, when carried out, will amount to an infringement (*Frearson v. Loe* (1878) 9 C. D. at p. 65; *Dowling v. Billington* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 201).

When it is shown that the defendant's article contains all the qualities of and it appears to the eye similar to the plaintiff's patented article, that is *prima facie* evidence, till the contrary is shown, that it was made according to the patentee's method (see *Huddart v. Grimshaw* (1803) 1 W. P. C. at p. 91; *Hall v. Jarvis* (1822) 1 W. P. C. 100; *Saccharin Corpn. v. Quincey* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at pp. 339, 340; *Saccharin Corpn. v. Jackson* (1903) 20 R. P. C. at pp. 615, 616) *Saccharin Corpn. v. Dawson* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at pp. 171, 172); and this is especially so when the article was made abroad, as the plaintiff, in that case, cannot obtain an order for inspection of the defendant's manufactory and thus obtain direct proof (*Neilson v. Betts* (1871) 5 H. L. C. 11). But if the defendant's article might have been made by another method which involved no infringement, the plaintiff must prove that it was actually made according to his method, even where the

article was made abroad (*Cartsburn Co. v. Sharp* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 186).

The defendant's answers to interrogatories may afford sufficient proof of infringement (*Welsbach Co. v. New Incandescent Co.* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at pp. 243, 247, 248; *cf. Ashworth v. English Card Co.* (1903) 20 R. P. C. at pp. 796, 797).

Effect of Previous Decision on Same Patent.—The fact that a patent has been supported in a former action does not estop a *new defendant* questioning its validity in a subsequent action (see *Patents Exploitation v. American Novelty Co.* (1903) 20 R. P. C. 689); and the fact that the plaintiff has failed in supporting his patent in a former action cannot be pleaded by a new defendant as a bar to a subsequent action for infringement (*Arkwright v. Nightingale* (1785) 1 W. P. C. at p. 61; and see *Dunlop Co. v. Rimington* (1900) 17 R. P. C. 665). The evidence in the second action may be altogether different to that in the first; a prior user relied on as an anticipation may defeat the patent in the second action, although it failed to do so in the first for want of sufficient evidence (see *Shaw v. Day* (1894) 11 R. P. C. 185; *Patents Exploitation Co. v. American Novelty Co.*, *supra*).

But although there is no estoppel when the parties are different, a Court of equal or inferior jurisdiction ought to be bound by the former decision with regard to the construction of the specification (*Edison v. Holland* (1888) 6 R. P. C. at p. 276; *Dunlop Co. v. Wapshare Co.* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 448); in fact, if disconformity is set up in the second action, the defendant ought not to be permitted to go into the question at all unless he brings forward new facts—not new arguments—which may lead to the conclusion that the former construction was not the true construction (see *per* Smith, L.J., in *Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Leicester Tyre Co.* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at p. 55). And a Judge should not vary the decision of another Judge of equal authority on the question of sufficiency of invention or utility (see *per* Cotton, L.J., in *Slazenger v. Feltham* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 234; *National Brick Co. v. Grand Hotel* (1901) 18 R. P. C. 249; *Saccharin Corpn. v. Anglo-Continental Works* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 315).

ESTOPPEL.—Where the second action is against the same defendant, and in the first action the issue of validity was decided in the plaintiff's favour, the defendant is estopped from contesting the validity again, even though he may have discovered

fresh evidence for impeachment; the question of validity is *res judicata* between the parties (*Shoe Co. v. Cutlan* (1896) 13 R. P. C. 141). And where the parties are the same in both actions and the patent was held void in the first, the subject of the second is *res judicata*, and that action may be dismissed with costs (*Horrocks v. Stubbs* (1895) 12 R. P. C. 540). If the defendant in the second action, though not a defendant in the first action, was bound by the judgment given in the first—if he was a party or privy to the estoppel—the second action may be dismissed or stayed (see *Dunlop Co. v. Rimington* (1900) 17 R. P. C. 665).

Amendment of the Specification.—The Court may at any time order that the patentee shall be at liberty to apply at the Patent Office for leave to amend his specification by way of *disclaimer*, and may direct that in the meantime the trial shall be postponed (see p. 86, *supra*).

Certificate as to Validity.—In an action for infringement the Court or a Judge may certify that the validity of the patent came in question; and if the Court or Judge so certifies, then in any subsequent action for infringement the plaintiff in that action, on obtaining a final order or judgment in his favour, is entitled to his full costs, charges, and expenses, as between *solicitor and client*, unless the Court or Judge trying the action certifies that he ought not to have the same (s. 31 of the Patents Act, 1883; see p. 216, *infra*).

The certificate may be granted by the Court of Appeal (*Birch v. Harrop* (1896) 13 R. P. C. at p. 627); but no appeal lies respecting its grant or refusal (*Haslam v. Hall* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 144).

The Court will not grant a certificate if one has already been granted in a previous action (*Edison v. Holland* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 287; *cf. Otto v. Steel* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 120).

A certificate may be granted, notwithstanding that the patent is declared invalid (*Haslam v. Hall* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at pp. 27, 28; *Badische v. La Société Chimique* (1897) 14 R. P. C. at p. 892), or has expired (*Kane v. Boyle* (1901) 18 R. P. C. at p. 337). But the fact of a certificate having been obtained in respect of a patent held bad would, of course, induce no Judge to allow solicitor and client costs in a subsequent action, even though the defect in the specification were cured by amendment. In a recent case, Buckley, J., refused to certify in respect of a patent which he declared invalid (*Acetylene Co. v. United Alkali Co.* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 234).

Whether the Court should grant a certificate where the defendant does not appear at the trial, or submits to judgment, or where the question of validity is not fought out, is not altogether settled. In *Peroni v. Hudson* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 263, Kay, J., held that s. 31 only applies where the patent is established in a case contested in Court. And in *Stocker v. Rodgers* (1846) 1 C. & K. 99, *Cloughten v. Foster* (1904) 21 R. P. C. at p. 18, and *Webb v. Atkinson* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 600, where there had been no contests, certificates were refused. On the other hand, certificates have been granted where the defendant has not appeared at the trial (*Haydock v. Bradbury* (1887) 4 R. P. C. 74; *Acetylene Co. v. Midland Syndicate* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 536; *Brooks v. Lycett* (1903) 20 R. P. C. 390), where the parties consented to an order (*Delta Co. v. Maxim* (1891) 8 R. P. C. 247), and where the question of validity was not fought out (*Tweeddale v. Ashworth* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 436; *Leeds Forge Co. v. Deighton's Co.* (1901) 18 R. P. C. at p. 240; and see *Field v. Wagel* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at pp. 275, 276).

REMEDIES.

The plaintiff, if successful, is entitled to—(1) a perpetual injunction; (2) delivery up or destruction of the infringing articles; and (3) damages or an account of profit.

The Injunction.

An injunction, it seems, ought not to be allowed to go by consent, but the order should be “the defendant appearing and undertaking, etc.”; for sometimes injunctions are taken by consent, and then the injunctions are advertised as if granted in an opposed case, and that ought not to be (see *per* Buckley, J., in *Dover v. New Townend Co.* (1904) 21 R. P. C. at p. 136).

If the case has been contested and the infringement complained of has been made out, the plaintiff is *prima facie* entitled to an injunction; for when a man has done a wrongful act the probability is that he will continue it (*Proctor v. Bailey* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 542; and see *Shelfer v. City of London Co.* [1895] 1 Ch. at p. 316). The plaintiff is also entitled to an injunction to prevent a case of threatened infringement (see *Proctor v. Bailey, supra*; *Dowling v. Billington* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 191; *Shoe Co. v. Cutlan* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at pp. 357, 358).

But there may be special circumstances depriving the plaintiff of his *prima facie* right (*per* Lindley, L.J., in *Shelfer v. City of London Co., supra*, at p. 316). For instance, no injunction will

be granted where there is no probability of the act of infringement being continued or repeated (*Proctor v. Bailey, supra*; *Hudson v. Chatteris* (1898) 15 R. P. C. at p. 440); and the plaintiff may by his acts or laches disentitle himself to an injunction (see *per* Smith, L.J., in *Shelfer v. City of London Co., supra*, at p. 322). Moreover, damages may be substituted for an injunction if “(1) the injury to the plaintiff’s legal rights is small, and (2) is one which is capable of being estimated in money, and (3) is one which can be adequately compensated by a small money payment, and (4) the case is one in which it would be oppressive to the defendant to grant an injunction. . . . There may also be cases in which, though the four above-mentioned requirements exist, the defendant by his conduct . . . has disentitled himself from asking that damages may be assessed in substitution for an injunction” (*per* Smith, L.J., in *Shelfer v. City of London Co., supra*, at pp. 322, 323).

But delay or acquiescence which would be fatal to an application for an interlocutory injunction (see pp. 188, 189, *supra*) will not debar a plaintiff from obtaining a perpetual injunction at the trial (see *Fullwood v. Fullwood* (1878) 9 C. D. 176; *per* Cotton, L.J., in *Proctor v. Bennis* (1887) 36 C. D. at p. 758).

Where the defendant has acted in ignorance of the plaintiff’s patent rights, and has admitted infringement, an injunction may be refused (*Hudson v. Chatteris* (1898) 15 R. P. C. 438); more especially where the infringement is a trifling one (*Jenkins v. Hope* (1896) 13 R. P. C. 57).

But where a patented article is sold under a limited licence, a purchaser who buys with notice of the terms of the licence, and disregards them, will be restrained by injunction, however trivial the infringement (see *Incandescent Co. v. Brogden* (1899) 16 R. P. C. 179).

An injunction will not be granted against third parties (*Edison v. Holland* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at pp. 285, 286); but it may be granted against the secretary of a company, although he has taken no part in the acts of infringement, if he is made a defendant and adopts the defence of the company and appears by the same counsel and solicitors (*Welsbach Co. v. Daylight Co.* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at p. 356).

As a general rule, an injunction will not be granted where the patent has already expired or is about to expire (*British Motor Syndicate v. Universal Motor Co* (1899) 16 R. P. C. 113; *British Insulated Co. v. Dublin Tramway Co.* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 22; *Ward v. Hill* (1901) 18 R. P. C. 493; *Kane v. Boyle* (1901) 18

R. P. C. 325; *Betts v. Gallais* (1870) 10 Eq. 392). But where infringing articles had been manufactured just before the expiration of the patent, with a view of throwing them upon the market after the expiration of the grant, an injunction was granted (*Crossley v. Beverley* (1829) 1 W. P. C. 119).

If numerous patents are sued upon, the injunction will be granted until the expiring of the patent which expires first (*Saccharin Corpn. v. Dowson* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 172; *Saccharin Corpn. v. Jackson* (1903) 20 R. P. C. at p. 616). If one of them has already expired no injunction will be granted (*Saccharin Corpn. v. Quincey* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 339).

Where an action is brought against two persons, and one contests the validity of the patent and the other does not appear at the trial but consents, an injunction will be granted against the other notwithstanding that the patent is declared void (*Savage v. Brindle* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 233).

If the defendant repeats his infringement in a new form, the patentee should not commence another action against him, but should move to attach him for contempt (*Thomson v. Moore* (1889) 6 R. P. C. 426).

Motion to Commit for Disobeying Injunction.—If the defendant continues his infringement after injunction granted, or after an undertaking by order (see *Schermuly v. Paine* (1901) 18 R. P. C. 529), and whilst the order against him remains in operation, the plaintiff may move to commit the defendant for contempt (see *Bowden's Patents v. Wilson* (1903) 20 R. P. C. 644).

It is no answer to a motion to commit that the injunction was not served on the defendant, if the defendant was fully aware that the order had been made and was intended to be enforced (see *per* Pearson, J., in *United Telephone Co. v. Dale* (1884) 25 C. D. at pp. 784, 785; *cf. Incandescent Co. v. Riemer* (1900) 17 R. P. C. 379). Nor is it any answer that the defendant believed he was not infringing (see *Thomson v. Moore* (1889) 6 R. P. C. 426), or has acted innocently (*Lyon v. Goddard* (1894) 11 R. P. C. 113); but where the defendant has clearly acted in ignorance, an order for committal will not readily be granted (see *Spencer v. Ancoats Co.* (1889) 6 R. P. C. 46; *Incandescent Co. v. Sluce* (1900) 17 R. P. C. 173), or, if granted, the order will usually be required to lie in the office for fourteen days, and not to issue if the defendant in the meantime delivers up all infringing machines and pays the costs of the motion (*Lyon v. Goddard* (1894) 11 R. P. C. 113).

As to the evidence on a motion to commit, see *Ripley v. Arthur* (1902) 19 R. P. C. 443).

Where a person, with knowledge of an injunction, chooses to help the defendant by committing acts of infringement for him, he is liable to be himself committed for contempt (see *per* Smith, L.J., in *Incandescent Co. v. Sluce* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 175); but it must be strictly proved that the person sought to be committed is a servant or agent of or has aided or abetted the defendant (*Incandescent Co. v. Sluce, supra*).

Upon a motion to commit, it is open to the defendant to show that the patent has been determined (*Daw v. Eley* (1867) 3 Eq. 496), or that he has not infringed (*Schermuly v. Pain* (1901) 18 R. P. C. 529).

Delivery Up or Destruction.

The plaintiff is entitled to an order that the defendant shall either destroy (*Betts v. De Vitrie* (1864) 34 L. J. Ch. at p. 291; *Howes v. Webber* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 470) or deliver up to the plaintiff (*Washburn Co. v. Patterson* (1884) 1 R. P. C. 191), within a certain period (see *Otto v. Steel* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 120; *Washburn Co. v. Patterson, supra*), all infringing articles in his possession. Sometimes the plaintiffs are given leave to inspect and mark all infringing articles in the possession or power of the defendant for the purpose of identification (*Westinghouse v. Lancashire, etc. Co.* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 253).

In some cases an order for destruction or delivery up will not be made, by reason of the nature of the invention (*Siddell v. Vickers* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 101; *Lancashire Explosives Co. v. Roburite Co.* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 483).

The order for delivery up will usually be limited to the infringing parts of the defendant's machines (*Edison-Bell v. Smith* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 406; *Automatic Weighing Co. v. Fearby* (1893) 10 R. P. C. 442; *Shoe Co. v. Cutlan* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 359; *cf. Moser v. Marsden* (1893) 10 R. P. C. at p. 364).

The defendant is sometimes required to file an affidavit stating what infringing articles are in his possession or control (*Westinghouse v. Lancashire, etc. Co.* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 253; *Edison-Bell v. Smith* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 406).

Damages or an Account.

The plaintiff may have either damages or an account of profits. But he cannot have both as against the same defendant; he must elect between the two remedies (*American Braided Co. v.*

Thomson (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 158; *United Horse Shoe Co. v. Stewart* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 266). He may, however, have damages against one defendant and an account against another (*Penn v. Bibby* (1866) 3 Eq. 308; and see *United Telephone Co. v. Walker* (1887) 4 R. P. C. at p. 67; *Boyd v. Tootal* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 179). Speaking generally, an inquiry as to damages is of more benefit to the plaintiff than an account. A patentee who elects to take profits stands in the shoes of the infringer, and condones, so to speak, his wrong, and he is entitled only to those profits (*per* Lord Alverstone, M.R., in *Saccharin Corpn. v. Chemicals Co.* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 615). But an account may sometimes prove to be of more benefit than an inquiry as to damages (see *English Machinery Co. v. Union Boot Co.* (1896) 13 R. P. C. at p. 67.)

Damages.—It is submitted that the following statements are established from the reported cases:—

(1) The innocence of an infringer will not save him from a claim for damages (see *Boyd v. Tootal* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 185; and see p. 153, *supra*).

(2) The loss recoverable as damages must be such as is the natural and direct consequence of the defendant's acts (see *per* Lord Macnaghten in *United Horse Shoe Co. v. Stewart* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 268; and see *Boyd v. Tootal* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at pp. 182, 184).

(3) A patentee is not bound to accept the same damages from a litigant that he accepts from others (*per* Robinson, V.-C., in *Boyd v. Tootal*, *supra*, at p. 179).

(4) In considering what amount of damages should be awarded, the test is: "What would have been the position of the plaintiffs if the defendants had acted properly instead of improperly?" (*per* Robinson, V.-C., in *Boyd v. Tootal*, *supra*, at p. 181; *Penn v. Jack* (1867) 5 Eq. at p. 84; and see *United Horse Shoe Co. v. Stewart* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 267; *American Braided Co. v. Thomson* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 162; *British Motor Syndicate v. Taylor* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 731).

(5) The profits made by the infringer are not the measure of damages (see *per* Lord Watson in *United Horse Shoe Co. v. Stewart*, *supra*, at p. 267; *Alexander v. Henry* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 366; *cf.* *American Braided Co. v. Thomson* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 152).

(6) Where the patentee has reduced his prices merely as a

matter of policy, the reduction—*i.e.*, the difference between the original price and the reduced price—is not recoverable as damages (*Alexander v. Henry* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 367; *United Horse Shoe Co. v. Stewart* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 260; *American Braided Co. v. Thomson* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 152).

(7) Where the patentee has reduced his prices in consequence of the infringer's competition, the reduction in price is the natural consequence of the infringement, and may be visited on the head of the infringer (*Alexander v. Henry, supra*; *American Braided Co. v. Thomson, supra*; *cf. Boyd v. Tootal* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 184).

(8) Where the plaintiffs have not been in the habit of selling, but more usually of letting out the patented article at a royalty, the measure of damages is the profit rent of the article during the entire period from the time when it came into possession of the infringer until the assessment of damage or the date of the delivery up; and it is immaterial for the purposes of assessment whether the article has or has not been in actual use during any portion of that period (*United Telephone Co. v. Walker* (1887) 4 R. P. C. 63; *English Machinery Co. v. Union Boot Co.* (1896) 13 R. P. C. at p. 67; *Penn v. Jack* (1867) 5 Eq. 81; but see *Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Puncture Proof Co.* (1899) 16 R. P. C. 209; *British Motor Syndicate v. Taylor* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at pp. 194, 730, 731).

(9) The plaintiff is entitled to full compensation for the injury which the defendant's competition may have occasioned; it is therefore not material where damages are claimed to consider how much of the invention was actually appropriated (see *per* Lord Watson in *United Horse Shoe Co. v. Stewart* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at pp. 266, 267; *cf. United Telephone Co. v. Walker* (1887) 4 R. P. C. 63).

(10) A claim for damages on the ground that, had it not been for the infringement, the plaintiff would have been able to produce his machine at a lower cost, is probably too remote (*Boyd v. Tootal* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at pp. 184, 185).

(11) The fact that the plaintiff has recovered damages against the manufacturer does not preclude him from recovering damages against the purchasers. The article may be followed in every man's hand, until the infringement is got rid of; so long as the article is used there is continuing damage (see *per* Wood, V.-C., in *Penn v. Bibby* (1866) 3 Eq. at p. 311; *United Telephone Co. v. Walker* (1887) 4 R. P. C. at p. 67; *Boyd v. Tootal* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 184).

(12) The amount of damages recoverable against users is not merely nominal (*Boyd v. Tootal* (1894) 11 R. P. C. 175); but the plaintiff cannot recover more than the damage sustained (*Boyd v. Tootal, supra*, at p. 184; *Garioli v. Shepherd* (1900) 17 R. P. C. 157).

(13) The amount which the plaintiff has accepted from another infringer in settlement of his claim is not to be taken finally as the complete measure of damages; for it is always worth a litigant's while to take off something from his claim for the sake of peace (*Boyd v. Tootal* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 184).

(14) No damages will be awarded where the plaintiff has sustained no pecuniary loss (*Garioli v. Shepherd* (1900) 17 R. P. C. 157; in this case the defendants filed evidence to show that their means would not have allowed them to purchase one of the plaintiff's articles), or in respect of infringements committed after the expiration of the patent (*British Insulated Co. v. Dublin Tramway Co.* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at pp. 21, 22).

No damages can be recovered—(1) for infringements committed before the publication of the complete specification (s. 13 of the Patents Act, 1883); (2) for infringements committed prior to amendment of the specification, unless the Court is satisfied that the original claim was framed in good faith and with reasonable skill and knowledge (s. 20, *ibid.*; see *Kane v. Boyle* (1901) 18 R. P. C. at p. 337; *Hopkinson v. St. James' Co.* (1893) 10 R. P. C. at p. 62; *Wenham v. Carpenter* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 68); or (3) for infringements committed after failure to pay any renewal fee within the prescribed time, and before the enlargement thereof, if the Court thinks fit not to award damages (s. 17 (4) (b), *ibid.*).

MITIGATION OF DAMAGES.—It is open to a defendant, by way of mitigating damages, to show that the patent has been declared bad in a previous action, and that persons have acted upon the faith of the former verdict (see *per* Lord Loughborough in *Arkwright v. Nightingale* (1785) 1 W. P. C. at p. 61). And if the plaintiff allows the defendant to openly use the invention and does not take any steps to prevent him for a considerable time, that may seriously affect the amount of damages recoverable (*Smith v. L. & N. W. Rail. Co.* (1853) Macr. P. C. at p. 202).

SET-OFF. — The defendant cannot set-off, as against the damages claimed, the value of the articles delivered up under the judgment; the plaintiffs are not liable to pay for the articles given up in any form. Nor is the defendant entitled to set-off

any portion of an agreed sum for damages for infringement recovered by the plaintiffs in a previous action against the manufacturer, from whom the defendant bought the article, although the period in respect of the rent payable by the defendant as damages commenced at a date antecedent to the commencement of the action against the manufacturer. If, however, the damages recovered by the plaintiffs from the manufacturer were not an agreed sum, but a sum representing the full rent or royalty, the defendant is entitled to a set-off (*United Telephone Co. v. Walker* (1887) 4 R. P. C. 63).

INQUIRY AS TO DAMAGES.—The amount of damage sustained can rarely be made the subject of exact arithmetical calculation (see *per* Lord Halsbury in *United Horse Shoe Co. v. Stewart* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 264).

Where the assessment cannot be conveniently dealt with by the Judge at the trial, the assessment will be referred to an Official Referee or the Chief Clerk; a Judge of the Chancery Division has no power to direct the assessment to be made by a jury (*American Braided Co. v. Thompson* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 538).

If the amount of the damages must be purely a matter of guess-work, the Judge should decide the question at the trial and not refer it (*Ungar v. Sugg* (1892) 9 R. P. C. 113; but this was an action for threats). And where the infringement is a trivial one, no inquiry will be directed (*Cole v. Saqui* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 489, where Kekewich, J., assessed the damages at 40s.), or, if directed, it will be at the plaintiffs' peril as to costs (*Incandescent Co. v. Brogden* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at p. 183).

The proper form of order is "what damage," and not, as in the case of a trade-mark, "what damage, *if any*," has been sustained (*per* Wood, V.-C., in *Davenport v. Rylands* (1865) 1 Eq. at p. 308).

The damages are assessed down to the time of the assessment (R. S. C. Ord. 36, r. 58), or, if the patent has expired, the expiration of the patent (*British Insulated Co. v. Dublin Tramway Co.* (1900) 17 R. P. C. 14).

The costs of the inquiry will generally be reserved (*United Telephone Co. v. Fleming* (1886) 3 R. P. C. 282; *United Telephone Co. v. Patterson* (1889) 6 R. P. C. 140; *Aktiebolaget Separator v. Dairy Co.* (1898) 15 R. P. C. at p. 338; *Incandescent Gas Co. v. Brogden* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at p. 183).

In prosecuting the inquiry the plaintiff is entitled to the fullest possible discovery (see *per* Bacon, V.-C., in *Murray v. Clayton* (1872) 15 Eq. at p. 118). The defendant may be

required to state the names of the persons to whom and the prices at which he has sold infringing articles (*American Braided Co. v. Thompson* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 375; *Murray v. Clayton*, *supra*; and see *Powell v. Birmingham Vinegar Co.* (1896) 14 R. P. C. 1), notwithstanding that such disclosure would expose such persons to actions for infringement (*Murray v. Clayton*, *supra*), and that an appeal is pending (*American Braided Co. v. Thompson*, *supra*, at p. 378).

If either party is dissatisfied with the finding at the inquiry, he may move to vary the certificate (see *Alexander v. Henry* (1895) 12 R. P. C. 360). When the Chief Clerk or Official Referee has had before him the whole case and much oral evidence, the Court ought to be unwilling to differ from him with regard to conclusions of fact; where the evidence is all in writing, then the Court is in a very different position (see *per Kekewich, J.*, in *Alexander v. Henry*, *supra*, at p. 366). The Judge may require further evidence than that which was before the Chief Clerk (*English Machinery Co. v. Union Boot Co.* (1896) 13 R. P. C. 64). The question of varying the certificate is very much as if it were a question on motion for a new trial after a verdict given by a jury, where the question would be, not whether the verdict given is that which the Judge would have given, but whether there is evidence upon which a jury could reasonably act in arriving at the conclusion at which they did arrive (see *per Lord Russell, C.J.*, in *Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Puncture Proof Tyre Co.* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at p. 214).

Account of Profits—The plaintiff is entitled to elect whether he will take damages or an account of profits (*Siddell v. Vickers* (1892) 9 R. P. C. at p. 162). But there is no form of account which is more difficult to work out than an account of profits; and the expense is great, and the time consumed is out of all proportion to the advantage ultimately attained. Therefore, although the law is that a patentee has a right to elect which course he will take, as a matter of business he is generally inclined to take an inquiry as to damages, rather than launch upon an inquiry as to profits (see *per Lindley, L.J.*, in *Siddell v. Vickers*, *supra*, at pp. 162, 163). If he elects to take an account, and the result is a waste of time and expense (*Automatic Coal Co. v. Mayor of Salford* (1897) 14 R. P. C. at p. 471), or the result shows less profits than those admitted (*Jenkins v. Hope* (1896) 13 R. P. C. at p. 60), he may have to pay the costs.

Where the taking of an account was likely to cause great

expense, delay, and difficulty in chambers, an order was made, by consent, that, in lieu of damages, an inquiry should be taken of what would be a proper sum for the defendants to pay by way of royalty (*Automatic Coal Co. v. Mayor of Salford, supra*).

On taking an account it is often material to inquire what profits were made both before and after the adoption of the plaintiff's invention, and also what was the cost of production both prior and subsequently to that adoption (*Siddell v. Vickers* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 467; (1892) 9 R. P. C. 152). It is necessary to ascertain how much of the invention was actually appropriated, in order to determine what proportion of the net profits was attributable to its use (see *per* Lord Watson in *United Horse Shoe Co. v. Stewart* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 266).

An account will not be directed where it appears that no profits have been made (*Bergmann v. Macmillan* (1881) 17 C. D. 423) or that the sales have been insufficient to make it worth while (see *Sanitas Co. v. Condy* (1887) 4 R. P. C. at p. 533). And the right to an account may be barred by laches or acquiescence (*Crossley v. Derby Gas Co.* (1884) 1 W. P. C. 120).

The plaintiff is *primâ facie* entitled to the fullest discovery in aid of the account; he can inspect the defendant's books, and the defendant cannot resist inspection on the ground that it would disclose the names and addresses of his customers (*Saccharin Corpn. v. Chemicals Co.* (1900) 17 R. P. C. 612).

Costs.

When the action is tried with a jury, the costs follow the event unless the Judge for good cause otherwise orders; in other cases the costs are in the discretion of the Judge (R. S. C. Ord. 65, r. 1).

As a general rule the successful party is awarded the costs of the action.

With regard to costs generally, the reader is referred to the notes to Ord. 65 contained in the Annual Practice; the following observations have reference to matters peculiar to patent actions:—

Costs where Defendant Acknowledges Infringement and Submits.—Although the defendant acknowledges infringement and offers to give an undertaking not to commit future acts of infringement, the plaintiff is entitled to proceed to obtain an injunction (*American Tobacco Co. v. Guest* (1892) 9 R. P. C. at p. 220; *cf.* *Lyon v. Mayor of Newcastle* (1894) 11 R. P. C. 218); but he will not in every case be awarded the costs, notwithstanding all that was said by Jessel, M.R., in *Cooper v.*

Whittingham (1880) 15 C. D. at p. 504), as to depriving the plaintiff of his right to costs.

The following propositions appear to be established from the reported cases:—

(1) Actions against innocent retailers are not looked upon with favour, and if brought, and the defendant submits, the plaintiff will not be awarded any costs (*American Tobacco Co. v. Guest* (1892) 9 R. P. C. at p. 220; and see *Betts v. Willmot* (1870) 18 W. R. 946; 19 W. R. 369).

(2) Where the defendant is in possession of a large number of infringing articles, the plaintiff need not be content with an undertaking not to sell, and will be awarded the costs of an action for infringement (*Upmann v. Forester* (1883) 24 C. D. 231).

Where the infringement is a trifling one, the plaintiff should accept an undertaking not to infringe, and if he does not he will be given no costs (*American Tobacco Co. v. Guest* (1892) 9 R. P. C. at p. 220; *cf. Edison-Bell v. Waterfield* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 330), or may even be ordered to pay the costs (*Lyon v. Mayor of Newcastle* (1894) 11 R. P. C. 218).

Costs of Particulars.—On taxation of costs, regard is to be had to the particulars delivered by the plaintiff and defendant; and they respectively are not to be allowed any costs in respect of any particular delivered by them unless the same is certified by the Court or a Judge to have been proven or to have been reasonable and proper, without regard to the general costs of the case (s. 29 (6) of the Patents Act, 1883).

A certificate as to particulars may be granted by the Court of Appeal (*Cole v. Saqui* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 45; *Sandow v. Szalay* (1904) 21 R. P. C. at p. 345), and by the House of Lords (*Morris v. Young* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 465). But if an appeal is dismissed, it is doubtful whether the Court above can vary the certificate (see *per* Lindley, L.J., in *Cassell Co. v. Cyanide Syndicate* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 305); for a certificate is not a “judgment or order” within s. 19 of the Judicature Act, and no appeal lies in respect of it (*Haslam v. Hall* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 144).

The application for a certificate should be made at the trial (*Duckett v. Sankey* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at p. 360). It may, however, be made within a reasonable time afterwards; but no costs of the application will be allowed (*Howcliffe v. Morris* (1886) 3 R. P. C. 145; *Duckett v. Sankey, supra*).

It is not necessary for the Judge to initial the particulars (*Dunlop Co. v. Hyde Co.* (1904) 21 R. P. C. at p. 210.

Where no certificate is given, the Taxing Master cannot allow the costs of the particulars; if one party, in such a case, thinks that in consequence of improper or vexatious particulars he has been put to unnecessary and improper costs, he should ask the Court to direct the Taxing Master to see whether any proceedings have been taken improperly, and to direct that he shall get the costs occasioned by the improper proceedings (*Garrard v. Edge* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 139).

A certificate may be granted to the unsuccessful party where the successful party has raised unnecessary or improper issues (*Kane v. Guest* (1899) 16 R. P. C. 433; and see *Badische v. Lerinstein* (1885) 2 R. P. C. at p. 118).

PARTICULARS OF BREACHES.—In *Kane v. Guest* ((1899) 16 R. P. C. at p. 443) it was contended that the section was not meant to apply to particulars of breaches; but Stirling, J., held that the section extended to particulars delivered by the plaintiff as well as by the defendant, and he certified that the plaintiff's particulars of breaches had been proven, although the plaintiff was unsuccessful in the action. And see *Young v. Rosenthal* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 41; *Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Chisholm* (1896) 13 R. P. C. at p. 489; *Birmingham Tyre Syndicate v. Reliance Tyre Co.* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 317.

A certificate that the plaintiff's particulars have been proven will be granted, although no evidence as to infringement is given, if infringement is admitted (*British Motor Co. v. Sherrin* (1901) 18 R. P. C. at p. 275; and see *Brooks v. Hall* (1904) 21 R. P. C. at p. 30; *Saccharin Corpn. v. Skidmore* (1904) 21 R. P. C. 31).

PARTICULARS OF OBJECTIONS.—The objections need not be proved; if the Court is satisfied that they were reasonable and proper a certificate will be granted (*Phillips v. Irel Cycle Co.* (1890) 7 R. P. C. 77; *Sandow v. Szalay* (1904) 21 R. P. C. 333).

The Court will not go through a case, when it has been decided on one short point at once, merely for the purpose of ascertaining whether the defendant's particulars are reasonable (*Longbottom v. Shaw* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 147; but see *Pegamoid v. British Leather Co.* (1901) 18 R. P. C. at p. 319, where Joyce, J., allowed the examination of a witness to be continued to ascertain whether the particulars were reasonable). Hence, a successful defendant often fails to get the costs of his particulars although they could have been proved (*Longbottom*

v. *Shaw*, *supra*; (1889) 6 R. P. C. 510; *Newsum v. Mann* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 310; *Badham v. Bird* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 238; *Middleton v. Bradley* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 393).

It follows, that where the plaintiff discontinues his action or submits at the trial no certificate can be granted (*Wilcox v. Janes* (1897) 14 R. P. C. at p. 524; *Middleton v. Bradley*, *supra*; *Mandlebery v. Morley* (1895) 12 R. P. C. 35; *Acetylene Co. v. United Alkali Co.* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 233; *cf. Boake v. Stevenson* (1895) 12 R. P. C. 228; *Kerr v. Crompton* (1901) 19 R. P. C. 9), unless there has been some interlocutory application with reference to the particulars in which the Court has had an opportunity of being satisfied as to their reasonableness (see *per Stirling, J.*, in *Middleton v. Bradley* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at pp. 392, 393; *Wilcox v. Janes* (1897) 14 R. P. C. at p. 524; *Ashworth v. Horsfall* (1904) 21 R. P. C. at p. 48.) And evidence will not be admitted to show that the objections raised in a former action, and certified to be reasonable, were similar to those raised in the subsequent action (*Ashworth v. Horsfall*, *supra*).

But where the whole of the plaintiff's evidence has been heard, and there are materials arising from the evidence adduced by the plaintiff which enables the Judge to come to the conclusion that the particulars are reasonable and proper, a certificate will be granted, although the defendant is not called upon (see *per Stirling, J.*, in *Mandlebery v. Morley* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 39; *Germ Milling Co. v. Robinson* (1886) 3 R. P. C. 254; *Nuttall v. Hargreaves* (1891) 8 R. P. C. at p. 276; *Lees v. West London Cycle Stores* (1892) 9 R. P. C. at p. 301). Where the defendant is stopped asking questions on the particulars a certificate should be granted (*Birmingham Tyre Syndicate v. Reliance Tyre Co.* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 317). And the Court will sometimes give leave to discontinue only on the terms of the plaintiff paying the costs of the defendant's particulars as if the same had been certified (*Boake v. Stevenson* (1895) 12 R. P. C. 228; *Chamberlain v. Mayor of Huddersfield* (1901) 18 R. P. C. at pp. 456, 457; and see *Bethell v. Gage* (1897) 14 R. P. C. 699—a threats action), or the costs of such of the particulars as the Taxing Master shall certify to be reasonable and proper (*Kerr v. Crompton* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 11).

Certificates are always granted so as to secure to the party delivering the particulars the costs of everything reasonably and properly inserted in them, although he may fail to prove the specific objection under which the detailed particulars may

be ranged (see *per Lindley, M.R.*, in *Castner-Kellner Co. v. Commercial Corpn.* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at p. 276; *cf. Dunlop Co. v. Wapshare Co.* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at pp. 458, 459).

Costs Where Certificate as to Validity Granted in Prior Action.—If in a prior action the Court or a Judge has certified that the validity of the patent came in question, then the plaintiff, on obtaining a final order or judgment in his favour, has his full costs, charges, and expenses, as between *solicitor and client*, unless the Court certifies that he ought not to have them (s. 31 of the Patents Act, 1883; see p. 202, *supra*).

If the second action is commenced prior to the date of the certificate given in the first action, s. 31 does not apply (*Automatic Weighing Co. v. International Society* (1889) 6 R. P. C. 475; *Saccharin Corpn. v. Anglo-Continental Works* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 320; *Automatic Weighing Co. v. Combined Weighing Co.* (1889) 6 R. P. C. 120).

The certificate should always be pleaded; but if the statement of claim asks for solicitor and client costs, that is probably sufficient (*Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Chisholm* (1896) 13 R. P. C. at p. 489).

The fact that the defendant in the second action does not dispute the validity of the patent is no ground for refusing to give the plaintiff costs as between solicitor and client (*United Telephone Co. v. Townshend* (1886) 3 R. P. C. 10; *Dunlop Co. v. Holborn Co.* (1901) 18 R. P. C. at p. 228; *United Telephone Co. v. St. George* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at pp. 339, 340; *Welsbach Co. v. Daylight Co.* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at pp. 353, 354; *Dunlop Tyre Co. v. Excelsior Tyre Co.* (1901) 18 R. P. C. at p. 210; but see *Automatic Weighing Co. v. International Society* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at pp. 480, 481; *Boyd v. Tootal* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 185; *Saccharin Corpn. v. Dowson* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at pp. 172, 173; *Edison-Bell v. Waterfield* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 330).

Solicitor and client costs may be refused where the patent was impeached in the first action on different grounds to those on which it is impeached in the second (*Otto v. Steel* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 120; *cf. Fabriques de Produits Chimiques v. Lafitte* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at p. 68; *Welsbach Co. v. Daylight Co.* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at pp. 354, 355); where the specification has been drawn in a lax manner (*Automatic Weighing Co. v. National Exhibitions* (1891) 8 R. P. C. at p. 352); where the defendant has acted innocently (*Boyd v. Tootal* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 185); or where the action is vexatious (*Proctor v. Sutton* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 184).

Primâ facie, however, the plaintiff is entitled to solicitor and client costs (*Fabriques de Produits Chimiques v. Lafitte, supra*); and the Court will not certify against such costs unless it sees good reason for so doing (*Welsbach Co. v. Daylight Co., supra*).

If several patents are sued upon, and it is impossible to say which particular patent has been infringed, and in respect of one of them a certificate as to validity has been granted in a former action, the plaintiffs will be entitled to solicitor and client costs (*Saccharin Corpn. v. Hopkinson* (1904) 21 R. P. C. 272).

As to obtaining a certificate as to validity, see p. 202, *supra*).

Costs on the Higher Scale.—Costs on the higher scale may be allowed if, on special grounds arising out of the nature and importance, or the difficulty, or urgency of the case, the Court or a Judge shall so order (R. S. C. Ord. 65, r. 9). As to such costs, generally, see the notes to Ord. 65, r. 9, contained in the Annual Practice.

Costs on the higher scale have been allowed where the case has involved a long examination, preparation of models, and the calling of expert evidence (*Wenham Co. v. May* (1887) 4 R. P. C. at p. 310); where “difficulty” has been removed by the expenditure of time, money, and learned industry (*Fraser v. Province of Brescia* (1887) 56 L. T. 771); where the case was a difficult one, and the solicitors and persons engaged in it had been put to a great deal of trouble (*Farbenfabriken v. Bowker* (1891) 8 R. P. C. at p. 397); where the case involved questions of a highly scientific character (*Muirhead v. Commercial Cable Co.* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 64; and see *Moseley v. Victoria Rubber Co.* (1887) 4 R. P. C. at p. 255); where the case required witnesses of a special class (*Hopkinson v. St. James’ Co.* (1893) 10 R. P. C. at p. 62; *Edison v. Holland* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 483; *Dunlop Co. v. Wapshare Co.* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at 460).

The mere fact, however, that scientific witnesses were necessary is not a reason for allowing costs on the higher scale (*Tweedale v. Howard* (1896) 13 R. P. C. at pp. 536, 537; *Patents Exploitation v. American Novelty Co.* (1903) 20 R. P. C. 689). “Costs on the higher scale ought only to be given where there are cases of very unusual difficulty and skill—antiquarian research, and things of that kind. The idea of giving costs on the higher scale in all patent cases is one that I will not sanction” (*per* Lindley, L.J., in *Gudd v. Mayor of Manchester* (1892) 9 R. P. C. at p. 535).

If the necessity for scientific evidence was largely due to the unfortunate wording of the specification—if the specification

might have been so worded as to need no scientific evidence at all—costs on the higher scale will not be given to a successful plaintiff (*Wenham Co. v. Champion Co.* (1891) 8 R. P. C. at p. 320). And where the evidence is not scientific, but only evidence of fact, such costs will not usually be allowed (*American Braided Co. v. Thomson* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 163). If, however, the plaintiffs bring scientific witnesses and so compel the defendants to do the same, the defendants may be given costs on the higher scale (*Ellington v. Clark* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 328).

Where the defendant does not appear at the trial, costs on the higher scale will probably not be awarded (see *Peroni v. Hudson* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 263).

The Court of Appeal may allow costs on the higher scale, although such costs were refused by the Judge at the trial (*Ellington v. Clark* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 328). But where higher scale costs are allowed at the trial, and the appeal is dismissed, the costs of the appeal will not be allowed on the higher scale (*Chamberlain v. Mayor of Bradford* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 92).

Application that the costs be on the higher scale should be made at the hearing; but where a successful appellant at the hearing of the appeal did not ask, but subsequently moved, for such costs, they were allowed, but no order was made as to the costs of the motion (*Automatic Weighing Co. v. Combined Weighing Co.* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 372).

Apportionment of Costs of Separate Issues.—When issues in fact and law are raised upon a claim or counter-claim, the costs of the several issues respectively, both in law and fact, unless otherwise ordered, follow the event. And an order giving a party costs except so far as they have been occasioned by some particular issue is to be construed as excluding only the amount by which the costs have been increased by such issue; but the Court, if the whole costs are not intended to be given, may direct taxation of the whole costs and payment of such proportion thereof as the Court shall determine (R. S. C. Ord. 65, r. 2, as amended by R. S. C. January, 1902, and July, 1902). As to apportionment of costs generally, see the notes to this rule contained in the Annual Practice.

The principle upon which the Court acts is that parties ought not, even if right in the action, to add to the expense of the action by fighting issues in which they are in the wrong (see *per Bowen, L.J.*, in *Budische v. Levinstein* (1885) 2 R. P. C. at p. 118; and see *Findlater v. Newman* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 245).

This principle has been applied where the defendant has succeeded on the issue of validity but failed on the issue of infringement (see *Badische v. Levinstein*, *supra*; *Hocking v. Fraser* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 7; *Young v. Rosenthal* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 41; *Pooley v. Pointon* (1885) 2 R. P. C. at p. 173; *Dunlop Co. v. Wapshare Co.* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 458; *Lister v. Norton* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 211; *Kane v. Guest* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at p. 443; *Haslam v. Hall* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 25); and where the plaintiff has succeeded on the issue of validity but failed on the issue of infringement (see *Nordenfelt v. Gardner* (1884) 1 R. P. C. 61; *White v. Hartley* (1903) 20 R. P. C. at p. 275; *Needham v. Johnson* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 59; *Westinghouse v. Lancashire, etc. Co.* (1884) 1 R. P. C. at p. 254). Also, where the plaintiff has succeeded as to an issue of threats, and failed as to the issue of infringement (*Mountain v. Parker* (1903) 20 R. P. C. 769); and where he has succeeded on one patent and failed on another (*Brooks v. Lamplugh* (1898) 15 R. P. C. at p. 52; *cf. Lucas v. Miller* (1900) 17 R. P. C. 165).

In cases, however, where there has been a genuine contest as to infringement, a successful defendant will not usually be ordered to pay the costs of the issue of infringement (see *Kaye v. Chubb* (1887) 4 R. P. C. at p. 300; *Westley v. Perkes* (1893) 10 R. P. C. at p. 194; *Guilbert-Machin v. Kerr* (1887) 4 R. P. C. at p. 23; *Stohwasser v. Humphreys* (1900) 18 R. P. C. at p. 128).

The cost of issues raised by either party, but abandoned at the trial or on appeal, will be ordered to be paid by the party who raised them (*Thomson v. American Braided Co.* (1889) 6 R. P. C. 518; *Marshalls' v. Chameleon Patents* (1901) 18 R. P. C. 400; but see *Worthington Co. v. Moore* (1903) 20 R. P. C. at pp. 49, 50; *Re Scott's Patent* (1903) 20 R. P. C. at p. 264).

Where two or more patents are sued upon, and the case as to one is abandoned at the trial, the proper order is that the defendant (if unsuccessful in the action) shall pay the costs, except so far as increased by the plaintiffs' claim to the patent not relied upon, the plaintiffs to pay the increase; the action will not be dismissed with costs in so far as it is based on the patent not relied upon (*Worthington Co. v. Moore* (1902) 20 R. P. C. at pp. 49, 50; *Sutcliffe v. Abbott* (1902) 20 R. P. C. at p. 60; *cf. Brooks v. Lamplugh* (1898) 15 R. P. C. at p. 52; and see Ord. 65, r. 2).

Costs of Shorthand Notes.—The costs of shorthand notes of the evidence are very seldom allowed; but the costs of the notes of the judgment are frequently given (see *Morris v. Young* (1895)

12 R. P. C. at p. 464). Where, however, the notes of the evidence were referred to day by day in the Court below, and copies were really necessary to enable the Court to follow the arguments, the costs of all copies reasonably required were allowed by the Court of Appeal (*Castner-Kellner Co. v. Commercial Corpn.* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at pp. 275, 276). And where the shorthand notes enabled the Court to try the case in far less time than it might otherwise have occupied, the costs were allowed (*Palmer Tyre Co. v. Pneumatic Tyre Co.* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at p. 496).

Miscellaneous Costs.—The costs of a view by counsel of the works of the other party after the trial, and before the hearing of the appeal, have been allowed (*Leeds Forge Co. v. Deighton's Co.* (1903) 20 R. P. C. 185).

Where the Court of Appeal has not given special leave to give fresh evidence on the appeal, the costs of a witness who attends to give the evidence will not be allowed (*Leeds Forge Co. v. Deighton's Co., supra*).

If the defendant is a person acting in exercise of statutory or public duties, he is entitled, by virtue of the Public Authorities Protection Act, 1893, if successful, to costs as between solicitor and client (*British Thomson-Houston Co. v. Mayor of Manchester* (1903) 20 R. P. C. at p. 471; *Chamberlain v. Mayor of Huddersfield* (1901) 18 R. P. C. at p. 456). As to the class of persons who are within the Act, see *Chamberlain v. Mayor of Bradford* (1900) 17 R. P. C. 762; *New Conveyer Co. v. Edinburgh Commissioners* (1904) 21 R. P. C. 147.

As to when the costs of three counsel will be allowed, see *Dunlop Co. v. Wapshare Co.* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at pp. 459, 460. As to costs of obtaining expert evidence, see *Bradford Dyers v. Bury* (1902) 19 R. P. C. 125. As to costs of inspection and of erecting machinery at the time of the trial, see *Ashworth v. English Card Co.* (1904) 21 R. P. C. 353.

Stay Pending Appeal.

An appeal does not operate as a stay of execution, or of proceedings under the decision appealed from, except so far as the Court appealed from, or any Judge thereof, or the Court of Appeal, may order (R. S. C. Ord. 58, r. 16). The application to stay should be made to the Court below in the first instance (Ord. 58, r. 17).

Neither an injunction nor an account will be stayed as a rule (*Otto v. Steel* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 121; *Chadburn v. Mechan*

(1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 135; *Edison v. Woodhouse* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 178; *Proctor v. Bennis* (1887) 4 R. P. C. at p. 363; *Pilkington v. Teakley* (1901) 18 R. P. C. at pp. 463, 464; *Hicks v. Simmons* (1904) 21 R. P. C. at p. 420). But an injunction and an account will sometimes be stayed on the defendant undertaking to keep an account and to prosecute the appeal with due diligence (*Kaye v. Chubb* (1887) 4 R. P. C. at p. 27 (injunction and account stayed); *Woodward v. Sansum* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 366 (account stayed); *Humpherson v. Syer* (1887) 4 R. P. C. at p. 189 (account stayed, but stay of injunction refused); *Hocking v. Fraser* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 7; *Duckett v. Whitehead* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 191; *North British Co. v. Macintosh* (1894) 11 R. P. C. at p. 489 (injunctions stayed)).

In *Kopp v. Rosewald* (1902) 19 R. P. C. at p. 212 an inquiry as to damages was stayed. In *Howes v. Webber* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 470 an order for destruction was stayed. In *Washburn Co. v. Patterson* (1884) 1 R. P. C. 191 an order for delivery up was stayed on the defendant undertaking that the infringing articles should not be removed out of this country pending the appeal.

A stay as to costs is very seldom granted (see *Castner-Kellner Co. v. Commercial Corpn.* (1898) 15 R. P. C. at p. 662; *Dick v. Ellam's Co.* (1899) 16 R. P. C. at p. 424; *Wolf v. Nopitsch* (1900) 17 R. P. C. at p. 331); the successful party's solicitor usually gives an undertaking to repay the costs if the judgment is reversed on appeal (see *Easterbrook v. G. W. R. Co.* (1885) 2 R. P. C. at p. 212; *Ticket Punch Co. v. Colley's Patents* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 10). But if the solicitor refuses to give an undertaking the payment of the costs may be stayed (*Ackroyd v. Thomas* (1904) 21 R. P. C. at p. 412).

Appeals.

Appeals to the Court of Appeal are by way of re-hearing, and must be brought by notice of motion in a summary way. The appellant may appeal from the whole or any part of any judgment or order, and the notice of motion must state whether the whole or part only of the judgment or order is complained of, and in the latter case must specify such part (R. S. C. Ord. 58, r. 1). Where the plaintiffs appealed, and the defendants served notice that on the hearing, in the event of the Court of Appeal reversing the judgment upon a certain claim, the defendants would ask that the judgment upon a counter-claim might be reversed, the Court

of Appeal refused to set aside the notice as irregular and embarrassing (*Dunlop Co. v. North British Co.* (1904) 21 R. P. C. at pp. 179, 180).

No appeal lies in respect of the grant or refusal of a certificate that the validity of the patent came in question in the action (*Haslam v. Hall* (1888) 5 R. P. C. 144), or, without leave, in respect of costs (s. 49 of the Judicature Act, 1873). But an appeal lies from a decision as to the taxation of costs on the higher or lower scale (*Paine v. Chisholm* [1891] 1 Q. B. 531).

Security for Costs.—Such deposit or other security for the costs to be occasioned by any appeal must be made or given as may be directed under special circumstances by the Court of Appeal (R. S. C. Ord. 58, r. 15).

Application for security should be made promptly (*Pooley v. Whetham* (1886) 33 C. D. 76; *cf. Garrard v. Edge* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 144); and application ought to be made to the appellant before moving (*Garrard v. Edge, supra*).

The order now usually made is that if the appellant does not give the required security within a fixed time the appeal shall stand dismissed. The amount of security to be given must depend upon the circumstances of each particular case; but the present practice is not to require a large amount of security. In an unreported case decided this year (*Sandow v. Szalay*), 20*l.* only was ordered, although the respondent's costs had already amounted to over 300*l.*, and the appellant was admittedly without means. The appeal was eventually allowed (*Sandow v. Szalay* (1904) 21 R. P. C. 333). 20*l.* was also ordered in the case of *Garrard v. Edge, supra*.

The insolvency of an appellant is *prima facie* a sufficient reason for ordering him to give security for costs (*per* Cotton, L.J., in *Re Ivory* (1878) 10 C. D. at p. 377; *Farrer v. Lacy* (1885) 28 C. D. 482). As to other grounds upon which security for costs will be required, see the notes to Ord. 58, r. 15 in the Annual Practice.

Judge's Notes.—When oral evidence taken in the Court below has to be considered on appeal, the appellant must apply for a copy of the Judge's notes, and if he does not the appeal will be ordered to stand over at the expense of the appellant (*Ellington v. Clark* (1889) 38 C. D. 332).

Evidence.—The Court of Appeal *may* admit evidence not given in the Court below (*Hinde v. Osborne* (1885) 2 R. P. C. at

p. 47) and has power to allow an amendment of the particulars for this purpose (*Shoe Co. v. Cutlan* (1895) 12 R. P. C. at p. 531). But the Court of Appeal is always very reluctant to allow fresh evidence (*Walker v. Hydro-Carbon Syndicate* (1886) 3 R. P. C. at p. 254; *Shoe Co. v. Cutlan, supra*; *Hinde v. Osborne, supra*; *Nadel v. Martin* (1903) 20 R. P. C. 721).

Where the defendant at the trial gives evidence of anticipations not within the particulars, and the plaintiff does not ask for an adjournment, the Court of Appeal will not allow the plaintiff to adduce fresh evidence as to such anticipations (*Barcroft v. Smith* (1897) 14 R. P. C. 172).

If an issue is abandoned at the trial, the Court of Appeal will not allow it to be raised on appeal (*Westley v. Perkes* (1893) 10 R. P. C. 382; *Hinde v. Osborne* (1885) 2 R. P. C. 45).

Where a model has been put in evidence at the trial, it should be produced in the Court of Appeal in the same condition as it was in at the trial; it is very improper to make any alteration whatever in its appearance or working power (*Winby v. Manchester Tramways* (1891) 8 R. P. C. at p. 63).

Appeal to the House of Lords.—An appeal lies to the House of Lords from any order or judgment of the Court of Appeal.

In the absence of special circumstances a stay of execution will not be granted pending appeal to the House of Lords (see *supra*).

If persons intending to appeal to the House of Lords desire to have security for repayment of the sum they have been ordered to pay as damages, they must make out a *prima facie* case; it must be shown that the appellant will probably not have the means of getting back the money if the House of Lords make a different order (*American Braided Co. v. Thomson* (1890) 7 R. P. C. at p. 163).

CHAPTER X.

APPEALS TO THE LAW OFFICERS.

WHEN APPEALS LIE—LAW OFFICERS' RULES—GENERAL.

It has already been stated that from the decision of the Comptroller (1) refusing an application (see p. 33, *supra*), or (2) requiring an amendment of the application or specifications (see p. 33, *supra*), or (3) refusing leave to amend or on opposition to the amendment of the specification (see p. 85, *supra*), or (4) an opposition to the grant of a patent (see p. 54, *supra*), an appeal lies to the Law Officer.

The procedure on such appeals is governed by the Law Officers' Rules, which are as follows:—

Law Officers' Rules.

I. When any person intends to appeal to the Law Officer from a decision of the Comptroller in any case in which such appeal is given by the Acts, he shall within fourteen days from the date of the decision appealed against (*a*) file in the Patent Office a notice of such his intention.

II. Such notice shall state the nature of the decision appealed against, and whether the appeal is from the whole, or part only, and if so, what part of such decision (*b*).

III. A copy of such notice of intention to appeal shall be sent by the party so intending to appeal to the Law Officers' clerk, at room 549, Royal Courts of Justice, London; and when there has been an opposition before the Comptroller, to the opponent or opponents; and when the Comptroller has refused to seal a patent on the

(*a*) Where the Comptroller requires an amendment, and does not in his decision settle the specific words of the amendment, the time for appealing is regarded as dating from the day of forwarding to the opponent a copy of the amendment approved by him (*Chandler's Patent* (1886) Griff. P. C. at p. 273).

(*b*) The effect of rules 1 and 2 is to limit the hearing before the Law Officers to points specifically raised by the notice

of appeal: and where a notice of appeal is given as to part only of the Comptroller's decision, the person receiving such notice and desiring to question other parts of the decision, must give a counter-notice. If the original notice is only given just before the expiration of the fourteen days, the time for giving a counter-notice may be extended under rule 5 (*Re Bairstow's Patent* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 289).

ground that a previous application for a patent for the same invention is pending, to the prior applicant (c).

IV. Upon notice of appeal being filed, the Comptroller shall forthwith transmit to the Law Officers' clerk all the papers relating to the matter of the application in respect of which such appeal is made.

V. No appeal shall be entertained of which notice is not given within fourteen days from the date of the decision appealed against, or such further time as the Comptroller may allow, except by special leave upon application to the Law Officer.

VI. Seven days' notice, at least, of the time and place appointed for the hearing of any appeal, shall be given by the Law Officers' clerk, unless special leave be given by the Law Officer that any shorter notice be given.

VII. Such notice shall in all cases be given to the Comptroller and the appellant; and, when there has been an opposition before the Comptroller, to the opponent or opponents; and, when the Comptroller has refused to seal a patent on the ground that an application for a patent for the same invention is pending, to the prior applicant.

VIII. The evidence used on appeal to the Law Officer shall be the same as that used at the hearing before the Comptroller; and no further evidence shall be given, save as to matters which have occurred or come to the knowledge of either party after the date of the decision appealed against, except with the leave of the Law Officer upon application for that purpose (d).

IX. The Law Officer shall, at the request of either party, order the attendance at the hearing on appeal, for the purpose of being cross-examined, of any person who has made a declaration in the matter to which the appeal relates, unless in the opinion of the Law Officer there is good ground for not making such order (e).

X. Any person requiring the attendance of a witness for

(c) Notice should be given to the respondent, even if he was the applicant before the Comptroller (*Re Hill's Application* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at pp. 601, 602; but see *Re Ryland's Patent* (1888) 5 R. P. C. at p. 668).

(d) The exception does not entitle a party to raise an additional ground of objection (*Bailey's Patent* (1884) Griff. P. C. at p. 270).

In *Re Thwait's Patent* ((1892) 9 R. P. C. 515) leave was given to call as witnesses persons who had not made declarations when the matter was before the Comptroller. In *Huth's Patent* ((1884) Griff. P. C. 292) leave to adduce new evidence of fraud was

refused.

(e) When it is desired to obtain an order for the attendance of declarants for cross-examination, a list of such persons should be left with the Law Officers' clerk, with a request for an order for their attendance; copies of the request and list should be sent to the other side. The Law Officer then requests the attendance of both parties before him with reference to the application, and if satisfied that an order should go, directs that summonses should be issued, which the Law Officers' clerk issues in due course (see Griff. P. C. at p. 319).

cross-examination shall tender to the witness whose attendance is required a reasonable sum for conduct money.

XI. Where the Law Officer orders that costs shall be paid by any party to another, he may fix the amount of such costs, and if he shall not think fit to fix the amount thereof, he shall direct by whom and in what manner the amount of such costs shall be ascertained (*f*).

XII. If any costs so ordered to be paid be not paid within fourteen days after the amount thereof has been so fixed or ascertained, or such shorter period as shall be directed by the Law Officer, the party to whom such costs are to be paid may apply to the Law Officer for an order for payment, under the provisions of s. 38 of the Act.

XIII. All documentary evidence required, or allowed by the Law Officer to be filed, shall be subject to the same regulations, in all respects, as apply to the procedure before the Comptroller, and shall be filed in the Patent Office, unless the Law Officer shall order to the contrary.

XIV. Any notice or other document required to be given to the Law Officers' clerk, under these Rules, may be sent by a prepaid letter through the post.

General.—After the decision of the Law Officer has been given, the matter will not be re-opened except under special circumstances, *e.g.*, in the case of fraud, a serious mistake, or miscarriage (*Re Thomas and Provost's Application* (1898) 15 R. P. C. 258).

The Law Officer may, if he thinks fit, obtain the assistance of an expert (s. 11 (4) of the Act of 1883); but it is not the practice to exercise this power (see *Re Lake's Patent* (1889) 6 R. P. C. at p. 550).

(*f*) Where there is no fresh evidence, or where there are no special circumstances, the costs generally follow the event (*Stubbs' Patent* (1884) Griff. P. C. 298; *Re Mills' Application* (1901) 18

R. P. C. at p. 324). It is not the custom of the Law Officers to give costs to such an amount as will completely indemnify the parties (*Re Stuart's Application* (1892) 9 R. P. C. at p. 453).

CHAPTER XI.

INTERNATIONAL AND COLONIAL ARRANGEMENTS.

INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS — COLONIAL ARRANGEMENTS — THE CONVENTION—THE APPLICATION.

International Arrangements.—S. 103 (1) of the Patents Act, 1883, as amended by s. 6 of the Patents Act, 1885, and s. 1 (1) of the Patents Act, 1901, provides that if (His) Majesty is pleased to make any arrangement with the Governments of any foreign States for mutual protection of inventions, then any person who has applied for protection for any invention in any such State shall be entitled to a patent for his invention in priority to other applicants, and such patent shall have the *same date* as the date of the application in such foreign State: Provided that his application is made within *twelve months* from his applying for protection in the foreign State with which the arrangement is in force.

The publication in this country, during the respective periods aforesaid, of any description of the invention, or the use therein during such periods of the invention, does not invalidate the patent which may be granted for the invention (s. 103 (2)). But the patentee is not entitled to recover damages for infringements happening prior to the date of the actual acceptance of his complete specification (s. 103 (1)).

The provisions of s. 103 apply only in the case of those foreign States in respect to which His Majesty shall from time to time by Order in Council declare them to be applicable, and so long only in the case of each State as the Order in Council shall continue in force with respect to that State (s. 103 (4)).

Colonial Arrangements.—Where the Legislature of any British Possession has made satisfactory provision for the protection of inventions patented in this country, His Majesty may from time to time by Order in Council apply the provisions of s. 103, with such variations or additions as to His Majesty in Council may seem fit, to such British Possession (s. 104 (1), *ibid.*). The Order in Council takes effect as if the provisions had been contained in

the Act; but it may be revoked by His Majesty in Council (s. 104 (2), *ibid.*).

The Convention.—By Order in Council dated the 26th June, 1884, the provisions of s. 103 were applied to the countries then signatories to the Convention. The Convention was amended at a conference on the 14th December, 1900. A copy of the Convention (published by Messrs. Eyre & Spottiswoode) may be purchased for 2*d.* The following are the most important points:—

(1) The subjects of each of the contracting States enjoy in all other States the same advantages that their respective laws grant to their own subjects (Art. 2).

(2) Any person who has applied for a patent in one of the contracting States enjoys, as regards registration in the other States, a right of priority for a term of twelve months. Consequently, subsequent registration in any of the other States before expiry of this period is not invalidated through another registration, or by publication or user of the invention during the interval (Art. 4).

(3) The introduction by the patentee into the country where the patent has been granted of objects manufactured in any of the States does not entail forfeiture; but the patentee remains bound to work his patent in conformity with the laws of the country into which he introduces the patented objects (Art. 5).

An International Office in connection with the Convention has been established at Berne, Switzerland, which publishes a monthly periodical, entitled “*La Propriété Industrielle.*”

The States now parties to the Convention are set out in a circular (“*Instructions to Applicants for Patents*”) published by the Patent Office and issued gratis.

The Application.—Every Convention application must be made within twelve months from the date of the first foreign application (Patents Rules, 1903, Rule 13; s. 1 (1) of the Patents Act, 1901).

The application must be on Form A. 2, and it must—

(a) Be accompanied by a complete specification (Rule 13, *ibid.*; s. 1 (2), *ibid.*).

(b) Be accompanied by a copy or copies of the specification, and drawings or documents filed or deposited by the applicant in the Patent Office of the foreign State or British Possession in respect of the first foreign application, duly certified by the official chief or

head of the Patent Office of such foreign State or British Possession, or otherwise verified to the satisfaction of the Comptroller (Rule 14, *ibid.*); and

(c) Be signed by the person or persons by whom the first foreign application was made, or, if such person or any of such persons be dead, by the legal representative of the deceased, as well as by the other applicants, if any (Rule 13, *ibid.*).

If any specification or other document relating to the application is in a foreign language, a translation must be annexed and verified by statutory declaration or otherwise to the satisfaction of the Comptroller (Rule 14, *ibid.*).

If the complete specification left with the application is not accepted within twelve months from the date of the first foreign application, it is open to public inspection at the expiration of that period (Rule 15, *ibid.*; s. 1 (2) of the Act of 1901).

Except as above mentioned, and as to dating (see p. 37, *supra*), and to the payment of renewal fees (see p. 38, *supra*), all proceedings in connection with a Convention application are taken within the times and in the manner prescribed by the Acts or Rules for ordinary applications (Rule 16, *ibid.*).

A corporation can apply under s. 103 (*Re Carez's Application* (1889) 6 R. P. C. 552; "Instructions to Applicants for Patents," issued by the Patent Office).

If a foreign patentee obtains a patent here in the ordinary way and not on Form A. 2, *i.e.*, not under s. 103, he cannot have his patent ante-dated (*British Tanning Co. v. Groth* (1891) 8 R. P. C. at pp. 121, 122; and see *Acetylene Co. v. United Alkali Co.* (1903) 20 R. P. C. at p. 167).

A patent under the Convention can only be granted to the person who has made the foreign application; an application for an invention communicated from abroad cannot be made under s. 103; it must be on Form A. 1, and cannot be dated back (*Re Shallenberger's Application* (1889) 6 R. P. C. 550; *Re Carez's Application*, *supra*).

CHAPTER XII.

PATENT AGENTS.

WHAT THINGS MAY BE DONE THROUGH AGENTS—WHO MAY BE REGISTERED—PENALTIES—PATENT AGENTS RULES.

With the exception of the signing of the following documents, namely:

- (1) Applications for patents;
- (2) Requests for leave to amend applications, specifications, or letters patent;
- (3) Authorizations of agents;
- (4) Notices of oppositions;
- (5) Requests for issue of duplicate letters patent; and
- (6) Notices of abandonment of or of intention not to proceed with applications, surrenders of letters patent, and petitions for compulsory licences and revocation of letters patent—

all communications to the Comptroller under the Acts and Rules may be signed by, and all attendances on the Comptroller may be made by or through an agent duly authorised to the satisfaction of the Comptroller, and, if he so requires, resident in the United Kingdom or the Isle of Man (Patents Rules, 1903, Rule 81).

The Comptroller is not bound to recognise as an agent or to receive further communications from any person whose name, by reason of disgraceful professional conduct, has been erased from the Register of Patent Agents, and not since restored. And in any particular case, the Comptroller may require the personal signature or presence of an applicant, opponent, or other person (Rule 81, *ibid.*).

Who is Entitled to be Registered as a Patent Agent.—A person is not entitled to describe himself as a patent agent, whether by advertisement, by description on his place of business, by any document issued by him, or otherwise, unless he is registered as a patent agent pursuant to the Act of 1888 (s. 1 (1) of the Patents Act, 1888).

Every person who proves to the satisfaction of the Board of

Trade that prior to the passing of the Act he had been *bonâ fide* practising as a patent agent, is entitled to be registered (s. 1 (3), *ibid.*). No other person is entitled to be registered unless he has passed such final examination as to his knowledge of Patent Law and practice and of the duties of a patent agent as the Institute of Patent Agents from time to time prescribe.

Penalty for Practising when not Registered.—If any person knowingly describes himself as a patent agent in contravention of the section, he is liable, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding 20*l.* (s. 1 (4), *ibid.*).

An unregistered person may describe himself as a “patent expert” without committing any offence (*Graham v. Eli* (1898) 15 R. P. C. 259).

If a person who has *bonâ fide* practised as a patent agent prior to the passing of the Act continues to describe himself as a patent agent without being *actually* registered, he commits an offence (*Starey v. Graham* (1899) 16 R. P. C. 106).

A person who fails to pay the registration fee or his annual fee can be struck off the register; and if he continues to practise may be convicted under the section (*Chartered Institute of Patent Agents v. Lockwood* (1894) 11 R. P. C. 374).

Register of Patent Agents Rules.—The Board of Trade may from time to time make such general rules as are, in their opinion, required for giving effect to the section (s. 1 (2), *ibid.*), and the rules so made are as effectual as if they were contained in an Act of Parliament (see *Chartered Institute of Patent Agents v. Lockwood* (1894) 11 R. P. C. 374).

The Register of Patent Agents Rules, 1889, as amended by the Register of Patent Agents Rules, 1891, are the Rules now in force and are as follows:—

1. A Register shall be kept by the **Chartered Institute of Patent Agents** (*a*) subject to the provisions of these Rules and to the Orders of the Board of Trade, for the registration of patent agents in pursuance of the Act.

2. The Register shall contain in one list all patent agents who are registered under the Act and these Rules.

Such list shall be made out alphabetically, according to the surnames of the registered persons, and shall also contain the full name of each registered person, with his address, the date of registration, and a mention of any honours, memberships, or other additions to the name of the registered person which the Council of the Institute may

(*a*) The words in heavy type are alterations effected by the Rules of 1891.

consider worthy of mention in the Register. The Register shall be in the Form 1 in Appendix A., with such variations as may be required.

3. In the month of February in each year, and at such other times as the Chartered Institute of Patent Agents may think desirable, the said Chartered Institute shall cause a correct copy of the Register to be printed under their direction, and placed on sale. A copy of the Register for the time being purporting to be so printed and published shall be admissible as evidence of all matters stated therein, and the absence of the name of any person from the Register shall be evidence, until the contrary is made to appear, that such person is not registered in pursuance of the Act.

4. The Institute shall appoint a Registrar, who shall keep the Register in accordance with the provisions of the Act and these Rules, and, subject thereto, shall act under the directions of the Institute, and the Board of Trade.

5. A person who is desirous of being registered in pursuance of the Act, on the ground that prior to the passing of the Act he had been *bonâ fide* practising as a patent agent, shall produce or transmit to the Board of Trade a statutory declaration in the Form 2 in Appendix A.; provided that the Board of Trade may, in any case in which they shall think fit, require further or other proof that the person had prior to the passing of the Act been *bonâ fide* practising as a patent agent. Upon the receipt of such statutory declaration, or of such further or other proof to their satisfaction, as the case may be, the Board of Trade shall transmit to the Registrar a certificate that the person therein named is entitled to be registered in pursuance of the Act, and the Registrar shall on the receipt of such certificate cause the name of such person to be entered in the Register.

6. Subject to the provisions of the Act in favour of every person who proves to the satisfaction of the Board of Trade that prior to the passing of the Act he had been *bonâ fide* practising as a patent agent, no person shall be entitled to be registered as a patent agent unless he has passed, and produces or transmits to the Registrar a certificate under the seal of the Institute that he has passed, such final examination as to his knowledge of Patent Law and practice and of the duties of a patent agent as the Institute shall from time to time prescribe.

7. Any person who has been for at least seven consecutive years continuously engaged as a pupil or assistant to one or more registered patent agents, and any person for the time being entitled to practise as a solicitor of the Supreme Court of Judicature in England or Ireland, or as a law agent before the Court of Session in Scotland, shall be entitled to be registered without passing any examination other than the final examination provided for in the last preceding Rule. The Registrar shall before registering the

name of any such person as a patent agent (in addition to the final examination certificate) require proof satisfactory to the Registrar that such person has been for at least seven consecutive years continuously engaged as such pupil or assistant, or is entitled to practise as such solicitor or law agent.

8. Any person who is not qualified under Rule 7 must, in order to be entitled to present himself for the final qualifying examination, be—

A person who has passed one of the preliminary examinations mentioned in Appendix B., or such other examination as the Institute shall, with the approval of the Board of Trade, by regulation prescribe.

9. The Institute shall hold at least once in the year, commencing with the first day of July, 1889, and in every other succeeding year, a final qualifying examination, which shall be the final qualifying examination required under Rules 6 and 7; and the Institute shall, subject to these Rules, have the entire management and control of all such examinations, and may from time to time make regulations with respect to all or any of the following matters, that is to say,

- (a) The subjects for and the mode of conducting the examination of candidates;
- (b) The times and places of the examinations, and the notices to be given of examinations;
- (c) The certificates to be given to persons of their having passed the examinations;
- (d) The appointment and removal of examiners, and the remuneration, by fees or otherwise, of the examiners so appointed; and
- (e) Any other matter or thing as to which the Institute may think it necessary to make regulations for the purpose of carrying out this Rule.

10. The Registrar shall from time to time insert in the Register any alteration which may come to his knowledge in the name or address of any person registered.

11. The Registrar shall erase from the Register the name of any registered person who is dead.

12. The Registrar may erase from the Register the name of any registered person who has ceased to practise as a patent agent, but not (save as hereinafter provided) without the consent of that person. For the purposes of this Rule the Registrar may send by post to a registered person to his registered address a notice inquiring whether or not he has ceased to practise or has changed his residence, and if the Registrar does not within three months after sending the notice receive an answer thereto from the said person, he may, within fourteen days after the expiration of the three months, send him by post to his registered address another

notice referring to the first notice, and stating that no answer has been received by the Registrar; and if the Registrar either before the second notice is sent receives the first notice back from the dead letter office of the Postmaster-General, or receives the second notice back from that office, or does not within three months after sending the second notice receive any answer thereto from the said person, that person shall, for the purpose of this Rule, be deemed to have ceased to practise, and his name may be erased accordingly.

13. If any registered person shall not, within one month from the day on which his annual registration fee becomes payable, pay such fee, the Registrar may send to such registered person to his registered address a notice requiring him, on or before a day to be named in the notice, to pay his annual registration fee; and if such registered patent agent shall not within one month from the day named in such notice pay the registration fee so due from him, the Registrar may erase his name from the Register: Provided that the name of a person erased from the Register under this rule may be restored to the Register by direction of the Institute or the Board of Trade on payment by such person of the fee or fees due from him, together with such further sum of money, not exceeding in amount the annual registration fee, as the Institute or the Board of Trade (as the case may be) may in each particular case direct.

14. In the execution of his duties the Registrar shall, subject to these Rules, in each case act on such evidence as appears to him sufficient.

15. The Board of Trade may order the Registrar to erase from the Register any entry therein which is proved to their satisfaction to have been incorrectly or fraudulently inserted.

16. If any registered person shall be convicted in Her Majesty's dominions or elsewhere of an offence which, if committed in England, would be a felony or misdemeanor, or after due inquiry, is proved to the satisfaction of the Board of Trade to have been guilty of disgraceful professional conduct, or having been entitled to practise as a solicitor or law agent shall have ceased to be so entitled, the Board of Trade may order the Registrar to erase from the Register the name of such person. Provided that no person shall be adjudged by the Board of Trade to have been guilty of disgraceful professional conduct unless such person has received notice of, and had an opportunity of defending himself from, any charge brought against him.

17.—(1.) Where the Board of Trade direct the erasure from the Register of a name of any person, or of any other entry, the name of the person or the entry shall not be again entered in the Register, except by order of the Board of Trade.

(2.) The Board of Trade may in any case in which they think

fit restore to the Register such name or entry erased therefrom either without fee, or on payment of such fee, not exceeding the registration fee, as the Board of Trade may from time to time fix, and the Registrar shall restore the name accordingly.

(3.) The name of any person erased from the Register at the request or with the consent of such person shall, unless it might, if not so erased, have been erased by order of the Board of Trade, be restored to the Register by the Registrar on his application and on payment of such fee, not exceeding the registration fee, as the Institute shall from time to time fix.

18. For the purpose of exercising in any case the powers of erasing from and of restoring to the Register the name of a person, or an entry, the Board of Trade may appoint a committee consisting of such persons as they shall think fit. Every application to the Board of Trade for the erasure from, or restoration to, the Register of the name of any patent agent shall be referred for hearing and inquiry to the committee, who shall report thereon to the Board of Trade, and a report of the committee shall be conclusive as to the facts for the purpose of the exercise of the said powers by the Board of Trade.

19. Any person aggrieved by any order, direction, or refusal of the Institute or Registrar may appeal to the Board of Trade.

20. A person who intends to appeal to the Board of Trade under these Rules (in these Rules referred to as the appellant) shall, within 14 days from the date of the making or giving of the order, direction, or refusal complained of, leave at the office of the Institute a notice in writing signed by him of such his intention.

21. The notice of intention to appeal shall be accompanied by a statement in writing of the grounds of the appeal, and of the case of the appellant in support thereof.

22. The appellant shall also immediately after leaving his notice of appeal at the Institute send by post a copy thereof with a copy of the appellant's case in support thereof addressed to the Secretary of the Board of Trade, 7, Whitehall Gardens, London.

23. The Board of Trade may thereupon give such directions (if any) as they may think fit for the purpose of the hearing of the appeal.

24. Seven days' notice, or such shorter notice as the Board of Trade may in any particular case direct, of the time and place appointed for the hearing of the appeal shall be given to the appellant and the Institute and the Registrar.

25. The appeal may be heard by the President, a Secretary, or an Assistant Secretary of the Board of Trade, and the decision and order thereon of the President, Secretary, or Assistant Secretary, as the case may be, shall be the decision of the Board of Trade on such appeal. On the appeal such decision may be given or order made

in reference to the subject-matter of the appeal as the case may require.

26. The fees set forth in Appendix C. to these Rules shall be paid in respect of the several matters, and at the times and in the manner therein mentioned. The Board of Trade may from time to time, by orders signed by the Secretary of the Board of Trade, alter any of or add to, the fees payable under these Rules.

27. Any regulation made by the Institute under these Rules may be altered or revoked by a subsequent regulation. Copies of all regulations made by the Institute under these Rules shall, within twenty-eight days of the date of their being made, be transmitted to the Board of Trade, and if within twenty-eight days after a copy of any regulation has been so transmitted, the Board of Trade by an order signify their disapproval thereof, such regulation shall be of no force or effect; and if, after any regulation under these Rules has come into force, the Board of Trade signify in manner aforesaid their disapproval thereof, such regulation shall immediately cease to be of any force or effect.

28. The Institute shall once every year in the month of December transmit to the Board of Trade a report stating the number of applications for registration which have been made in the preceding year, the nature and results of the final examinations which have been held, and the amount of fees received by the Institute under these Rules, and such other matters in relation to the provisions of these Rules as the Board of Trade may from time to time, by notice signed by the Secretary of the Board of Trade and addressed to the Institute, require.

29. In these Rules, unless the context otherwise requires—

“The Act” means the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1888.

“The Institute” means the Institute of Patent Agents acting through the Council for the time being.

“The Registrar” means the Registrar appointed under these Rules.

“Registered patent agent” means any agent for obtaining patents in the United Kingdom whose name is registered under the Act and these Rules.

APPENDIX A.

Form 1.

Form of Register.

Name.	Designation.	Address.	Date of Registration.

Form 2.

Form of Statutory Declaration.

Register of Patent Agents Rules, 1889.

I, *A.B.* [*insert full name, and in the case of a member of a firm add "a member of the firm of _____", of _____, in the county of _____, Patent Agent, do solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:—*

1. That prior to the 24th December, 1888, I had been *bonâ fide* practising in the United Kingdom as a patent agent.

2. That I acted as patent agent in obtaining the following patents:—
[*Give the official numbers and dates of some patents for the United Kingdom in the obtaining of which the declarant acted as patent agent.*]

3. That I desire to be registered as a patent agent in pursuance of the said Act.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the provisions of the Statutory Declarations Acts, 1835.

Declared at _____

APPENDIX B (a).

Particulars of Preliminary Examinations.

1. The Matriculation examination at any University in England, Scotland, or Ireland.

2. The Oxford or Cambridge Middle Class Senior Local Examinations.

3. The first public examination before Moderators at Oxford.

(a) As altered by the Rules of 1891.

4. The previous examination at Cambridge.
5. The examination in Arts for the second year at Durham.
6. The examination for first-class certificate of the College of Preceptors (40 & 41 Vict. c. 25, s. 10).
7. The examination resulting in the obtaining of a Whitworth Scholarship.

APPENDIX C.

Fees.

Nature of Fee.	When to be paid.	To whom to be paid.	Amount.
For registration of name of patent agent who had been <i>bonâ fide</i> in practice prior to the passing of the Act.	On application and before registration.	To the Registrar at the Institute.	£ s. d. 5 5 0
For registration of name of any person other than as above.	Do. do.	Do. do.	5 5 0
Annual fee to be paid by every registered patent agent.	On or before November 30 of each year, in respect of the year commencing January 1st following.	Do. do.	3 3 0
On entry of a candidate for the final qualifying examination.	At time of entering name.	Do. do.	2 2 0

APPENDIX.

FEES PAYABLE IN CONNECTION WITH PATENTS.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
On application for provisional protection	1	0	0			
On filing complete specification	3	0	0			
	—————			4	0	0
or						
On filing complete specification with first application	4	0	0			
On appeal from Comptroller to Law Officer. By appellant	3	0	0			
On notice of opposition to grant of patent. By opponent	0	10	0			
On hearing by Comptroller. By applicant and by opponent respectively	1	0	0			
On application to amend specification :—						
Up to sealing. By applicant	1	10	0			
After sealing. By patentee	3	0	0			
On notice of opposition to amendment. By opponent	0	10	0			
On hearing by Comptroller. By applicant and by opponent respectively	1	0	0			
On application to amend specification during action or proceeding. By patentee	3	0	0			
On application to the Board of Trade for a compulsory licence. By person applying	1	0	0			
On opposition to grant of compulsory licence. By opponent	1	0	0			
On certificate of renewal :—						
Before the expiration of the 4th year from the date of the patent and in respect of the 5th year	5	0	0			
Before the expiration of the 5th year from the date of the patent and in respect of the 6th year	6	0	0			
Before the expiration of the 6th year from the date of the patent and in respect of the 7th year	7	0	0			

	£	s.	d.
Before the expiration of the 7th year from the date of the patent and in respect of the 8th year	8	0	0
Before the expiration of the 8th year from the date of the patent and in respect of the 9th year	9	0	0
Before the expiration of the 9th year from the date of the patent and in respect of the 10th year	10	0	0
Before the expiration of the 10th year from the date of the patent and in respect of the 11th year	11	0	0
Before the expiration of the 11th year from the date of the patent and in respect of the 12th year	12	0	0
Before the expiration of the 12th year from the date of the patent and in respect of the 13th year	13	0	0
Before the expiration of the 13th year from the date of the patent and in respect of the 14th year	14	0	0
On enlargement of time for payment of renewal fees:—			
Not exceeding one month	1	0	0
,, two months	3	0	0
,, three months	5	0	0
For every entry of an assignment, transmission, agreement, licence, or extension of patent	0	10	0
For duplicate of letters patent each	2	0	0
On notice to Comptroller of intended exhibition of a patent under section 39	0	10	0
Search or inspection fee each	0	1	0
For office copies every 100 words	0	0	4
			(but never less than one shilling)
For office copies of drawings, cost according to agreement			
For certifying office copies, MSS. or printed each	0	1	0
On postal request for printed specification	0	0	8
On request to Comptroller to correct a clerical error:—			
Up to sealing	0	5	0
After sealing.	1	0	0
For certificate of Comptroller under section 96	0	5	0
For altering address in register	0	5	0
For enlargement of time for filing complete specification, not exceeding one month	2	0	0
For enlargement of time for acceptance of complete specification:—			
Not exceeding one month	2	0	0
,, two months	4	0	0
,, three months	6	0	0

PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE MARKS ACT, 1883.

[NOTE.—*The parts of the Act which have been repealed are here omitted ; amendments made by subsequent Acts are printed in heavier type. The Act of 1902 is printed separately, and the parts of that Act which have not yet come into operation are not noted here.*]

46 & 47 Vict. c. 57.

An Act to amend and consolidate the law relating to Patents for Inventions, Registration of Designs, and of Trade Marks.

BE IT ENACTED, etc. :

PART I.**PRELIMINARY.**

1. This Act may be cited as “The Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883.”

2. This Act is divided into parts, as follows: Part I.—Preliminary; Part II.—Patents; Part III.—Designs; Part IV.—Trade Marks; Part V.—General.

3. This Act, except where it is otherwise expressed, shall commence from and immediately after the 31st day of December, 1883.

PART II.**PATENTS.***Application for and Grant of Patent.*

4. (1) Any person, whether a British subject or not, may make an application for a patent.

(2) Two or more persons may make a joint application for a patent, and a patent may be granted to them jointly.

Whereas doubts have arisen whether under the principal Act a patent may lawfully be granted to several persons jointly, some or one of them only are or is the true and first inventors or inventor;

be it therefore enacted and declared that it has been and is lawful under the principal Act to grant such a patent. [*Act of 1885, s. 5.*]

5. (1) An application for a patent must be made in the form set forth in the First Schedule to this Act, or in such other form as may be from time to time prescribed; and must be left at, or sent by post to, the Patent Office in the prescribed manner.

(2) An application must contain a declaration to the effect that the applicant is in possession of an invention, whereof he, 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; and must be accompanied by either a provisional or complete specification.

The declaration may be either a statutory declaration under the Statutory Declarations Act, 1835, or not, as may be from time to time prescribed. [*Act of 1885, s. 2.*]

(3) A provisional specification must describe the nature of the invention, and be accompanied by drawings, if required.

(4) A complete specification, whether left on application or subsequently, must particularly describe and ascertain the nature of the invention, and in what manner it is to be performed, and must be accompanied by drawings, if required.

The requirement of (this sub-section) as to drawings shall not be deemed to be insufficiently complied with by reason only that instead of being accompanied by drawings the complete specification refers to the drawings which accompanied the provisional specification. And no patent heretofore sealed shall be invalid by reason only that the complete specification was not accompanied by drawings, but referred to those which accompanied the provisional specification. [*Act of 1886, s. 2.*]

(5) A specification, whether provisional or complete, must commence with the title, and in the case of a complete specification must end with a distinct statement of the invention claimed.

6. The comptroller shall refer every application to an examiner, who shall ascertain and report to the comptroller whether the nature of the invention has been fairly described, and the application, specification, and drawings (if any) have been prepared in the prescribed manner, and the title sufficiently indicates the subject-matter of the invention.

“ 7. (1) If the examiner reports that the nature of the invention is not fairly described, or that the application, specification, or drawings has not, or have not, been prepared in the prescribed manner, or that the title does not sufficiently indicate the subject-matter of the

invention, the comptroller may refuse to accept the application, or require that the application, specification, or drawings be amended before he proceeds with the application; and in the latter case the application shall, if the comptroller so directs, bear date as from the time when the requirement is complied with.

“(2) Where the comptroller refuses to accept an application or requires an amendment, the applicant may appeal from his decision to the law officer.

“(3) The law officer shall, if required, hear the applicant and the comptroller, and may make an order determining whether, and subject to what conditions, if any, the application shall be accepted.

“(4) The comptroller shall, when an application has been accepted, give notice thereof to the applicant.

“(5) If, after an application for a patent has been made, but before the patent thereon has been sealed, another application for a patent is made, accompanied by a specification bearing the same or a similar title, the comptroller, if he thinks fit, on the request of the second applicant, or of his legal representative, may, within two months of the grant of a patent on the first application, either decline to proceed with the second application or allow the surrender of the patent, if any, granted thereon.” [*Act of 1888, s. 2.*]

8. (1) If the applicant does not leave a complete specification with his application, he may leave it at any subsequent time within nine months from the date of application.

A complete specification may be left within such extended time, not exceeding one month after the said nine months, as the comptroller may on payment of the prescribed fee allow. [*Act of 1885, s. 3.*]

(2) Unless a complete specification is left within that time the application shall be deemed to be abandoned.

9. (1) Where a complete specification is left after a provisional specification, the comptroller shall refer both specifications to an examiner for the purpose of ascertaining whether the complete specification has been prepared in the prescribed manner, and whether the invention particularly described in the complete specification is substantially the same as that which is described in the provisional specification.

(2) If the examiner reports that the conditions hereinbefore contained have not been complied with, the comptroller may refuse to accept the complete specification unless and until the same shall have been amended to his satisfaction; but any such refusal shall be subject to appeal to the law officer.

(3) The law officer shall, if required, hear the applicant and the comptroller, and may make an order determining whether and subject to what conditions, if any, the complete specification shall be accepted.

(4) Unless a complete specification is accepted within twelve months from the date of application, then (save in the case of an appeal having been lodged against the refusal to accept) the application shall, at the expiration of those twelve months, become void.

A complete specification may be accepted within such extended time, not exceeding three months after the said twelve months, as the comptroller may on payment of the prescribed fee allow. [*Act of 1885, s. 3.*]

(5) Reports of examiners shall not in any case be published or be open to public inspection, and shall not be liable to production or inspection in any legal proceeding [*see Act of 1888, s. 3.*], unless the Court or officer having power to order discovery in such legal proceeding shall certify that such production or inspection is desirable in the interests of justice, and ought to be allowed.

10. On the acceptance of the complete specification the comptroller shall advertise the acceptance; and the application and specification or specifications with the drawings (if any) shall be open to public inspection.

11. (1) Any person may at any time within two months from the date of the advertisement of the acceptance of a complete specification give notice at the Patent Office of opposition to the grant of the patent on the ground of the applicant having obtained the invention from him, or from a person of whom he is the legal representative, or on the ground that the invention has been patented in this country on an application of prior date, or on the ground that the complete specification describes or claims an invention other than that described in the provisional specification, and that such other invention forms the subject of an application made by the opponent in the interval between the leaving of the provisional specification and the leaving of the complete specification [*Act of 1888, s. 4.*], but on no other ground.

(2) Where such notice is given the comptroller shall give notice of the opposition to the applicant, and shall, on the expiration of those two months, after hearing the applicant and the person so giving notice, if desirous of being heard, decide on the case, but subject to appeal to the law officer.

(3) The law officer shall, if required, hear the applicant and any person so giving notice and being, in the opinion of the law officer, entitled to be heard in opposition to the grant, and shall determine whether the grant ought or ought not to be made.

(4) The law officer may, if he thinks fit, obtain the assistance of an expert, who shall be paid such remuneration as the law officer, with the consent of the Treasury, shall appoint.

12. (1) If there is no opposition, or, in case of opposition, if the determination is in favour of the grant of a patent, the comptroller shall cause a patent to be sealed with the seal of the Patent Office.

(2) A patent so sealed shall have the same effect as if it were sealed with the Great Seal of the United Kingdom.

(3) A patent shall be sealed as soon as may be, and not after the expiration of fifteen months from the date of application except in the cases hereinafter mentioned, that is to say—

(a) Where the sealing is delayed by an appeal to the law officer, or by opposition to the grant of the patent, the patent may be sealed at such times as the law officer may direct.

(b) If the person making the application dies before the expiration of the fifteen months aforesaid, the patent may be granted to his legal representative and sealed at any time within twelve months after the death of the applicant.

A complete specification may be left and accepted within such extended times, not exceeding one month and three months respectively after the said nine and twelve months respectively as the comptroller may on payment of the prescribed fee allow, and where such extension of time has been allowed, a further extension of four months after the said fifteen months shall be allowed for the sealing of the patent; and the principal Act shall have effect as if any time so allowed were added to the said periods specified in the principal Act. [*Act of 1885, s. 3.*]

13. Every patent shall be dated and sealed as of the day of the application: Provided that no proceedings shall be taken in respect of an infringement committed before the publication of the complete specification: Provided also, that in case of more than one application for a patent for the same invention, the sealing of a patent on one of those applications shall not prevent the sealing of a patent on an earlier application.

Where an application for a patent has been abandoned, or become

void, the specification or specifications and drawings (if any) accompanying or left in connection with such application, shall not at any time be open to public inspection or be published by the comptroller. [Act of 1885, s. 4.]

Provisional Protection.

14. Where an application for a patent in respect of an invention has been accepted, the invention may during the period between the date of the application and the date of sealing such patent be used and published without prejudice to the patent to be granted for the same; and such protection from the consequences of use and publication is in this Act referred to as provisional protection.

Protection by Complete Specification.

15. After the acceptance of a complete specification and until the date of sealing a patent in respect thereof, or the expiration of the time for sealing, the applicant shall have the like privileges and rights as if a patent for the invention had been sealed on the date of the acceptance of the complete specification: Provided that an applicant shall not be entitled to institute any proceeding for infringement unless and until a patent for the invention has been granted to him.

Patent.

16. Every patent when sealed shall have effect throughout the United Kingdom and the Isle of Man.

17. (1) The term limited in every patent for the duration thereof shall be fourteen years from its date.

(2) But every patent shall, notwithstanding anything therein or in this Act, cease if the patentee fails to make the prescribed payments within the prescribed times.

(3) If, nevertheless, in any case, by accident, mistake, or inadvertence, a patentee fails to make any prescribed payment within the prescribed time, he may apply to the comptroller for an enlargement of the time for making that payment.

(4) Thereupon the comptroller shall, if satisfied that the failure has arisen from any of the above-mentioned causes, on receipt of the prescribed fee for enlargement, not exceeding ten pounds, enlarge the time accordingly, subject to the following conditions:

(a) The time for making any payment shall not in any case be enlarged for more than three months.

- (b) If any proceeding shall be taken in respect of an infringement of the patent committed after a failure to make any payment within the prescribed time, and before the enlargement thereof, the Court before which the proceeding is proposed to be taken may, if it shall think fit, refuse to award or give any damages in respect of such infringement.

Amendment of Specification.

18. (1) An applicant or a patentee may, from time to time, by request in writing left at the Patent Office, seek leave to amend his specification, including drawings forming part thereof, by way of disclaimer, correction, or explanation, stating the nature of such amendment and his reasons for the same.

(2) The request and the nature of such proposed amendment shall be advertised in the prescribed manner, and at any time within one month from its first advertisement any person may give notice at the Patent Office of opposition to the amendment.

(3) Where such notice is given the comptroller shall give notice of the opposition to the person making the request, and shall hear and decide the case subject to an appeal to the law officer.

(4) The law officer shall, if required, hear the person making the request and the person so giving notice, and being in the opinion of the law officer entitled to be heard in opposition to the request, and shall determine whether and subject to what conditions, if any, the amendment ought to be allowed.

(5) Where no notice of opposition is given, or the person so giving notice does not appear, the comptroller shall determine whether and subject to what conditions, if any, the amendment ought to be allowed.

(6) When leave to amend is refused by the comptroller, the person making the request may appeal from his decision to the law officer.

(7) The law officer shall, if required, hear the person making the request and the comptroller, and may make an order determining whether, and subject to what conditions, if any, the amendment ought to be allowed.

(8) No amendment shall be allowed that would make the specification, as amended, claim an invention substantially larger than or substantially different from the invention claimed by the specification as it stood before amendment.

(9) Leave to amend shall be conclusive as to the right of the party to make the amendment allowed, except in case of fraud;

and the amendment shall in all Courts and for all purposes be deemed to form part of the specification.

(10) The foregoing provisions of this section do not apply when, and so long as any action for infringement or proceeding for revocation of a patent is pending. [*S. 5 of the Patents Act, 1888.*]

19. In an action for infringement of a patent, and in a proceeding for revocation of a patent, the Court or a judge may at any time order that the patentee shall, subject to such terms as to costs and otherwise as the Court or a judge may impose, be at liberty to apply at the Patent Office for leave to amend his specification by way of disclaimer, and may direct that in the meantime the trial or hearing of the action shall be postponed.

20. Where an amendment by way of disclaimer, correction, or explanation, has been allowed under this Act, no damages shall be given in any action in respect of the use of the invention before the disclaimer, correction, or explanation, unless the patentee establishes to the satisfaction of the Court that his original claim was framed in good faith and with reasonable skill and knowledge.

21. Every amendment of a specification shall be advertised in the prescribed manner.

Compulsory Licences.

22. [*Repealed by s. 3 of the Act of 1902.*]

Register of Patents.

23. (1) There shall be kept at the Patent Office a book called the Register of Patents, wherein shall be entered the names and addresses of grantees of patents, notifications of assignments and of transmissions of patents, of licences under patents, and of amendments, extensions, and revocations of patents, and such other matters affecting the validity or proprietorship of patents as may from time to time be prescribed.

(2) The Register of Patents shall be *prima facie* evidence of any matters by this Act directed or authorized to be inserted therein.

(3) Copies of deeds, licences, and any other documents affecting the proprietorship in any letters patent or in any licence thereunder, must be supplied to the comptroller in the prescribed manner for filing in the Patent Office.

Fees.

24. (1) There shall be paid in respect of the several instruments described in the Second Schedule to this Act, the fees in

that schedule mentioned, and there shall likewise be paid, in respect of other matters under this part of the Act, such fees as may be from time to time, with the sanction of the Treasury, prescribed by the Board of Trade; and such fees shall be levied and paid to the account of Her Majesty's Exchequer in such manner as the Treasury may from time to time direct.

(2) The Board of Trade may from time to time, if they think fit, with the consent of the Treasury, reduce any of those fees.

Extension of Term of Patent.

25. (1) A patentee may, after advertising in manner directed by any rules made under this section his intention to do so, present a petition to Her Majesty in Council, praying that his patent may be extended for a further term; but such petition must be presented at least six months before the time limited for the expiration of the patent.

(2) Any person may enter a caveat, addressed to the Registrar of the Council at the Council Office, against the extension.

(3) If Her Majesty shall be pleased to refer any such petition to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the said Committee shall proceed to consider the same, and the petitioner and any person who has entered a caveat shall be entitled to be heard by himself or by counsel on the petition.

(4) The Judicial Committee shall, in considering their decision, have regard to the nature and merits of the invention in relation to the public, to the profits made by the patentee as such, and to all the circumstances of the case.

(5) If the Judicial Committee report that the patentee has been inadequately remunerated by his patent, it shall be lawful for Her Majesty in Council to extend the term of the patent for a further term not exceeding seven, or in exceptional cases fourteen, years; or to order the grant of a new patent for the term therein mentioned, and containing any restrictions, conditions, and provisions that the Judicial Committee may think fit.

(6) It shall be lawful for Her Majesty in Council to make, from time to time, rules of procedure and practice for regulating proceedings on such petitions, and subject thereto such proceedings shall be regulated according to the existing procedure and practice in patent matters of the Judicial Committee.

(7) The costs of all parties of and incident to such proceedings shall be in the discretion of the Judicial Committee; and the orders of the Committee respecting costs shall be enforceable as if they were orders of a division of the High Court of Justice.

Revocation.

26. (1) The proceeding by scire facias to repeal a patent is hereby abolished.

(2) Revocation of a patent may be obtained on petition to the Court.

(3) Every ground on which a patent might, at the commencement of this Act, be repealed by scire facias shall be available by way of defence to an action of infringement and shall also be a ground of revocation.

(4) A petition for revocation of a patent may be presented by—

(a) The Attorney-General in England or Ireland, or the Lord Advocate in Scotland :

(b) Any person authorized by the Attorney-General in England or Ireland, or the Lord Advocate in Scotland :

(c) Any person alleging that the patent was obtained in fraud of his rights, or of the rights of any person under or through whom he claims :

(d) Any person alleging that he, or any person under or through whom he claims, was the true inventor of any invention included in the claim of the patentee :

(e) Any person alleging that he, or any person under or through whom he claims an interest in any trade, business, or manufacture, had publicly manufactured, used, or sold, within this realm, before the date of the patent, anything claimed by the patentee as his invention.

(5) The plaintiff must deliver with his petition particulars of the objections on which he means to rely, and no evidence shall, except by leave of the Court or a judge, be admitted in proof of any objection of which particulars are not so delivered.

(6) Particulars delivered may be from time to time amended by leave of the Court or a judge.

(7) The defendant shall be entitled to begin, and give evidence in support of the patent, and if the plaintiff gives evidence impeaching the validity of the patent the defendant shall be entitled to reply.

(8) Where a patent has been revoked on the ground of fraud, the comptroller may, on the application of the true inventor made in accordance with the provisions of this Act, grant to him a patent in lieu of and bearing the same date as the date of revocation of the patent so revoked, but the patent so granted shall cease on the expiration of the term for which the revoked patent was granted.

Crown.

27. (1) A patent shall have to all intents the like effect as against Her Majesty the Queen, her heirs and successors, as it has against a subject.

(2) But the officers or authorities administering any department of the service of the Crown may, by themselves, their agents, contractors, or others, at any time after the application, use the invention for the services of the Crown on terms to be before or after the use thereof agreed on, with the approval of the Treasury, between those officers or authorities and the patentee, or, in default of such agreement, on such terms as may be settled by the Treasury after hearing all parties interested.

Legal Proceedings.

28. (1) In an action or proceeding for infringement or revocation of a patent, the Court may, if it thinks fit, and shall, on the request of either of the parties to the proceeding, call in the aid of an assessor specially qualified, and try and hear the case wholly or partially with his assistance; the action shall be tried without a jury unless the Court shall otherwise direct.

(2) The Court of Appeal or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council may, if they see fit, in any proceeding before them respectively, call in the aid of an assessor as aforesaid.

(3) The remuneration, if any, to be paid to an assessor under this section shall be determined by the Court or the Court of Appeal or Judicial Committee, as the case may be, and be paid in the same manner as the other expenses of the execution of this Act.

29. (1) In an action for infringement of a patent the plaintiff must deliver with his statement of claim, or by order of the Court or the judge, at any subsequent time, particulars of the breaches complained of.

(2) The defendant must deliver with his statement of defence, or, by order of the Court or a judge, at any subsequent time, particulars of any objections on which he relies in support thereof.

(3) If the defendant disputes the validity of the patent, the particulars delivered by him must state on what grounds he disputes it, and if one of those grounds is want of novelty must state the time and place of the previous publication or user alleged by him.

(4) At the hearing no evidence shall, except by leave of the Court or a judge, be admitted in proof of any alleged infringement or objection of which particulars are not so delivered.

(5) Particulars delivered may be from time to time amended, by leave of the Court or a judge.

(6) On taxation of costs regard shall be had to the particulars delivered by the plaintiff and by the defendant; and they respectively shall not be allowed any costs in respect of any particular delivered by them unless the same is certified by the Court or a judge to have been proven or to have been reasonable and proper, without regard to the general costs of the case.

30. In an action for infringement of a patent, the Court or a judge may on the application of either party make such order for an injunction, inspection, or account, and impose such terms and give such directions respecting the same and the proceedings thereon as the Court or a judge may see fit.

31. In an action for infringement of a patent, the Court or a judge may certify that the validity of the patent came in question; and if the Court or a judge so certifies, then in any subsequent action for infringement, the plaintiff in that action on obtaining a final order or judgment in his favour shall have his full costs, charges and expenses as between solicitor and client, unless the Court or a judge trying the action certifies that he ought not to have the same.

32. Where any person claiming to be the patentee of an invention, by circulars, advertisements or otherwise threatens any other person with any legal proceedings or liability in respect of any alleged manufacture, use, sale or purchase of the invention, any person or persons aggrieved thereby may bring an action against him, and may obtain an injunction against the continuance of such threats, and may recover such damage (if any) as may have been sustained thereby, if the alleged manufacture, use, sale, or purchase to which the threats related was not in fact an infringement of any legal rights of the person making such threats: Provided that this section shall not apply if the person making such threats with due diligence commences and prosecutes an action for infringement of his patent.

Miscellaneous.

33. Every patent may be in the form in the First Schedule to this Act, and shall be granted for one invention only, but may contain more than one claim: but it shall not be competent

for any person in an action or other proceeding to take any objection to a patent on the ground that it comprises more than one invention.

34. (1) If a person possessed of an invention dies without making application for a patent for the invention, application may be made by, and a patent for the invention granted to, his legal representative.

(2) Every such application must be made within six months of the decease of such person, and must contain a declaration by the legal representative that he believes such person to be the true and first inventor of the invention.

35. A patent granted to the true and first inventor shall not be invalidated by an application in fraud of him, or by provisional protection obtained thereon, or by any use or publication of the invention subsequent to that fraudulent application during the period of provisional protection.

36. A patentee may assign his patent for any place in or part of the United Kingdom, or Isle of Man, as effectually as if the patent were originally granted to extend to that place or part only.

37. If a patent is lost or destroyed, or its non-production is accounted for to the satisfaction of the comptroller, the comptroller may at any time cause a duplicate thereof to be sealed.

38. The law officers may examine witnesses on oath and administer oaths for that purpose under this part of this Act, and may from time to time make, alter, and rescind rules regulating references and appeals to the law officers and the practice and procedure before them under this part of this Act; and in any proceeding before either of the law officers under this part of this Act, the law officer may order costs to be paid by either party, and any such order may be made a rule of the Court.

39. [*Set out in full on p. 13, supra.*]

It shall be lawful for Her Majesty, by Order in Council, from time to time to declare that sections thirty-nine and fifty-seven of the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883, or either of those sections, shall apply to any exhibition mentioned in the Order in like manner as if it were an industrial or international exhibition certified by the Board of Trade, and to provide that the exhibitor shall be relieved from the conditions, specified in the said sections, of giving notice to the comptroller of his intention to exhibit, and shall be so relieved either absolutely or upon such terms and conditions as to Her Majesty in Council may seem fit. [*Act of 1886, s. 3.*]

40. (1) The comptroller shall cause to be issued periodically an illustrated journal of patented inventions, as well as reports of patent cases decided by Courts of law, and any other information that the comptroller may deem generally useful or important.

(2) Provision shall be made by the comptroller for keeping on sale copies of such journal, and also of all complete specifications of patents for the time being in force, with their accompanying drawings, if any.

(3) The comptroller shall continue, in such form as he may deem expedient, the indexes and abridgments of specifications hitherto published, and shall from time to time prepare and publish such other indexes, abridgments of specifications, catalogues, and other works relating to inventions, as he may see fit.

41. The control and management of the existing Patent Museum and its contents shall, from and after the commencement of this Act, be transferred to and vested in the Department of Science and Art, subject to such directions as Her Majesty in Council may see fit to give.

42. The Department of Science and Art may at any time require a patentee to furnish them with a model of his invention on payment to the patentee of the cost of the manufacture of the model; the amount to be settled, in case of dispute, by the Board of Trade.

43. (1) A patent shall not prevent the use of an invention for the purposes of the navigation of a foreign vessel within the jurisdiction of any of Her Majesty's Courts in the United Kingdom, or Isle of Man, or the use of an invention in a foreign vessel within that jurisdiction, provided it is not used therein for or in connexion with the manufacture or preparation of anything intended to be sold in or exported from the United Kingdom or Isle of Man.

(2) But this section shall not extend to vessels of any foreign state of which the laws authorize subjects of such foreign state, having patents or like privileges for the exclusive use or exercise of inventions within its territories, to prevent or interfere with the use of such inventions in British vessels while in the ports of such foreign state, or in the waters within the jurisdiction of its Courts, where such inventions are not so used for the manufacture or preparation of anything intended to be sold in or exported from the territories of such foreign state.

44. [*Set out in full on pp. 95-96, supra.*]

Existing Patents.

45. [*Provisions respecting patents granted before the commencement of the Act of 1883.*]

Definitions.

46. In and for the purposes of this Act—

“Patent” means letters patent for an invention :

“Patentee” means the person for the time being entitled to the benefit of a patent :

“Invention” means any manner of new manufacture the subject of letters patent and grant of privilege within section six of the Statute of Monopolies (that is, the Act of the twenty-first year of the reign of King James the First, chapter three, intituled “An Act concerning monopolies and dispensations with penal laws and the forfeiture thereof”), and includes an alleged invention.

In Scotland “injunction” means “interdict.”

PART III.

[DESIGNS.—Ss. 47-61.]

PART IV.

[TRADE MARKS.—Ss. 62-81.]

PART V.

GENERAL.

Patent Office and Proceedings thereat.

82. (1) The Treasury may provide for the purposes of this Act an office with all requisite buildings and conveniences, which shall be called, and is in this Act referred to as, the Patent Office.

(2) Until a new Patent Office is provided, the offices of the Commissioners of Patents for inventions and for the registration of designs and trade marks existing at the commencement of this Act shall be the Patent Office within the meaning of this Act.

(3) The Patent Office shall be under the immediate control of an officer called the comptroller-general of patents, designs, and trade marks, who shall act under the superintendence and direction of the Board of Trade.

(4) Any act or thing directed to be done by or to the comptroller may [*see Act of 1902, s. 4*] be done by or to any officer for the time being in that behalf authorized by the Board of Trade.

83. (1) The Board of Trade may at any time after the passing of this Act, and from time to time, subject to the approval of the Treasury, appoint the comptroller-general of patents, designs, and trade marks, and so many examiners and other officers and clerks, with such designations and duties as the Board of Trade think fit, and may from time to time remove any of those officers and clerks.

(2) The salaries of those officers and clerks shall be appointed by the Board of Trade, with the concurrence of the Treasury, and the same and the other expenses of the execution of this Act shall be paid out of money provided by Parliament.

84. There shall be a seal for the Patent Office, and impressions thereof shall be judicially noticed and admitted in evidence.

85. There shall not be entered in any register kept under this Act, or be receivable by the comptroller, any notice of any trust expressed, implied or constructive.

86. The comptroller may refuse to grant a patent for an invention, or to register a design or trade mark, of which the use would, in his opinion, be contrary to law or morality.

87. Where a person becomes entitled by assignment, transmission, or other operation of law to a patent, or to the copyright in a registered design, or to a registered trade mark, the comptroller shall on request, and on proof of title to his satisfaction, cause the name of such person to be entered as proprietor of the patent, copyright in the design, or trade mark, in the register of patents, designs, or trade marks, as the case may be. The person for the time being entered in the register of patents, designs, or trade marks, as proprietor of a patent, copyright in a design, or trade mark as the case may be, shall, subject to the provisions of this Act and to [*Act of 1888, s. 21*] any rights appearing from such register to be vested in any other person, have power absolutely to assign, grant licences as to, or otherwise deal with, the same and to give effectual receipts for any consideration for such assignment, licence, or dealing. Provided that any equities in respect of such patent, design, or trade mark may be enforced in like manner as in respect of any other personal property.

88. Every register kept under this Act shall at all convenient times be open to the inspection of the public, subject to the provisions of this Act and to [*Act of 1888, s. 22*] such regulations as may be prescribed; and certified copies, sealed with the

seal of the Patent Office, of any entry in any such register shall be given to any person requiring the same on payment of the prescribed fee.

89. Printed or written copies or extracts, purporting to be certified by the comptroller and sealed with the seal of the Patent Office, of or from patents, specifications, disclaimers and other documents in the Patent Office, and of or from registers and other books kept there, shall be admitted in evidence in all Courts in Her Majesty's dominions, and in all proceedings, without further proof or production of the originals.

90. (1) The Court may on the application of any person aggrieved by the omission without sufficient cause of the name of any person or of any other particulars [*Act of 1888, s. 23*] from any register kept under this Act, or by any entry made without sufficient cause in any such register, make such order for making, expunging or varying the entry, as the Court thinks fit; or the Court may refuse the application; and in either case may make such order with respect to the costs of the proceedings as the Court thinks fit.

(2) The Court may in any proceeding under this section decide any question that it may be necessary or expedient to decide for the rectification of a register, and may direct an issue to be tried for the decision of any question of fact, and may award damages to the party aggrieved.

(3) Any order of the Court rectifying a register shall direct that due notice of the rectification be given to the comptroller.

91. The comptroller may, on request in writing accompanied by the prescribed fee—

(a) Correct any clerical error in or in connexion with an application for a patent, or for registration of a design or trade mark; or,

(b) Correct any clerical error in the name, style or address of the registered proprietor of a patent, design or trade mark. (a)

92. [*This section, and s.-s. (c) of s. 91, refer to trade marks.*]

93. If any person makes or causes to be made a false entry in any register kept under this Act, or a writing falsely purporting to be a copy of an entry in any such register, or produces or tenders or causes to be produced or tendered in evidence any such writing, knowing the entry or writing to be false, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanour.

94. Where any discretionary power is by this Act given to the comptroller, he shall not exercise that power adversely to the

applicant for a patent, or for amendment of a specification, or for registration of a trade mark or design, without (if so required within the prescribed time by the applicant) giving the applicant an opportunity of being heard personally or by his agent.

95. The comptroller may, in any case of doubt or difficulty arising in the administration of any of the provisions of this Act, apply to either of the law officers for directions in the matter.

96. A certificate purporting to be under the hand of the comptroller as to any entry, matter, or thing which he is authorized by this Act, or any general rules made thereunder, to make or do, shall be *prima facie* evidence of the entry having been made, and of the contents thereof, and of the matter or thing having been done or left undone.

97. (1) Any application, notice, or other document authorized or required to be left, made or given at the Patent Office or to the comptroller, or to any other person under this Act, may be sent by a prepaid letter through the post; and if so sent shall be deemed to have been left, made or given respectively at the time when the letter containing the same would be delivered in the ordinary course of post.

(2) In proving such service or sending, it shall be sufficient to prove that the letter was properly addressed and put into the post.

98. Whenever the last day fixed by this Act, or by any rule for the time being in force, for leaving any document or paying any fee at the Patent Office shall fall on Christmas Day, Good Friday, or on a Saturday or Sunday, or any day observed as a holiday at the Bank of England, or any day observed as a day of public fast or thanksgiving, herein referred to as excluded days, it shall be lawful to leave such document or to pay such fee on the day next following such excluded day, or days if two or more of them occur consecutively.

99. If any person is, by reason of infancy, lunacy or other inability, incapable of making any declaration or doing anything required or permitted by this Act or by any rules made under the authority of this Act, then the guardian or committee (if any) of such incapable person, or if there be none, any person appointed by any Court or judge possessing jurisdiction in respect of the property of incapable persons, upon the petition of any person on behalf of such incapable person, or of any other person interested in making such declaration or doing such thing, may make such declaration or a declaration as nearly corresponding thereto as

circumstances permit, and do such thing in the name and on behalf of such incapable person, and all acts done by such substitute shall for the purposes of this Act be as effectual as if done by the person for whom he is substituted.

100. Copies of all specifications, drawings, and amendments left at the Patent Office after the commencement of this Act, printed for and sealed with the seal of the Patent Office, shall be transmitted to the Edinburgh Museum of Science and Art, and to the Enrolments Office of the Chancery Division in Ireland, and to the Rolls Office in the Isle of Man, within twenty-one days after the same shall respectively have been accepted or allowed at the Patent Office; and certified copies of or extracts from any such documents shall be given to any person requiring the same on payment of the prescribed fee; and any such copy or extract shall be admitted in evidence in all Courts in Scotland and Ireland and in the Isle of Man without further proof or production of the originals.

101. (1) The Board of Trade may from time to time make such general rules and do such things as they think expedient, subject to the provisions of this Act—

- (a) For regulating the practice of registration under this Act;
- (b) For classifying goods for the purposes of designs and trade marks;
- (c) For making or requiring duplicates of specifications, amendments, drawings, and other documents;
- (d) For securing and regulating the publishing and selling of copies, at such prices and in such manner as the Board of Trade think fit, of specifications, drawings, amendments, and other documents;
- (e) For securing and regulating the making, printing, publishing and selling of indexes to, and abridgments of, specifications and other documents in the Patent Office, and providing for the inspection of indexes and abridgments and other documents;
- (f) For regulating (with the approval of the Treasury) the presentation of copies of Patent Office publications to patentees and to public authorities, bodies, and institutions at home and abroad;
- (g) Generally for regulating the business of the Patent Office and all things by this Act placed under the direction or control of the comptroller, or of the Board of Trade.

(2) Any of the forms in the first schedule to this Act may be altered or amended by rules made by the Board as aforesaid.

(3) General rules may be made under this section at any time after the passing of this Act, but not so as to take effect before the commencement of this Act, and shall (subject as hereinafter mentioned) be of the same effect as if they were contained in this Act, and shall be judicially noticed.

(4) Any rules made in pursuance of this section shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament, if Parliament be in session at the time of making thereof, or, if not, then as soon as practicable after the beginning of the then next session of Parliament, and they shall also be advertised twice in the official journal to be issued by the comptroller.

(5) If either House of Parliament, within the next forty days after any rules have been so laid before such House, resolve that such rules or any of them ought to be annulled, the same shall after the date of such resolution be of no effect, without prejudice to the validity of anything done in the meantime under such rules or rule, or to the making of any new rules or rule.

102. The comptroller shall, before the first day of June in every year, cause a report respecting the execution by or under him of this Act to be laid before both Houses of Parliament, and therein shall include for the year to which each report relates all general rules made in that year under or for the purposes of this Act, and an account of all fees, salaries, and allowances, and other money received and paid under this Act.

102a. (1) All things required or authorized under this Act to be done by, to, or before the Board of Trade, may be done by, to, or before the President or a secretary or an assistant secretary of the Board.

(2) All documents purporting to be orders made by the Board of Trade and to be sealed with the seal of the Board, or to be signed by a secretary or assistant secretary of the Board, or by any person authorized in that behalf by the President of the Board, shall be received in evidence, and shall be deemed to be such orders without further proof, unless the contrary is shown.

(3) A certificate, signed by the President of the Board of Trade, that any order made or act done is the order or act of the Board, shall be conclusive evidence of the fact so certified. [*Act of 1888, s. 25.*]

International and Colonial Arrangements.

103. (1) If Her Majesty is pleased to make any arrangement with the government or governments of any foreign state or states for mutual protection of inventions, designs, and trade marks, or any of them, then any person who has applied for

protection for any invention, design, or trade mark in any such state, shall be entitled to a patent for his invention or to registration of his design or trade mark (as the case may be) under this Act, in priority to other applicants; and such patent or registration shall have the same date as the date of the application [*Act of 1885, s. 6*] in such foreign state.

Provided that his application is made, in the case of a patent within twelve [*Act of 1901, s. 1 (1)*] months, and in the case of a design or trade mark within four months, from his applying for protection in the foreign state with which the arrangement is in force.

Provided that nothing in this section contained shall entitle the patentee or proprietor of the design or trade mark to recover damages for infringements happening prior to the date of the actual acceptance of his complete specification, or the actual registration of his design or trade mark in this country, as the case may be.

An application under this section shall be accompanied by a complete specification, which, if it be not accepted within the period of twelve months, shall, with the drawings (if any), be open to public inspection at the expiration of that period [*s. 1 (2) of the Act of 1901*].

(2) The publication in the United Kingdom, or the Isle of Man, during the respective periods aforesaid of any description of the invention, or the use therein during such periods of the invention, or the exhibition or use therein during such periods of the design, or the publication therein during such periods of a description or representation of the design, or the use therein during such periods of the trade mark, shall not invalidate the patent which may be granted for the invention, or the registration of the design or trade mark :

(3) The application for the grant of a patent, or the registration of a design, or the registration of a trade mark under this section, must be made in the same manner as an ordinary application under this Act : Provided that, in the case of trade marks, any trade mark the registration of which has been duly applied for in the country of origin may be registered under this Act :

(4) The provisions of this section shall apply only in the case of those foreign states with respect to which Her Majesty shall from time to time by Order in Council declare them to be applicable, and so long only in the case of each state as the Order in Council shall continue in force with respect to that state.

104. (1) Where it is made to appear to Her Majesty that the

legislature of any British possession has made satisfactory provision for the protection of inventions, designs, and trade marks, patented or registered in this country, it shall be lawful for Her Majesty from time to time, by Order in Council, to apply the provisions of the last preceding section, with such variations or additions, if any, as to Her Majesty in Council may seem fit, to such British possession.

(2) An Order in Council under this Act shall, from a date to be mentioned for the purpose in the Order, take effect as if its provisions had been contained in this Act; but it shall be lawful for Her Majesty in Council to revoke any Order in Council made under this Act.

Offences.

105. (1) Any person who represents that any article sold by him is a patented article, when no patent has been granted for the same, or describes any design or trade mark applied to any article sold by him as registered which is not so, shall be liable for every offence on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding five pounds.

(2) A person shall be deemed, for the purposes of this enactment, to represent that an article is patented or a design or a trade mark is registered, if he sells the article with the word "patent," "patented," "registered," or any word or words expressing or implying that a patent or registration has been obtained for the article stamped, engraved, or impressed on, or otherwise applied to, the article.

106. Any person who, without the authority of Her Majesty, or any of the Royal family, or of any government department, assumes or uses in connexion with any trade, business, calling, or profession, the Royal arms, or arms so nearly resembling the same as to be calculated to deceive, in such a manner as to be calculated to lead other persons to believe that he is carrying on his trade, business, calling, or profession by or under such authority as aforesaid, shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding twenty pounds.

Scotland ; Ireland ; etc.

107. In any action for infringement of a patent in Scotland the provisions of this Act, with respect to calling in the aid of an assessor, shall apply, and the action shall be tried without a jury, unless the Court shall otherwise direct, but otherwise nothing shall affect the jurisdiction and forms of process of the Courts in

Scotland in such an action or in any action or proceeding respecting a patent hitherto competent to those Courts.

For the purposes of this section "Court of Appeal" shall mean any Court to which such action is appealed.

108. In Scotland any offence under this Act declared to be punishable on summary conviction may be prosecuted in the Sheriff Court.

109. (1) Proceedings in Scotland for revocation of a patent shall be in the form of an action of reduction at the instance of the Lord Advocate, or at the instance of a party having interest with his concurrence, which concurrence may be given on just cause shown only.

(2) Service of all writs and summonses in that action shall be made according to the forms and practice existing at the commencement of this Act.

110. All parties shall, notwithstanding anything in this Act, have in Ireland their remedies under or in respect of a patent as if the same had been granted to extend to Ireland only.

111. (1) The provisions of this Act conferring a special jurisdiction on the Court as defined by this Act, shall not, except so far as the jurisdiction extends, affect the jurisdiction of any Court in Scotland or Ireland in any proceedings relating to patents or to designs or to trade marks; and with reference to any such proceedings in Scotland, the term "the Court" shall mean any Lord Ordinary of the Court of Session, and the term "Court of Appeal" shall mean either division of the said Court; and with reference to any such proceedings in Ireland, the terms "the Court" and the "Court of Appeal" respectively mean the High Court of Justice in Ireland and Her Majesty's Court of Appeal in Ireland.

(2) If any rectification of a register under this Act is required in pursuance of any proceeding in a Court in Scotland or Ireland, a copy of the order, decree, or other authority for the rectification, shall be served on the comptroller, and he shall rectify the register accordingly.

112. This Act shall extend to the Isle of Man, and—

(1) Nothing in this Act shall affect the jurisdiction of the Courts in the Isle of Man, in proceedings for infringement or in any action or proceeding respecting a patent, design, or trade mark competent to those Courts;

(2) The punishment for a misdemeanour under this Act in the Isle of Man shall be imprisonment for any term not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour, and with or

without a fine not exceeding one hundred pounds, at the discretion of the Court ;

(3) Any offence under this Act committed in the Isle of Man which would in England be punishable on summary conviction may be prosecuted, and any fine in respect thereof recovered at the instance of any person aggrieved, in the manner in which offences punishable on summary conviction may for the time being be prosecuted.

Repeal ; Transitional Provisions ; Savings.

113. The enactments described in the Third Schedule to this Act are hereby repealed. But this repeal of enactments shall not—

- (a) Affect the past operation of any of those enactments, or any patent or copyright or right to use a trade mark granted or acquired, or application pending, or appointment made, or compensation granted, or order or direction made or given, or right, privilege, obligation, or liability acquired, accrued, or incurred, or anything duly done or suffered under or by any of those enactments before or at the commencement of this Act ; or
- (b) Interfere with the institution or prosecution of any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, in respect thereof, and any such proceeding may be carried on as if this Act had not been passed ; or
- (c) Take away or abridge any protection or benefit in relation to any such action or proceeding.

114. (1) The registers of patents and of proprietors kept under any enactment repealed by this Act shall respectively be deemed parts of the same book as the register of patents kept under this Act.

(2) The registers of designs and of trade marks kept under any enactment repealed by this Act shall respectively be deemed parts of the same book as the register of designs and the register of trade marks kept under this Act.

115. All general rules made by the Lord Chancellor or by any other authority under any enactment repealed by this Act, and in force at the commencement of this Act, may at any time after the passing of this Act be repealed, altered, or amended by the Board of Trade, as if they had been made by the Board under this Act, but so that no such repeal, alteration or amendment shall take effect before the commencement of this Act ;

and, subject as aforesaid, such general rules shall, so far as they are consistent with and are not superseded by this Act, continue in force as if they had been made by the Board of Trade under this Act.

116. Nothing in this Act shall take away, abridge, or prejudicially affect the prerogative of the Crown in relation to the granting of any letters patent or to the withholding of a grant thereof.

General Definitions.

117. In and for the purposes of this Act, unless the context otherwise requires—

“Person” includes a body corporate:

“The Court” means (subject to the provisions for Scotland, Ireland, and the Isle of Man) Her Majesty’s High Court of Justice in England:

“Law officer” means Her Majesty’s Attorney-General or Solicitor-General for England:

“The Treasury” means the Commissioners of Her Majesty’s Treasury:

“Comptroller” means the Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks:

“Prescribed” means prescribed by any of the Schedules to this Act, or by general rules under or within the meaning of this Act:

“British possession” means any territory or place situate within Her Majesty’s dominions, and not being or forming part of the United Kingdom, or of the Channel Islands, or of the Isle of Man, and all territories and places under one legislature, as hereinafter defined, are deemed to be one British possession for the purposes of this Act:

“Legislature” includes any person or persons who exercise legislative authority in the British possession; and where there are local legislatures as well as a central legislature, means the central legislature only.

In the application of this Act to Ireland, “summary conviction” means a conviction under the Summary Jurisdiction Acts, that is to say, with reference to the Dublin Metropolitan Police District the Acts regulating the duties of justices of the peace and of the police for such district, and elsewhere in Ireland the Petty Sessions (Ireland) Act, 1851, and any Act amending it.

SCHEDULES.

THE FIRST SCHEDULE.

FORMS OF APPLICATION, ETC.

- Form A. Form of Application for Patent [see p. 292, *infra*].
Form B. Form of Provisional Specification [see p. 294, *infra*].
Form C. Form of Complete Specification [see p. 294, *infra*].
Form D. Form of Patent.

THE SECOND SCHEDULE.

[Scale of Fees; but see now the Fees prescribed by the Board of Trade, p. 239, supra.]

THE THIRD SCHEDULE.

[Enactments Repealed.]

**PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE MARKS (AMENDMENT)
ACT, 1885.**

48 & 49 VICT. c. 63.

*An Act to amend the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act,
1883.*

BE IT ENACTED, etc.:

1. This Act shall be construed as one with the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883 (in this Act referred to as the principal Act).

This Act may be cited as the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks (Amendment) Act, 1885, and this Act and the principal Act may be cited together as the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Acts, 1883 and 1885.

2. Whereas sub-section two of section five of the principal Act requires a declaration to be made by an applicant for a patent to the effect in that sub-section mentioned, and doubts have arisen as to the nature of that declaration, and it is expedient to remove such doubts: Be it therefore enacted that:

The declaration mentioned in sub-section two of section five of the principal Act may be either a statutory declaration under the Statutory Declarations Act, 1835, or not, as may be from time to time prescribed.

3. Whereas under the principal Act, a complete specification is required (by section eight) to be left within nine months, and (by section nine) to be accepted within twelve months, from the date of application, and a patent is required by section twelve to be sealed within fifteen months from the date of application, and it is expedient to empower the comptroller to extend in certain cases the said times: Be it therefore enacted as follows:

A complete specification may be left and accepted within such extended times, not exceeding one month and three months respectively after the said nine and twelve months respectively as the comptroller may on payment of the prescribed fee allow, and where such extension of time has been allowed, a further extension of four months after the said fifteen months shall be

allowed for the sealing of the patent ; and the principal Act shall have effect as if any time so allowed were added to the said periods specified in the principal Act.

4. Where an application for a patent has been abandoned, or become void, the specification or specifications and drawings (if any) accompanying or left in connexion with such application, shall not at any time be open to public inspection or be published by the comptroller.

5. Whereas doubts have arisen whether under the principal Act a patent may lawfully be granted to several persons jointly, some or one of whom only are or is the true and first inventors or inventor ; be it therefore enacted and declared that it has been and is lawful under the principal Act to grant such a patent.

6. In sub-section one of section one hundred and three of the principal Act, the words "date of the application" shall be substituted for the words "date of the protection obtained."

PATENTS ACT, 1886.

49 & 50 VICT. c. 37.

An Act to remove certain doubts respecting the construction of the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883, so far as respects the drawings by which specifications are required to be accompanied, and as respects exhibitions.

WHEREAS by section five of the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883, specifications, whether provisional or complete, must be accompanied by drawings if required, and doubts have arisen as to whether it is sufficient that a complete specification refers to the drawings by which the provisional specification was accompanied, and it is expedient to remove such doubts:

BE IT THEREFORE ENACTED, etc.:

1. This Act may be cited as the Patents Act, 1886, and shall be construed as one with the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Acts, 1883 and 1885, and, together with those Acts, may be cited as the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Acts, 1883 to 1886.

2. The requirement of sub-section four of section five of the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883, as to drawings shall not be deemed to be insufficiently complied with by reason only that instead of being accompanied by drawings the complete specification refers to the drawings which accompanied the provisional specification. And no patent heretofore sealed shall be invalid by reason only that the complete specification was not accompanied by drawings but referred to those which accompanied the provisional specification.

3. Whereas by section thirty-nine of the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883, as respects patents, and by section fifty-seven of the same Act as respects designs, provision is made that the exhibition of an invention or design at an industrial or international exhibition, certified as such by the Board of Trade, shall not prejudice the rights of the inventor or proprietor thereof, subject to the conditions therein mentioned, one of which is that the exhibitor must, before exhibiting the

invention, design, or article, or publishing a description of the design, give the comptroller the prescribed notice of his intention to do so:

And whereas it is expedient to provide for the extension of the said sections to industrial and international exhibitions held out of the United Kingdom, be it therefore enacted as follows:—

It shall be lawful for Her Majesty, by Order in Council, from time to time to declare that sections thirty-nine and fifty-seven of the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883, or either of those sections, shall apply to any exhibition mentioned in the Order in like manner as if it were an industrial or international exhibition certified by the Board of Trade, and to provide that the exhibitor shall be relieved from the conditions, specified in the said sections, of giving notice to the comptroller of his intention to exhibit, and shall be so relieved either absolutely or upon such terms and conditions as to Her Majesty in Council may seem fit.

PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE MARKS ACT, 1888.

51 & 52 Vict. c. 50.

An Act to amend the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883.

WHEREAS it is expedient to amend the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883, hereinafter referred to as the principal Act:

BE IT THEREFORE ENACTED, etc.—

1. (1) After the first day of July one thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine a person shall not be entitled to describe himself as a patent agent, whether by advertisement, by description on his place of business, by any document issued by him, or otherwise, unless he is registered as a patent agent in pursuance of this Act.

(2) The Board of Trade shall, as soon as may be after the passing of this Act, and may from time to time, make such general rules as are in the opinion of the Board required for giving effect to this section, and the provisions of section one hundred and one of the principal Act shall apply to all rules so made as if they were made in pursuance of that section.

(3) Provided that every person who proves to the satisfaction of the Board of Trade that prior to the passing of this Act he had been bonâ fide practising as a patent agent shall be entitled to be registered as a patent agent in pursuance of this Act.

(4) If any person knowingly describes himself as a patent agent in contravention of this section he shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding twenty pounds.

(5) In this section “patent agent” means exclusively an agent for obtaining patents in the United Kingdom.

2. For section seven of the principal Act the following section shall be substituted, namely—[*The section is set out on pp. 242, 243, supra.*]

3. In sub-section five of section nine of the principal Act the words “other than an appeal to the law officer under this Act” shall be omitted.

4. In sub-section one of section eleven of the principal Act the words from "or on the ground of an examiner" to "a previous application," both inclusive, shall be omitted, and there shall be added in lieu thereof the following words, namely, "or on the ground that the complete specification describes or claims an invention other than that described in the provisional specification, and that such other invention forms the subject of an application made by the opponent in the interval between the leaving of the provisional specification and the leaving of the complete specification."

5. For sub-section ten of section eighteen of the principal Act the following sub-section shall be substituted, namely:—

"(10) The foregoing provisions of this section do not apply when and so long as any action for infringement or proceeding for revocation of a patent is pending."

6—20. [*These sections relate to designs and trade marks.*]

21. In section eighty-seven of the principal Act, after the words "subject to," shall be added the words "the provisions of this Act and to."

22. In section eighty-eight of the principal Act, after the words "subject to," shall be added the words "the provisions of this Act and to."

23. In section ninety of the principal Act, after the words "of the name of any person," shall be added the words "or of any other particulars."

24. To section ninety-one of the principal Act the following sub-section shall be added; namely—

"(d) Permit an applicant for registration of a design or trade mark to amend his application by omitting any particular goods or classes of goods in connexion with which he has desired the design or trade mark to be registered."

25. After section one hundred and two of the principal Act the following section shall be added and numbered 102A; namely—

"(1) All things required or authorized under this Act to be done by, to, or before the Board of Trade, may be done by, to, or before the President or a secretary or an assistant secretary of the Board.

"(2) All documents purporting to be orders made by the Board of Trade and to be sealed with the seal of the Board, or to be signed by a secretary or assistant secretary of the Board, or by any person authorized in that

behalf by the President of the Board, shall be received in evidence, and shall be deemed to be such orders without further proof, unless the contrary is shown.

“(3) A certificate, signed by the President of the Board of Trade, that any order made or act done is the order or act of the Board, shall be conclusive evidence of the fact so certified.”

26. After section one hundred and twelve of the principal Act the following section shall be added and numbered 112A; namely—

“The Court of Chancery of the County Palatine of Lancaster shall, with respect to any action or other proceeding in relation to trade marks the registration whereof is applied for in the Manchester Office, have the like jurisdiction under this Act as her Majesty’s High Court of Justice in England, and the expression ‘the Court’ in this Act shall be construed and have effect accordingly.

“Provided that every decision of the Court of Chancery of the County Palatine of Lancaster in pursuance of this section shall be subject to the like appeal as decisions of that Court in other cases.”

27. The principal Act shall, as from the commencement of this Act, take effect subject to the additions, omissions, and substitutions required by this Act, but nothing in this Act shall affect the validity of any act done, right acquired, or liability incurred before the commencement of this Act.

28. This Act shall, except so far as is by this Act otherwise specially provided, commence and come into operation on the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine.

29. This Act may be cited as the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1888, and this Act and the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Acts, 1883 to 1886, may be cited collectively as the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Acts, 1883 to 1888.

PATENTS ACT, 1901.

1 ED. VII. c. 18.

An Act to amend the law with reference to International Arrangements for Patents.

BE IT ENACTED, etc.:

1. (1) In the first proviso to sub-section one of section 103 of the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883 (which section relates to the time for making applications for protection under international arrangements), the words "twelve months" shall be substituted for the words "seven months."

(2) An application under that section shall be accompanied by a complete specification, which, if it be not accepted within the period of twelve months, shall, with the drawings (if any), be open to public inspection at the expiration of that period.

2. (1) This Act may be cited as the Patents Act, 1901, and may be cited and shall be construed as one with the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Acts, 1883 to 1888.

(2) This Act shall come into operation on the first day of January, 1902.

PATENTS ACT, 1902.

2 EDW. VII. c. 34.

An Act to amend the law with reference to Applications for patents and compulsory licences, and other matters connected therewith.

BE IT ENACTED, etc.

1. (1) Where an application for a patent has been made and a complete specification has been deposited by the applicant, the examiner shall forthwith, in addition to the inquiries which he is directed to make by the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883 (in this Act referred to as "the principal Act"), make a further investigation for the purpose of ascertaining whether the invention claimed has been wholly or in part claimed or described in any specification (other than a provisional specification not followed by a complete specification) published before the date of the application, and deposited pursuant to any application for a patent made in the United Kingdom within fifty years next before the date of the application.

S. 1 of the Act is only to come into operation at such date as the Board of Trade may by order direct (see sub-s. 11). At the present time, no search is made as to novelty (see p. 34, *supra*).

(2) If on investigation it appears that the invention has been wholly or in part claimed or described in any such specification, the applicant shall be informed thereof, and the applicant may, within such time as may be prescribed, amend his specification, and the amended specification shall be investigated in like manner as the original specification.

As to amendments generally, see p. 79, *supra*.

(3) The examiner shall report to the Comptroller the result of his investigations in such manner as the Board of Trade may direct.

(4) The provisions of sub-section 5 of section 9 of the principal

Act, as amended by any subsequent enactment, shall apply to reports under this section.

Sub-s. 5 provides that reports of examiners shall not be published unless the Court certifies that their production or inspection is desirable in the interests of justice (see p. 244, *supra*).

(5) If the Comptroller is satisfied that no objection exists to the specification on the ground that the invention claimed thereby has been wholly or in part claimed or described in a previous specification as before mentioned, he shall, in the absence of any other lawful ground of objection, accept the specification.

“PREVIOUS SPECIFICATION AS BEFORE MENTIONED.”—This means any specification (other than a provisional not followed by a complete) published before the date of the application, and deposited pursuant to any application for a patent made in the United Kingdom within fifty years next before the date of the application.

“ANY OTHER LAWFUL GROUND.”—As to the other grounds upon which the Comptroller may refuse to accept a specification, see pp. 32, 33, *supra*.

(6) If the Comptroller is not so satisfied, he shall, after hearing the applicant, and unless the objection be removed by amending the specification to the satisfaction of the Comptroller, determine whether a reference to any, and, if so, what, prior specifications ought to be made in the specification by way of notice to the public.

(7) An appeal shall lie from the decision of the Comptroller under this section to the Law Officer.

As to the procedure on appeals to the Law Officer, see p. 224, *supra*.

(8) Section 8 of the principal Act and section 3 of the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks (Amendment) Act, 1885 (which regulate the time for depositing a complete specification), shall have effect as if references therein to the period of nine months were references to the period of six months.

S. 8 of the principal Act provides that a complete specification may be left at any time within nine months from the date of the application (see p. 243, *supra*). S. 3 of the Act of 1885 provides for extension of time for leaving and accepting the specification (see p. 267, *supra*). When s. 1 of the Act of 1902 comes into operation, the period of provisional protection will be reduced to six months.

(9) The investigations and reports required by this section shall not be held in any way to guarantee the validity of any patent, and no liability shall be incurred by the Board of Trade

The Board of Trade, in pursuance of sect. 1 (11) of the Patents Act, 1902, have fixed the 1st January, 1905, as the date for the coming into operation of sect. 1 of that Act. The note to sub-sect. 11 on p. 277 must, therefore, be read accordingly.

The Patents Rules, 1905, have been added to the work, and will be found after p. 306. They govern the procedure under sect. 1 of the Act of 1902, and substitute new rules for Rules 9, 17, and 18 to 24 of the Patents Rules, 1903. The new rules do not, however, come into operation until the 1st January, 1905.

or any officer thereof by reason of, or in connection with, any such investigation or report, or any proceeding consequent thereon.

Notwithstanding the investigation by the Examiner, a patent will still be bad by reason of publication of the invention in a prior specification (except a specification deposited pursuant to an application made in the United Kingdom not less than fifty years before the date of the application; see s. 2), or by reason of any other prior publication (see p. 8, *supra*) or of prior user (see p. 14, *supra*).

(10) The Board of Trade, with the sanction of the Treasury, may prescribe an additional fee not exceeding one pound in respect of the investigation mentioned in this section, which shall be payable on the sealing of the patent.

(11) This section shall come into operation at such date as the Board of Trade may by order direct, and shall apply only to applications made after that date, and the order shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

No order has yet been made. It is probable, however, that the Patent Office will be in a position to undertake the great amount of extra work involved, and that the order will be made some time during next year.

2. An invention covered by any patent granted on an application to which section one of this Act applies shall not be deemed to have been anticipated by reason only of its publication in a specification deposited pursuant to an application made in the United Kingdom not less than fifty years before the date of the application for a patent therefor, or of its publication in a provisional specification of any date not followed by a complete specification.

3. Section 22 of the principal Act (relating to the grant of compulsory licences by the Board of Trade) is hereby repealed, and the following provisions shall be substituted therefor:—

(1) Any person interested may present a petition to the Board of Trade alleging that the reasonable requirements of the public with respect to a patented invention have not been satisfied, and praying for the grant of a compulsory licence, or, in the alternative, for the revocation of the patent.

Under s. 22 the grounds were that: (1) The patent was not being worked in the United Kingdom; (2) the reasonable requirements of the public with respect to the invention could not be supplied; (3) some person was prevented from working or using to the best advantage an invention of which he was possessed. And the jurisdiction to order the grant of licences was vested in the Board of Trade. It is conceived that the decisions under that section will be of little or no value in proceedings under the new Act, and they are not, therefore, referred to in the text (see p. 102, *supra*).

For the Rules of the Board of Trade and of the Judicial Committee under this section, see pp. 103–107, *supra*; for Form of Petition, see p. 296, *infra*.

Revocation can only be prayed for *in the alternative*; if revocation solely is desired, proceedings must be taken in the High Court in the ordinary way. And a licence will not be ordered if the reasonable requirements of the public will not be satisfied by the grant of a licence.

(2) The Board of Trade shall consider the petition, and if the parties do not come to an arrangement between themselves, the Board of Trade, if satisfied that a *prima facie* case has been made out, shall refer the petition to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and, if the Board are not so satisfied, they may dismiss the petition.

See the rules made hereunder by the Board of Trade, p. 103, *supra*.

(3) Where any such petition is referred by the Board of Trade to the Judicial Committee, and it is proved to the satisfaction of the Judicial Committee that the reasonable requirements of the public with reference to the patented invention have not been satisfied, the patentee may be ordered by an Order in Council to grant licences on such terms as the said Committee may think just, or, if the Judicial Committee are of opinion that the reasonable requirements of the public will not be satisfied by the grant of licences, the patent may be revoked by Order in Council.

Provided that no order of revocation shall be made before the expiration of three years from the date of the patent, or if the patentee gives satisfactory reasons for his default.

(4) On the hearing of any petition under this section, the patentee and any person claiming an interest in the patent as exclusive licensee or otherwise, shall be made parties to the proceeding, and the Law Officer, or such other counsel as he may appoint, shall be entitled to appear and be heard.

(5) If it is proved to the satisfaction of the Judicial Committee that the patent is worked, or that the patented article is manufactured, exclusively or mainly outside the United Kingdom, then, unless the patentee can show that the reasonable requirements of the public have been satisfied, the petitioner shall be entitled either to an order for a compulsory licence or, subject to the above proviso, to an order for the revocation of the patent.

(6) For the purposes of this section the reasonable requirements of the public shall not be deemed to have been satisfied, if by reason of the default of the patentee to work his patent, or to manufacture the patented article in the United Kingdom to an adequate extent, or to grant licences on reasonable terms, (a) any

existing industry or the establishment of any new industry is unfairly prejudiced, or (b) the demand for the patented article is not reasonably met.

(7) An Order in Council directing the grant of any licence under this section shall, without prejudice to any other method of enforcement, operate as if it were embodied in a deed granting a licence and made between the parties to the proceeding.

(8) His Majesty in Council may make rules of procedure and practice for regulating proceedings before the Judicial Committee under this section, and, subject thereto, such proceedings shall be regulated according to the existing procedure and practice in patent matters. Any Order in Council, or any order made by the Judicial Committee under this Act, may be enforced by the High Court as if it were an order of the High Court.

For the Rules made hereunder, see p. 104, *supra*.

(9) The costs of and incidental to all proceedings under this section shall be in the discretion of the Judicial Committee, but, in awarding costs on any application for the grant of a licence, the Judicial Committee may have regard to any previous request for, or offer of, a licence made either before or after the application to the Committee.

(10) For the purposes of this section, three members of the Judicial Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(11) This section shall apply to patents granted before, as well as after, the commencement of this Act.

4. In sub-section 4 of section 82 of the principal Act (which relates to the performance of the duties of the Comptroller by other officers under the direction of the Board of Trade) the words "in his absence" shall be repealed.

5. This Act may be cited as the Patents Act, 1902, and may be cited, and shall be construed, as one with the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Acts, 1883 to 1901.

PATENTS RULES, 1903.

By virtue of the provisions of the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883 to 1902, the Board of Trade do hereby make the following Rules:—

SHORT TITLE.

1. These Rules may be cited as the Patents Rules, 1903.

COMMENCEMENT.

2. These Rules shall come into operation from and immediately after the 12th day of January, 1903.

INTERPRETATION.

3. In the construction of these Rules—

“United Kingdom” includes the Isle of Man;

“Foreign Application” means an application by any person for protection of his invention in a foreign State or British Possession to which any Order in Council for the time being in force the provision of section 103 of the Act of 1883 as amended by any subsequent Act have been declared applicable;

“Convention Application” means an application in the United Kingdom under the provisions of section 103 of the Act of 1883 as amended by any subsequent Act.

Save as aforesaid any words herein used defined by the said Acts shall have the meanings thereby assigned to them respectively.

FEES.

4. The fees to be paid under the said Acts shall be those specified in the list of fees in the First Schedule to these Rules (see p. 239, *supra*).

FORMS.

5. The Forms contained in the Second Schedule to these Rules (see pp. 292–302, *infra*) may, as far as they are applicable, be used in any proceedings under the said Acts or under these Rules and so far as they relate to the same subject-matter shall be substituted for the forms in the First Schedule to the Act of 1883.

APPLICATIONS FOR PATENTS.

6. In the case of an application for a patent by the legal representative of a person who has died possessed of an invention (see p. 30), the probate of his will, or the letters of administration granted of his estate and effects, or an official copy of such probate or letters, shall be produced at the Patent Office in proof of the applicant's title as such legal representative and must be supported by such further evidence as the Comptroller may require.

7. Every application for a patent shall be accompanied by a statement of an address (hereinafter referred to as "the address for service") to which all notices, requisitions, and communications of every kind may be sent by the Comptroller or by the Board of Trade, and such statement shall thereafter be binding upon the applicant until a substituted address for service shall be furnished by him to the Comptroller. The Comptroller may in any particular case require that the address for service be in the United Kingdom.

8. Applications for patents sent through the post shall, as far as may be practicable, be opened and numbered in the order in which the letters containing the same have been respectively delivered in the ordinary course of post.

Applications left at the Patent Office otherwise than through the post shall be in like manner numbered in the order of their receipt at the Patent Office.

9. Where a person making application for a patent includes in his specification by mistake, inadvertence, or otherwise, more than one invention (see p. 32), he may, with the consent of the Comptroller, at any time before the date allowed for the acceptance of his complete specification, amend the same so as to apply to one invention only, and may make application for a separate patent for each such invention accordingly. Every such application shall, if the applicant notify his desire to that effect to the Comptroller, bear the date of the first application and shall, together therewith, be proceeded with in the manner prescribed by the said Acts and by these Rules, as if every such application had been originally made on that date.

10. An application for extension of time for leaving or accepting a complete specification shall be made on Form U. (see p. 301) or on Form V. (see p. 302), as the case may require, and shall state in detail in what circumstances and upon what grounds such extension is applied for, and the Comptroller may require the

applicant to substantiate such allegations by such proof as the Comptroller may think necessary.

11. On the acceptance of a provisional or complete specification the Comptroller shall give notice thereof to the applicant, and shall advertise the acceptance of every complete specification in the official journal of the Patent Office.

12. Upon such acceptance in the case of a complete specification, the application and specification or specifications with the drawings (if any) may be inspected at the Patent Office upon payment of the prescribed fee.

APPLICATIONS UNDER THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION.

13. Every Convention application (see p. 226) shall contain a declaration that foreign application has been made for protection of the invention to which such Convention application relates, and shall specify all the foreign States or British Possessions in which such foreign applications have been made, and the official date or dates thereof respectively. The application must be made within twelve months from the date of the first foreign application, and must be accompanied by a complete specification, and signed by the person or persons by whom such first foreign application was made. If such person, or any of such persons be dead, the application must be signed by the legal representative of such dead person, as well as by the other applicants, if any.

14. Every Convention application, in addition to the specification left therewith, must be accompanied by a copy or copies of the specification, and drawings or documents filed or deposited by the applicant in the Patent Office of the foreign State or British Possession in respect of the first foreign application, duly certified by the official chief or head of the Patent Office of such foreign State or British Possession as aforesaid, or otherwise verified to the satisfaction of the Comptroller. If any specification or other document relating to the application is in a foreign language, a translation thereof shall be annexed thereto and verified by statutory declaration or otherwise to the satisfaction of the Comptroller.

15. If the complete specification left with the application be not accepted within twelve months from the date of the first foreign application, it shall, with the drawings, if any, be open to public inspection at the expiration of that period.

16. Save as aforesaid and as provided by Rule 52 all proceedings in connection with a Convention application shall be taken

within the times and in the manner prescribed by the said Acts or these Rules for ordinary applications.

SIZE, ETC., OF DOCUMENTS.

17. All documents and copies of documents, except drawings, sent to or left at the Patent Office or otherwise furnished to the Comptroller or to the Board of Trade shall be written or printed in the English language (unless otherwise directed) in large and legible characters upon strong paper and, except in the case of statutory declarations and affidavits, on one side only, of a size of 13 inches by 8 inches, leaving a margin of two inches on the left-hand part thereof, and the signatures thereto must be written in a large and legible hand. Duplicate documents shall at any time be left, if required by the Comptroller.

DRAWINGS ACCOMPANYING SPECIFICATIONS.

[*Rules 18-24 are set out in full on pp. 65, 66, supra.*]

25, 26, 27. [*These rules have been omitted in error, and are printed at the end of the work (see p. 306, infra).*]

EXERCISE OF DISCRETIONARY POWERS BY THE COMPTROLLER.

28. Before exercising any discretionary power given to the Comptroller by the said Acts or these Rules adversely to the applicant for a patent or for amendment of a specification, the Comptroller shall give ten days' notice, or such longer notice as he may think fit, to the applicant of the time when he may be heard personally or by his agent before the Comptroller.

29. Within five days from the date when such notice would be delivered in the ordinary course of post, or such longer time as the Comptroller may appoint in such notice, the applicant shall notify in writing to the Comptroller whether or not he intends to be heard upon the matter.

30. Whether the applicant desires to be heard or not, the Comptroller may at any time require him to submit a statement in writing within a time to be notified by the Comptroller, or to attend before him and make oral explanations with respect to such matters as the Comptroller may require.

31. The decision or determination of the Comptroller in the exercise of any such discretionary power as aforesaid shall be notified by him to the applicant, and to any other person who appears to him to be affected thereby.

OPPOSITION TO GRANTS OF PATENTS (see p. 40).

32. A notice of opposition to the grant of a patent shall be on Form D., and shall state the ground or grounds on which the person giving such notice (hereinafter called the opponent) intends to oppose the grant, and must be signed by him. Such notice shall state his address for service in the United Kingdom, and shall be accompanied by an unstamped copy, which copy shall be transmitted by the Comptroller to the applicant.

33. Where the ground of an opposition is that the applicant has obtained the invention from the opponent, or from a person of whom such opponent is the legal representative, unless evidence in support of such allegation be left at the Patent Office within fourteen days after the expiration of two months from the date of the advertisement of the acceptance of the applicant's complete specification, the opposition shall be deemed to be abandoned.

34. Where the ground of an opposition is that the applicant has obtained the invention from the opponent, or from a person of whom such opponent is the legal representative, the Comptroller may request or allow any person who has made a statutory declaration in the matter to which the opposition relates to attend before him at the hearing of the case and make oral explanations with respect to such matters as the Comptroller may require.

35. Where the ground or one of the grounds of opposition is that the invention has been patented in this country on an application of prior date, the number and date of such prior application shall be specified in the notice.

36. Except in the case provided for in Rule 33, statutory declarations need not be left in connection with an opposition, but the opponent may within fourteen days after the expiration of two months from the date of the advertisement of the acceptance of the applicant's complete specification, leave at the Patent Office statutory declarations in support of his opposition, and on so leaving shall deliver to the applicant copies thereof.

37. Within fourteen days from the delivery of such copies, the applicant may leave at the Patent Office statutory declarations in answer, and on so leaving shall deliver to the opponent copies thereof, and within fourteen days from such delivery the opponent may leave at the Patent Office his statutory declarations in reply, and on so leaving shall deliver to the applicant copies thereof. Such last-mentioned declarations shall be confined to matters strictly in reply.

38. If the opponent does not leave statutory declarations in support of his opposition, the applicant may (if he desires so to do) within three months from the date of the advertisement of the acceptance of his complete specification, leave at the Patent Office statutory declarations in support of his application, and on so leaving shall deliver to the opponent copies thereof.

39. Within fourteen days from the delivery of such copies, the opponent may leave at the Patent Office statutory declarations in answer, and on so leaving shall deliver to the applicant copies thereof, and within fourteen days from such delivery the applicant may leave at the Patent Office his statutory declarations in reply, and on so leaving shall deliver to the opponent copies thereof. Such last-mentioned declarations shall be confined to matters strictly in reply.

40. No further evidence shall be left on either side except by leave, or on the requisition, of the Comptroller.

41. On completion of the evidence (if any), or at such other time as he may see fit, the Comptroller shall appoint a time for the hearing of the case, and shall give the parties ten days' notice at the least of such appointment. If either party does not desire to be heard he shall as soon as possible notify the Comptroller to that effect. If either party desires to be heard he must leave Form E. at the Patent Office. The Comptroller may refuse to hear either party who has not left Form E prior to the date of hearing. If either party intends to refer at the hearing to any publication other than a specification mentioned in the notice of opposition, he should, unless the same has been referred to in a statutory declaration already filed, give to the other party and to the Comptroller five days' notice at the least of his intention, together with details of each publication to which he intends to refer. After hearing the party or parties desirous of being heard or if neither party desires to be heard, then without a hearing the Comptroller shall decide the case and notify his decision to the parties.

AMENDMENT OF SPECIFICATION (see p. 79).

42. A request for leave to amend a specification must be signed by the applicant and shall contain an address for service in the United Kingdom. When not made in pursuance of an order of the Court or a Judge the request must, where a patent has been sealed, also contain a statement that no action for infringement nor proceeding for revocation of the patent is pending. The request must be accompanied by a duly certified

copy of the original specification and drawings, showing in red ink the proposed amendment, and shall be advertised by publication of the request and the nature of the proposed amendment in the official journal of the Patent Office, and in such other manner (if any) as the Comptroller may in each case direct.

43. Where a request for leave to amend is made in pursuance of an order of the Court or a Judge, an office copy of the order shall be left with the request at the Patent Office.

44. A notice of opposition to the amendment shall be on Form G and shall state the ground or grounds on which the person giving such notice (hereinafter called the opponent) intends to oppose the amendment, and must be signed by him. Such notice shall state his address for service in the United Kingdom, and shall be accompanied by an unstamped copy, which copy shall be transmitted by the Comptroller to the applicant.

45. Within fourteen days after the expiration of one month from the first advertisement of the application for leave to amend, the opponent may leave at the Patent Office statutory declarations in support of his opposition, and on so leaving shall deliver to the applicant copies thereof.

46. Upon such declarations being left, and such copies being delivered, the provisions of Rules 37, 40 and 41 shall apply to the case, and the further proceedings therein shall be regulated in accordance with such provisions as if they were here repeated.

47. If the opponent does not leave statutory declarations in support of his opposition, the applicant may (if he desires so to do) within two months from the date of the first advertisement of the application for leave to amend leave at the Patent Office statutory declarations in support of his application, and on so leaving shall deliver to the opponent copies thereof.

48. Upon such declarations being left, and such copies being delivered, the provisions of Rules 39, 40, and 41 shall apply to the case, and further proceedings therein shall be regulated in accordance with such provisions as if they were here repeated.

49. Where leave to amend is given the applicant shall, if the Comptroller so require, and within a time to be limited by him, leave at the Patent Office a new specification and drawings as amended, to be prepared in accordance with Rules 17 to 23.

50. Every amendment of a specification shall be advertised forthwith by the Comptroller in the official journal of the Patent Office, and in such other manner (if any) as the Comptroller may direct.

REGISTER OF PATENTS (see p. 107).

51. Upon the sealing of a patent the Comptroller shall cause to be entered in the Register of Patents the name, address, and calling of the patentee as the grantee thereof, and the title of the invention, together with the address for service.

52. The patent granted on any Convention application (see p. 227) shall be entered in the Register as dated of the date on which the first foreign application was made, and the payment of renewal fees, and the expiration of the patent, shall be reckoned as from the date of the first foreign application.

53. If a patentee send to the Comptroller on Form R. (see p. 300) notice of an alteration in his address, the Comptroller shall cause the Register to be altered accordingly, and may require the altered address to be in the United Kingdom.

54. Where a person becomes entitled to a patent or to any share or interest therein, by assignment, or by transmission, or other operation of law (see p. 108), a request for the entry of his name in the Register as such complete or partial proprietor of the patent, or of such share or interest therein, as the case may be, shall be addressed to the Comptroller, and left at the Patent Office.

55. Such request shall be on Form L. (see p. 298) and shall in the case of individuals be made and signed by the person requiring to be registered as proprietor, or by his agent duly authorised to the satisfaction of the Comptroller, and in the case of a body corporate by its agent, authorised in like manner.

56. Every such request shall state the name, address, and calling of the person claiming to be entitled to the patent, or to any share or interest therein, as the case may be, and the particulars of the assignment, transmission, or other operation of law, by virtue of which he claims to be entered in the register as proprietor, so as to show the manner in which, and the person or persons to whom, the patent, or such share or interest therein as aforesaid, has been assigned or transmitted.

57. Every assignment, and every other document containing, giving effect to, or being evidence of, the transmission of a patent or affecting the proprietorship thereof as claimed by such request, except such documents as are matters of record, shall, unless the Comptroller in his discretion otherwise directs, be produced to him together with the request, and such other proof of title as he may require for his satisfaction.

As to a document which is a matter of record, an official or

certified copy thereof shall in like manner be produced to the Comptroller.

58. There shall also be left with the request an attested copy of the assignment or other document or copy above required to be produced.

59. A body corporate may be registered as proprietor by its corporate name.

60. Where an order has been made by His Majesty in Council for the extension of a patent for a further term or for the grant of a new patent (see p. 137), or where an order has been made for the revocation of a patent (see p. 114), or the rectification of the Register under section 90 of the Act of 1883 (see p. 111), or otherwise affecting the validity or proprietorship of the patent, the person in whose favour such order has been made shall forthwith leave at the Patent Office an office copy of such order. The Register shall thereupon be rectified or the purport of such order shall otherwise be duly entered in the register, as the case may be.

61. Upon the issue of a certificate of payment under Rule 68, the Comptroller shall cause to be entered in the Register a record of the date of payment of the fee on such certificate.

62. If a patentee fails to make any prescribed payment within the prescribed time, or any enlargement thereof duly granted, there shall be duly entered in the Register a notification of such failure.

63. An attested copy of every licence granted under a patent, or of any other document purporting to affect the proprietorship of a patent shall be left at the Patent Office with a request on Form M. (see p. 299), that a notification thereof may be entered in the Register. The accuracy of such copy shall be certified as the Comptroller may direct, and the original document shall at the same time be produced and left at the Patent Office if required for further verification.

64. The Register of Patents shall be open to the inspection of the public on every week-day except Saturday between the hours of ten and four, and on Saturday between the hours of ten and one, except on the days and the times following:—

(a) Christmas Day, Good Friday, the day observed as His Majesty's birthday, days observed as days of public fast or thanksgiving, and days observed as holidays at the Bank of England; or

(b) Days which may from time to time be notified by a placard posted in a conspicuous place at the Patent Office;

(c) Times when the register is required for any purpose of official use.

65. Certified copies of any entry in the register, or certified copies of, or extracts from, patents, specifications, disclaimers, affidavits, statutory declarations, and other public documents in the Patent Office, or of or from registers and other books kept there, may be furnished by the Comptroller on payment of the prescribed fee.

PAYMENT OF FEES FOR CONTINUANCE OF PATENT.

66. If a patentee intends at the expiration of the fourth year from the date of his patent to keep the same in force, he shall, before the expiration of the fourth and each succeeding year during the term of the patent, pay the prescribed fee. The patentee may pay the whole or any portion of the aggregate of such prescribed annual fees in advance.

The Form J. (see p. 298) in the Second Schedule, duly stamped, should be used for the purpose of this payment.

67. An application for an enlargement of the time for making a prescribed payment (see Form K., p. 298) shall state in detail the circumstances in which the patentee by accident, mistake or inadvertence has failed to make such payment, and the Comptroller may require the patentee to substantiate by such proof as he may think necessary the allegations contained in the application for enlargement.

68. On due compliance with the terms of Rule 66, and as soon as may be after such respective periods as aforesaid, or any enlargement thereof respectively duly granted, the Comptroller shall issue a certificate that the prescribed payment has been duly made.

COMPULSORY LICENCES AND REVOCATION OF PATENTS.

[Rules 69—75 are set out in full on pp. 103, 104, supra.]

GENERAL.

76. Any document for the amending of which no special provision is made by the said Acts may be amended, and any irregularity in procedure, which in the opinion of the Comptroller may be obviated without detriment to the interests of any person, may be corrected, if and on such terms as the Comptroller may think fit.

77. The times prescribed by these Rules for doing any act, or taking any proceeding thereunder, other than the times for lodging evidence referred to in Rule 33 or in the procedure in these Rules

relating to compulsory licences and revocation of patents, may be enlarged by the Comptroller if he think fit, and upon such notice to other parties, and proceedings thereon, and upon such terms, as he may direct.

78. Where, under these Rules, any person is required to do any act or thing, or to sign any document, or to make any declaration on behalf of himself or of any body corporate, or any document or evidence is required to be produced to or left with the Comptroller, or at the Patent Office, and it is shown to the satisfaction of the Comptroller that from any reasonable cause such person is unable to do such act or thing, or to sign such document, or make such declaration, or that such document or evidence cannot be produced or left as aforesaid, it shall be lawful for the Comptroller, with the sanction of the Board of Trade, and upon the production of such other evidence, and subject to such terms as they may think fit, to dispense with any such act or thing, document, declaration, or evidence.

79. The Patent Office shall be open to the public every week-day except Saturday between the hours of ten and four, and on Saturday between the hours of ten and one, except on the days following :—

Christmas Day, Good Friday, the day observed as His Majesty's birthday, the days observed as days of public fast or thanksgiving, or as holidays at the Bank of England, and days which may from time to time be notified by a placard posted in a conspicuous place at the Patent Office.

80. Any application, notice, or other document authorised or required to be left, made, or given at the Patent Office, or to the Comptroller, or to any other person under these Rules, may be sent by a prepaid letter through the post, and if so sent shall be deemed to have been left, made, or given at the time when the letter containing the same would be delivered in the ordinary course of post. In proving such service or sending, it shall be sufficient to prove that the letter was properly addressed and put into the post.

AGENCY.

81. With the exception of the signing of the following documents, namely, applications for patents, requests for leave to amend applications, specifications, or letters patent, authorisations of agents, notices of oppositions, requests for issue of duplicate letters patent, notices of abandonment of or of intention

not to proceed with applications, surrenders of letters patent, and petitions for compulsory licence and revocation of patent, all communications to the Comptroller under the said Acts and these Rules may be signed by and all attendances upon the Comptroller may be made by or through an agent duly authorised to the satisfaction of the Comptroller, and, if he so require it, resident in the United Kingdom. The Comptroller shall not be bound to recognise as such agent, or to receive further communications from any person whose name, by reason of his having been adjudged guilty of disgraceful professional conduct has been erased from the register of patent agents, kept under the provisions of the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1888, relating to the registration of patent agents, and not since restored. In any particular case, the Comptroller may, if he think fit, require the personal signature or presence of an applicant, opponent, or other person.

REPEAL.

82. All general Rules relative to patents heretofore made by the Board of Trade under the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Acts, 1888 to 1901, and in force on the 12th day of January, 1903, shall be and they are hereby repealed as from that date, without prejudice, nevertheless, to anything done under such Rules, or to any application or other matter then pending.

Dated the 12th day of January, 1903.

G. W. BALFOUR,
President of the Board of Trade.

THE FIRST SCHEDULE.

[List of Fees payable in connection with Patents; see p. 289, supra.]

THE SECOND SCHEDULE.

[Forms; see pp. 292-302, infra.]

THE OFFICIAL FORMS.

[Prescribed by the Board of Trade and contained in the Second Schedule to the Patents Rules, 1903.]

Form A. (see p. 28, *supra*).

Application for Patent for Original Invention.

[To be accompanied by two copies of Form B. or of Form C.]

I [or We] [name, address, and calling of applicant or applicants, in full] do hereby declare that I am [or we are] in possession of an invention the title of which is [title]; that [in case of joint applicants state whether all, or, if not, who is or are the inventor or inventors] claim to be true and first inventor thereof; and that the same is not in use by any other person or persons to the best of my [or our] knowledge and belief; and I [or we] humbly pray that a Patent may be granted to me [or us] for the said invention.

Dated — day of —, 19—.

[Signature of applicant or applicants.]

NOTE.—One of the two next forms (which are printed on the back of the application), or a separate authorisation of agent, should be signed by the applicant or applicants.

(1) *Where Application is made through an Agent.*

I [or We] hereby appoint [agent], of —, to act as my [or our] Agent in respect of the within application for a Patent, and request that all notices, requisitions, and communications relating thereto may be sent to such Agent at the above address.

— day of —, 19—.

[Signature of applicant or applicants.]

(2) *Where application is made without an Agent.*

I [or We] hereby request that all notices, requisitions, and communications in respect of the within application may be sent to — at —.

— day of —, 19—.

[Signature of applicant or applicants.]

Form A1. (see p. 28, *supra*).**Application for Patent for Invention Communicated from Abroad.**

[To be accompanied by two copies of Form B. or of Form C.]

I *[name, address, and calling of applicant, in full]* of —, in the county of —, do hereby declare that I am in possession of an invention, the title of which is *[title]*, which invention has been communicated to me by *[name, address, and calling of communicator]*; that I claim to be the true and first inventor thereof; and that the same is not in use within the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the Isle of Man by any other person or persons to the best of my knowledge and belief; and I humbly pray that a Patent may be granted to me for the said invention.

Dated — day of —, 19—.

[Signature of applicant or applicants.]

NOTE.—One of the two forms printed on the back of the application (see p. 292, *supra*), or a separate authorisation of agent, should be signed by the applicant.

Form A2. (see p. 228, *supra*).**Application for Patent under International and Colonial Arrangements.**

I *[or We]* *[name, address, and calling of applicant or applicants, in full]* do hereby declare that I *[or we]* have made applications for protection of my *[or our]* invention of *[title]* in the following foreign States, and on the following official dates, viz.: *[name of each State and official date of each application]*; and in the following British Possessions and on the following official dates, viz.: *[name of each British Possession and official date of each application]*: That the said invention was not in use within the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the Isle of Man by any other person or persons before the *[official date of earliest foreign application]* to the best of my *[or our]* knowledge, information, and belief, and I *[or we]* humbly pray that a patent may be granted to me *[or us]* for the said invention in priority to other applicants, and that such patent shall have the date *[date of earliest foreign application]*.

[Signature of applicant or applicants.]

NOTE.—If the application be made through an agent, a proper authorisation should be supplied; if not, an address for service to which communications may be sent should be furnished.

Form B. (see p. 56, *supra*).**Provisional Specification.**

[To be furnished in Duplicate, and issued with Form A. or A1.]

[Title; verbally agreeing with that in the Application Form.]

I [or We] [name, address, and calling of applicant or applicants as in application form] do hereby declare the nature of this invention to be as follows:—[nature of invention].

Dated this —— day of ——.

[Signature.]

Form C. (see p. 58, *supra*).

Where Provisional Specification has
been left quote No. and date.

No. ——.

Date ——.

Complete Specification.

[To be furnished in Duplicate—one unstamped.]

[Title; verbally agreeing with that in the application form.]

I [or We] [name, address, and calling of applicant or applicants as in application form] do hereby declare the nature of this invention and in what manner the same is to be performed, to be particularly described and ascertained in and by the following statement: [nature of invention and mode of performing it].

Having now particularly described and ascertained the nature of my said invention, and in what manner the same is to be performed, I declare that what I claim is:—[claim or claims numbered consecutively].

Dated this —— day of ——.

[Signature.]

Form C1.**Postal Request for Printed Specification.**

To the Comptroller-General.

Please send one copy of Specification, No. —— Year ——
to——.

[Name (in full) and address.]

Form D. (see p. 40, *supra*).

Form of Opposition to Grant of Patent.

I [*name and address, in full*] hereby give notice of my intention to oppose the grant of Letters Patent upon application No. — of —, applied for by — upon the ground [*see pp. 40-48, supra*].

[*Signature of opponent.*]

My address for service in the United Kingdom is —.
To the Comptroller.

Form E. (see pp. 53, 84, *supra*).

Form of Notice that Hearing before the Comptroller will be Attended.

[*Opposition to the Grant or to Amendments.*]

SIR,

I, of — hereby give notice that the hearing in reference to — will be attended by myself or by some person on my behalf.

Your obedient servant,

[*Signature.*]

To the Comptroller.

Form F. (see p. 79, *supra*).

Form of Application for Amendment of Specification.

I [*name and address of applicant or patentee, in full*] seek leave to amend the specification of Letters Patent No. — of —, as shown in red ink in the certified copy of the original specification hereunto annexed.

[*If the patent has been sealed and such is the case add: I declare that no action for infringement or proceeding for revocation of the Letters Patent in question is pending.*]

My reasons for making this amendment are as follows:—[*state reasons (see p. 83, supra); and if applicant is not the patentee, state his interest in the patent*].

[*Signature of applicant.*]

My address for service in the United Kingdom is —.
To the Comptroller.

Form G. (see p. 83, *supra*).

Form of Opposition to Amendment of Specification.

[To be accompanied by an unstamped copy.]

I [*name and address of opponent, in full*] hereby give notice of objection to the proposed amendment of the specification of Letters Patent No. — of — for the following reason:—*[state reason ; see p. 83, supra]*.

[Signature of opponent.]

My address for service within the United Kingdom is —.
To the Comptroller.

Form H. (see p. 102, *supra*).

Form of Application for Grant of Compulsory Licence or Revocation.

[To be accompanied by an unstamped copy.]

I [*name and address of applicant, in full*] hereby request you to bring to the notice of the Board of Trade the accompanying Petition for the grant of a licence to me by [*name and address of patentee, and number and date of his patent*].

[Signature of petitioner.]

NOTE.—The petition must clearly set forth the facts of the case and be accompanied by an examined copy thereof (see Form H1.).

To the Comptroller.

Form H1. (see p. 102, *supra*).

Form of Petition for Grant of Compulsory Licence or Revocation.

To the Lords of the Committee of Privy Council for Trade.

THE PETITION of [*name, address, and calling of petitioner, in full*] of — in the county of —, being a person interested in the matter of this petition as hereinafter described.

SHEWETH as follows:—

1. A patent dated — No. — was duly granted to — for an invention of [*title of invention*].

2. The nature of my interest in the matter of this petition is as follows:—*[state nature of interest]*.

3. [Statement in detail of the circumstances of the case under s. 3 of the Act (see p. 102, *supra*), showing that it arises by reason of the default of the patentee, or as the case may be, of any other person claiming an interest in the patent as exclusive licensee, or otherwise, to work his patent or to manufacture the patented article in the United Kingdom to an adequate extent, or to grant licences on reasonable terms. The statement should give the names and addresses of any persons who are alleged to have made default. Subsequent paragraphs should be numbered consecutively.]

The evidence which I propose to leave at the Patent Office accompanying this petition is as follows :—[state what affidavits or statutory declarations, together with any other documentary evidence, will be left ; see Rule 70, and p. 103, *supra*].

Having regard to the circumstances above stated, the petitioner alleges that by reason of the aforesaid default the reasonable requirements of the public with respect to the invention patented as above stated have not been satisfied.

Your petitioner therefore prays that an order may be made granting to him a compulsory licence on the terms following, viz. : [state the terms as to the amount of royalties, security for payment, or otherwise, upon which the petitioner claims to be entitled to the relief,] or that the said patent may be revoked.

[Signature.]

Form I. (see p. 102, *supra*).

**Form of Opposition to Petition for Grant of Compulsory Licence
or Revocation.**

I [name and address, in full] hereby give notice of opposition to the petition of — for the grant of a compulsory licence under Patent No. — of —, or the revocation of the said patent. The grounds upon which I oppose the said application are as follows, viz. :—[grounds of opposition].

[Signature.]

NOTE.—In pursuance of the requirements of Rule 71, copies of the affidavits or statutory declarations in reply to the evidence left with the petition must be delivered to the petitioner.

To the Comptroller.

Form J. (see p. 38, *supra*).**Application for Certificate of Payment or Renewal.**

[When stamped this Form must be sent at once to the Patent Office.]

I hereby transmit the fee prescribed for the continuation in force of *[name of patentee]* Patent No. — of — for a further period of — .

[Name and full address.]

To the Comptroller.

* * * * *

Certificate of Payment or Renewal.

Letters Patent No. — of — .

This is to certify that — did this — day of — make the prescribed payment of £ — in respect of a period of — from — and that by virtue of such payment the rights of the patentee remain in force.

Seal.

Form K. (see p. 39, *supra*).**Form of Application for Enlargement of Time for Payment of Renewal Fee.**

SIR,

I hereby apply for an enlargement of time for — month in which to make the — payment of — upon my Patent, No. — of — .

The circumstances in which the payment was omitted are as follows:— *[state circumstances in detail; see p. 39, supra]*.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

[Signature of Applicant and full address to which receipt is to be sent.]

To the Comptroller.

Form L.**Request to Enter Name upon the Register.**

I *[name, address, and description]* hereby request that you will enter my name in the Register of Patents:

I claim to be entitled *[nature of claim, e.g., as assignee]* of the

Patent No. — of — granted to [*name and address of patentee*] the title of which is [*title*] by virtue of [*particulars of document, giving its date, and the parties thereto, and showing how the claim is substantiated*].

And in proof whereof I transmit the accompanying [*document*] with an attested copy thereof.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

[*Signature.*]

To the Comptroller.

Form M. (see p. 110, *supra*).

Request to Enter Notification of Licence or Other Document
in the Register.

SIR,

I hereby transmit an attested copy of [*description of nature of document*] under Patent No. — of —, as well as the original document of verification, and I have to request that a notification thereof may be entered in the Register.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

[*Signature and full address.*]

To the Comptroller.

Form N. (see p. 39, *supra*).

Application for Duplicate of Patent.

Date —.

SIR,

I regret to have to inform you that the patent dated [*date, number, and full name and address of grantee*] for an invention the title of which is [*title*] has been destroyed [*or lost*] [*state the circumstances, which must be verified by statutory declaration*].

I beg therefore to apply for the issue of a duplicate of such Patent.

[*Here state interest of applicant in the patent.*]

[*Signature of applicant.*]

To the Comptroller.

Form O. (see p. 13, *supra*).**Notice of Intended Exhibition of an Unpatented Invention.**

I [*name and address, in full*] hereby give notice of my intention to exhibit a — of — at the — Exhibition, which opened [*or is to open*] on the — day of —, under the provisions of the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Acts, 1883 to 1902.

I herewith enclose a brief description of my invention [*the description should be accompanied by drawings, if necessary*].

[*Signature of inventor.*]

To the Comptroller.

Form P. (see pp. 32, 110, *supra*).**Request for Correction of Clerical Error.**

SIR,

I hereby request that the following clerical error [*or errors*] in the application [*or specification or register*] No. — of —, may be corrected in the manner shown in red ink in the certified copy of the original application [*or specification or register*] hereunto annexed.

[*Signature and full address.*]

Form Q.**Certificate of Comptroller-General.**

The Patent Office,
London, 19—.

I —, Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks, hereby certify—.

To [*full name and address of person requiring certificate*].

Form R. (see p. 110, *supra*).**Notice for Alteration of an Address in Register.**

SIR,

I [*name and address, in full*] hereby request that my address now upon the Register may be altered as follows:—[*full address*].

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

[*Signature of applicant.*]

To the Comptroller.

Form S. (see p. 107, *supra*).

Application for Entry of Order of Privy Council in Register.

I [*name and address, in full*] hereby transmit an office copy of an Order in Council with reference to [*purport of the order*].

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

[*Signature of applicant.*]

To the Comptroller.

Form T. (see p. 224, *supra*).

Form of Appeal to the Law Officer.

I [*name and address, in full*] hereby give notice of my intention to appeal to the Law Officer from the decision [*or that part of the decision*] of the Comptroller of the — day of — whereby he refused [*or allowed*] application for Patent [*or application for leave to amend Patent or as the case may be*] No. — of —

[*Signature and date.*]

N.B.—This notice must be sent to the Comptroller-General, and a copy to the Law Officers' Clerk (Room 549), Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, London.

Form U. (see p. 30, *supra*).

Application for Extension of Time for Leaving a Complete Specification.

SIR,

I hereby, in respect of application No. —, dated —, apply for one month's extension of time in which to leave a complete specification.

The circumstances in and grounds upon which this extension is applied for are as follows:—[*circumstances and grounds; see p. 30, supra*].

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

[*Signature of applicant or his agent.*]

To the Comptroller.

Form V. (see p. 35, *supra*).

Application for Extension of Time for Acceptance of a Complete Specification.

SIR,

I hereby apply for ——— months' extension of time for the acceptance of the complete specification upon application No. ——— dated ——— .

The circumstances in and grounds upon which the extension is applied for are as follows :— [*circumstances and grounds ; see p. 35, supra*].

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

[*Signature of applicant or his agent.*]

To the Comptroller.

PRIVY COUNCIL RULES, 1897.

Rules to be observed in proceedings before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council under the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883, Section 25.

1. A PARTY intending to apply by petition under section 25 of the Act shall give public notice by advertising three times in the *London Gazette* and once at least in each of three London newspapers.

If the applicant's principal place of business is situate in the United Kingdom at a distance of 15 miles or more from Charing Cross he shall also advertise once at least in some local newspaper published or circulating in the town or district where such place of business is situated. If the applicant has no place of business, then, if he carries on the manufacture of anything made under his specification at a distance of 15 miles or more from Charing Cross he shall advertise once at least in some local newspaper published or circulating in the town or district where he carries on such manufacture. If he has no place of business and carries on no such manufacture, then, if he resides at a distance of 50 miles or more from Charing Cross, he shall advertise once at least in some newspaper published or circulating in the town or district where he resides.

The applicant shall in his advertisements state the object of his petition and shall give notice of the day on which he intends to apply for a time to be fixed for hearing the matter thereof, which day shall not be less than four weeks from the date of the publication of the last of the advertisements to be inserted in the *London Gazette*. He shall also give notice that caveats must be entered at the Council Office on or before such day so named in the said advertisements.

2. A petition under section 25 of the Act must be presented within one week from the publication of the last of the advertisements required to be published in the *London Gazette*.

The petition must be accompanied with an affidavit or affidavits of advertisements having been published according to the requirements of the first of these Rules. The statements contained in such affidavit or affidavits may be disputed upon the hearing.

The petitioner shall apply to the Lords of the Committee to fix a time for hearing the petition, and when such time is fixed the petitioner shall forthwith give public notice of the same by advertising once at least in the *London Gazette* and in two London newspapers.

3. A party presenting a petition under section 25 of the Act must lodge at the Council Office eight printed copies of the specification; but if the specification has not been printed and if the expense of making eight copies of any drawing therein contained or referred to would be considerable the lodging of two copies only shall be deemed sufficient.

The petitioner shall also lodge at the Council Office eight copies of the balance sheet of expenditure and receipts relating to the patent in question, which accounts are to be proved on oath before the Lords of the Committee at the hearing. He shall also furnish three copies of the said balance sheet for the use of the Solicitor to the Treasury, and shall upon receiving two days' notice give to the Solicitor to the Treasury, or any person deputed by him for the purpose reasonable facilities for inspecting and taking extracts from the books of account by reference to which he proposes to verify the said balance sheet at the hearing or from which the materials for making up the said balance sheet have been derived.

All copies mentioned in this Rule must be lodged and furnished not less than fourteen days before the day fixed for the hearing.

4. A party intending to oppose a petition under section 25 of the Act must enter a caveat at the Council Office before the day on which the petitioner applies for a time to be fixed for hearing the matter thereof, and having entered such caveat shall be entitled to have from the petitioner four weeks' notice of the time appointed for the hearing.

The petitioner shall serve copies of his petition on all parties entering caveats in accordance with this Rule, and no application to fix a time for hearing shall be made without affidavit of such service.

All parties intending to oppose a petition shall within three weeks after such copies are served on them respectively lodge at the Council Office eight printed copies of the grounds of their objections to the granting of the prayer of the petition.

5. Parties shall be entitled to have copies of all papers lodged in respect of any petition under section 25 of the Act at their own expense.

All such petitions and all statements of grounds of objection

shall be printed in the form prescribed by the Rules which apply to proceedings before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Balance sheets of expenditure and receipts shall be printed in a form convenient for binding along with such petitions.

6. Costs incurred in the matter of any petition under section 25 of the Act shall be taxed by the Registrar of the Privy Council, or other officer deputed by the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to tax the costs in the matter of any petition, and the Registrar or such other officer shall have authority to allow or disallow in his discretion all payments made to persons of science or skill examined as witnesses.

7. The Lords of the Committee may excuse petitioners and opponents from compliance with any of the requirements of these Rules, and may give such directions in matters of procedure and practice under section 25 of the Act as they shall consider to be just and expedient.

8. The Lords of the Committee will hear the Attorney-General or other Counsel on behalf of the Crown on the question of granting the prayer of any petition under section 25 of the Act. The Attorney-General is not required to give notice of the grounds of any objection he may think fit to take or of any evidence which he may think fit to place before the Lords of the Committee.

PRIVY COUNCIL RULES, 1903.

[These are fully set out on pp. 104—107, supra.]

REGISTER OF PATENT AGENTS RULES.

[These are fully set out on pp. 231—238, supra.]

Rules 25—27 of the Patents Rules, 1903 (a).

STATUTORY DECLARATIONS AND AFFIDAVITS.

25. The statutory declarations and affidavits required by these Rules, or used in any proceedings thereunder, shall be headed in the matter or matters to which they relate and shall be drawn up in the first person, and shall be divided into paragraphs consecutively numbered, and each paragraph shall so far as possible be confined to one subject. Every statutory declaration or affidavit shall state the description and true place of abode of the person making the same, and shall be written or printed bookwise and shall bear the name and address of the person leaving it and shall state on whose behalf it is left.

26. The statutory declarations and affidavits required by the said Acts and these Rules, or used in any proceedings thereunder, shall be made and subscribed as follows:—

- (a) In the United Kingdom, before any justice of the peace, or any commissioner or other officer authorised by law in any part of the United Kingdom to administer an oath for the purpose of any legal proceeding;
- (b) In any other part of His Majesty's dominions, before any court, judge, justice of the peace, or any officer authorised by law to administer an oath there for the purpose of a legal proceeding; and
- (c) If made out of His Majesty's dominions, before a British Minister, or person exercising the functions of a British Minister, or a Consul, Vice-Consul, or other person exercising the functions of a British Consul, or before a notary public, or before a judge or magistrate.

INDUSTRIAL OR INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITIONS.

27. Any person desirous of exhibiting an invention at an industrial or international exhibition, or of publishing any description of the invention during the period of the holding of the exhibition, or of using the invention for the purpose of the exhibition in the place where the exhibition is held, may, after the Board of Trade have issued a certificate that the exhibition is an industrial or international one, give to the Comptroller notice on Form O of his intention to exhibit, publish, or use the invention, as the case may be. For the purpose of identifying the invention in the event of an application for a patent being subsequently made the inventor shall furnish to the Comptroller a brief description of his invention, accompanied, if necessary, by drawings, and such other information as the Comptroller may in each case require.

(a) These rules were omitted, in error, from p. 283, *supra*.

INDEX.

ABANDONMENT,

- complete specification, in, of part of invention, effect of, 71
- opposition to grant, of, 284
- petition for prolongation, of, 150
- prior user, of, effect of, 16
- provisional specification, of, does not amount to a publication, 8, 30

ABROAD,

- communications from : *see* COMMUNICATIONS FROM ABROAD.
- importation from, may be an infringement, 165, 166
- importers from, are true and first inventors, 27, 28
- prior publication, effect of, 7
 - user, effect of, 7
- service of writ on defendant who is, 173

ACCEPTANCE,

- complete specification, of, 35
 - rights of inventor after, 36
- provisional specification, of, rights of inventor after, 36

ACCIDENT,

- invention discovered by, is patentable, 22
- mode of performing invention discovered by, effect of, 22, 68

ACCOUNT,

- petition for extension, on, 139--142
- profits, of, 169, 173, 203, 206, 211, 212
 - ascertained, how, 212
 - damages cannot be claimed as well as, 206, 207, 211
 - disadvantages of, 207, 211
 - discovery in aid of, 212
 - lashes, effect of, on, 212
 - refused, is, when, 212
 - stay of, 220, 221
 - undertaking to keep, 187, 190, 221

ACQUIESCENCE,

- effect of,
 - assignment of licence, on, 101
 - interlocutory injunction, application for, on, 189
 - perpetual injunction, application for, on, 204

ACTION,

- licensees, against : *see* LICENSEE.
- reduction, of, 119, 263
- Statute of Monopolies, under, 124
- threats, for : *see* THREATS.

INDEX.

ACTION FOR INFRINGEMENT: *and see* INFRINGEMENT; COSTS.

- amendment of specification, in, 85—89, 202
- appeals in, 221—223
 - Court of Appeal, to, 221
 - evidence on, 222, 223
 - practice on, 221—223
 - security for costs, on, 222
 - stay pending, 220
 - House of Lords, to, 223
- assessor, aid of, at trial of, 171, 197
- camera, hearing of, in, 193
- costs in: *see* COSTS.
- Court in which, can be tried, 171
- damages, in: *see* DAMAGES.
- delivery up of infringing articles in: *see* DELIVERY UP.
- destruction of infringing articles in: *see* DESTRUCTION.
- defence in, 175
 - grounds of, 175, 178
- defendants in, 153, 154, 155, 172
- discovery in: *see* DISCOVERY; INTERROGATORIES.
- discontinue, leave to, 196
- evidence in, 191, 198—201
 - expert, 199, 200
 - infringement, of, 200
- execution, stay of, pending appeal, 220, 221
- expediting, 196
- intention, effect of, in, 153, 213
- injunction in: *see* INJUNCTION.
- inspection in, 192—194
- interrogatories in: *see* INTERROGATORIES.
- invalidity of patent may be declared in, 178
- issues, separate, hearing of, in, 197
 - costs of, in, 218, 219
- jury, claiming, in, 197
- liable in, who are, 153, 154, 155, 172, 173
- non-appearance of defendant in, 174, 198
- numerous infringers, against, 169
- particulars, breaches of, in, 175, 176, 177, 213, 214
 - objections, of, in, 178—184, 213—216
- parties to, 171—173
- plaintiffs in, 171, 172
- pleadings in, 173—175
- remedies in, 203—212
- statement of claim in, 173, 174
- trial of, 197—203
 - surprise at, 199
- writ in, 173
 - service of, out of the jurisdiction, 173

ACTS, PATENT,

- 1883...241—266
- 1885...267, 268
- 1886...269, 270
- 1888...271—273

INDEX.

ACTS, PATENT—*continuu* .

1901...274

1902...275—279

ADDRESS,

applicant, of, 29

infringer's customers, of, 194, 210, 211, 212

opponent to grant, of, 51

ADJOURNMENT,

petition for extension, of hearing of, 139

trial of action for infringement, of, 199

ADMINISTRATOR: *see* LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE.

ADVERTISEMENT,

amendment of specification, of, 85

application for extension, of, 147, 148

complete specification, of acceptance of, 36

request to amend specification, of, 83

threats by, 125

AFFIDAVITS,

advertisements, of, on petition for extension, 147, 148

evidence by, application for inspection, on, 192

 motion for injunction, on, 191

 petition for compulsory licence, on, 103, 105, 106

 petition for revocation, on, 121

patent rules, form of, under, 306

AGENT,

patent: *see* PATENT AGENTS.

patentee, may be, of foreign invention, 28

sale, for, cannot sue infringers, 172

AGREEMENT,

assignment, for, 91

licence, for, 97

verbal, cannot be noted in register, 109

 licence, for, is enforceable, 97

ALIENS: *see* FOREIGNER.

AMBIGUOUS SPECIFICATION, effect of, 69, 70

AMENDMENT,

application, of, 33

documents, of, required by Comptroller, 33, 79

rules as to, 285, 286

specification, of, 79, 285

 action, when pending, 85—89

 damages, restriction on recovery of, before, 89, 209

 effect of, 82

 opposition to, 83—85

particulars, of, 183

title of invention, of, 57

ANALOGOUS APPLICATION, patentable, when, 23, 24

INDEX.

ANTICIPATION,

- prior publication, by, 8—14
- user, by, 14—16

APPEAL,

- Court of Appeal, to, 221—223
- House of Lords, to, 223
- law officer, to, 224—226

APPEARANCE,

- effect of no, by defendant in action for infringement, 174, 198

APPLICANT for letters patent, who may be, 25—28

APPLICATION,

- certificate as to validity, for, 202
 - that particulars reasonable and proper, for, 176, 213
- compulsory licence, for, 102 *et seq.*
- extension of grant, for, 137 *et seq.*
- interlocutory injunction, for: *see* INJUNCTION.
- letters patent, for, 28 *et seq.*
 - abandoned, treated as, when, 30
 - amendment of, 33
 - appeal as to, 33, 221—226
 - communications from abroad, in respect of, 28, 293
 - Convention, under the, 228, 293
 - declaration on, 29, 292
 - errors in, correction of, 32
 - examination of, 32, 33
 - forms of, 292, 293
 - joint, 30, 31
 - legal representatives, by, 30
 - mode of leaving, 31, 32
 - one invention, must be for, 32
 - persons under disability, by, 31
 - refusal of, 33, 34
 - rules as to, 281, 282
 - who may make, 25—28

AREA,

- grant, of, 38
- monopoly, of, 156, 157

ASSESSOR,

- Court may obtain aid of, 171
- Court of Appeal may call in aid of, 251
- law officer may call in aid of, 245
- Privy Council, Judicial Committee of, may call in, 251

ASSIGNEE OF PATENT,

- bankrupt patentee may sue, for infringement, 92
- equitable, position of, 94, 172
- infringement, may sue for, 171
- legal, position of, 91, 93, 171, 172
- notice of prior assignment, is bound by, 93, 94
- oppose grant, may, 50
- prolongation, application for, by, 139, 146, 147
- registered as proprietor, may be, 108

INDEX.

COLONIES,

- importation of invention from, 28
- prior publication in, effect of, 7

COMBINATIONS,

- infringement of, 161—163
- patentable, are, 3

COMMITTAL: *see* INJUNCTION.

COMMON KNOWLEDGE,

- ambit of invention, effect of, on, 156
- construction of specification, effect of, on, 78, 156

COMMUNICATIONS FROM ABROAD,

- application for inventions which are, 28, 229
 - form of, 293
- patentable, are, 28

COMMUNICATION OF INVENTION,

- publication, amounts to, when, 13

COMPANY: *and see* BODY CORPORATE.

- directors of, are liable for infringement committed by servants, 151
 - parties in action for infringement, should not be made, when, 154, 173
- interrogatories, administration of, to, 195

COMPLETE SPECIFICATION,

- acceptance of, 35, 36
- addressed, is, to whom, 61
- ambiguous, must not be, 69
- amendment of, 79 *et seq.*
- claims in, 72 *et seq.*: *and see* CLAIMS.
- construction of, 77, 78
- disclosure in, 66—68
- disconformity of, 70, 71, 72
- drawings, must be accompanied by, if necessary, 64—66
 - rules as to, 65, 66
- errors in, effect of, 64
- examination of, 32—34, 275
- improvements in, adding, effect of, 70, 71
- inspection of, 36
- manner of performing invention must be particularly described in, 59, 61
- misleading suggestions, must not contain, 59, 68
- nature of invention must be particularly described in, 59, 60
- omission of part of invention in, effect of, 71
- publication of, 36
- requirements as to contents of, 59
- report of examiner as to, 32, 33, 35
- tests of sufficiency of, 60, 63
- variance between, and provisional specification, 70—72

COMPULSORY LICENCES,

- patentee may be ordered to grant, when, 102
- rules as to, 103—107

INDEX.

CONSTRUCTION,

- claims, of, 78
- specification, of, 77, 78

CONVENTION: *see* INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

CO-OWNERS of patent, rights of, 94

CORPORATION: *see* BODY CORPORATE; COMPANY.

CORRECTION of errors in register, 110, 111

COSTS,

- amendment of specification, on, 85, 87
 - Comptroller cannot award, 85
 - law officer, awarded by, 226
 - pending action, 87
- compulsory licence, on proceedings for, 107
- infringement, action for, in, 212—220
 - appeal as to, 222
 - amending particulars, on, 183
 - certificate as to validity, where granted, 216
 - damages, inquiry as to, on, 210
 - expert witnesses, of, 220
 - general, 212
 - higher scale, on, 217
 - issues, separate, of, 218, 219
 - motion for injunction, of, 192
 - to commit, of, 205
 - particulars, of, 213—216
 - security for, 222
 - shorthand notes, of, 219, 220.
 - solicitor and client, between, 216
 - pleaded, should be, 216
 - stay as to, 221
 - submits, where defendant, 212, 213
- opposition to grant, on, 54, 226
 - Comptroller cannot award, 54
 - law officer, may be awarded by, 226
- petition for extension, on, 150
- revocation, proceeding for, in, 123
- threats, action for, in, 135

COUNTY COURT,

- patent cases, has no jurisdiction to try, 171

COURT OF APPEAL,

- appeal to, 221—223
 - certificates, in respect of, does not lie, 222
 - costs, as to, 222
 - infringement action, in, 221
 - injunction. refusal to grant, as to, 184
 - notice of, 221
 - revocation, petition for, as to, 123
 - stay pending, 220

amendments by, 223

appeals from, 223

evidence before, 222, 223

COURT OF SESSION, 262, 263

INDEX.

CROWN,

- bound by grant, is, 155
- extend term of grant, may, 137
- good faith towards, patentee must exercise, 66, 68
- prerogative of, as regards patent grants, 1

CUSTOMERS,

- infringer, of, discovery as to, 194, 211, 212
- threats to, 126, 127

DAMAGES,

- acceptance of complete specification. cannot be recovered before, 36, 209
- account of profits cannot be claimed as well as, 206, 207
- assessment of, 207—210
- assignee, right of, as to, 171, 172
- default in payment of fees, where, 39, 209
- discovery in aid of inquiry as to, 210
- inquiry as to, 210
- infringements prior to amendment, cannot be recovered for. when, 82, 209
- injunction, instead of, when given, 203, 204
- innocence no defence to claim for, 153, 207
- manufacturer and purchaser liable for, 208
- measure of, 207—209
- refused, are, when, 209
- reviewing finding as to, 211
- stay of inquiry as to, 221
- threats, in action for, 136
- undertaking as to, 191

DATE,

- applications, of, 32, 37
- letters patent, of, 37

DEATH,

- co-patentee, of, 90
- inventor, of, before applying for patent, 25, 26
- patent agent, of, 233

DECLARATION (Statutory),

- patent agent, by, 232, 237
- patent rules, under, 306

DEFENCE: *see* ACTION FOR INFRINGEMENT; THREATS.

DELAY,

- account, effect of, on claim for, 212
- action for infringement after threats, in bringing. effect of, 129, 130
- applying for patent, in, effect of, 27

DELIVERY UP,

- claim for, in action for infringement, 173, 206
 - refused, will be, when, 206
- order for, 206

DESCRIPTION OF INVENTION: *see* COMPLETE SPECIFICATION; PROVISIONAL SPECIFICATION.

INDEX.

- DESTRUCTION of infringing articles,
claim for, 173, 206
order for, 206
will not be made, when, 206
- DEVOLUTION of letters patent, 90
- DIRECTORS: *see* COMPANY.
- DISABILITY,
application for patent by person under, 31
evidence by persons under, 31
- DISCLAIMERS required on opposition, 44 *et seq.*
- DISCONFORMITY, 70—72
defence to action for infringement, is, 178, 181
revocation, ground for, is, 114, 115
fatal, is, 70
improvements inserted in complete specification do not amount to, 70
omissions in complete specification, whether amount to, 71
particulars of, in action for infringement, 181
- DISCOVERY: *and see* INTERROGATORIES.
account of profits, in aid of, 212
customers of infringer, as to, 194, 211, 212
damages, in aid of inquiry as to, 210
documents, of, 195
difference between invention and, 20
patent agents, communications to, not privileged from, 196
- DRAWINGS,
amending, 81
publication by, 12
rules as to, 65, 66
size of, 65
specification, must accompany, when, 64
- DURATION OF THE GRANT, 38
- ENLARGEMENT OF TIME: *see* TIME.
- ENTRY IN REGISTER: *see* REGISTER OF PATENTS.
- EQUITABLE ASSIGNMENT: *see* ASSIGNMENT OF PATENT.
- EQUIVALENTS: *and see* INFRINGEMENT.
doctrine of, does not apply, when, 159
meaning of term "mechanical equivalent," 159, 160
substitution of, infringement by, 158—160
- ERRORS,
register, in, correction of, 110
specification, in, effect of, 64
- ESTOPPEL,
assignment, by, 91
licence, by, 99
previous judgment, by, 201, 202
revocation proceedings, none by, 122

INDEX.

EVIDENCE,

- action for infringement, in, 198—202
 - threats, in, 134, 135
- appeal to Court of Appeal, on, 222, 223
 - law officer, on, 225
- application to amend specification, on, 84
 - for compulsory licence, on, 103, 105, 106
 - interlocutory injunction, on, 191
- camera, in, 193
- expert, 199, 200, 220
- infringement, of, 200
- invention, of, 22, 23
- opposition to grant, on, 53, 54
- particulars, limited by, 120, 175, 176, 178
- revocation proceedings, in, 121, 122
- utility, of, 18, 19
 - of want of, 19

EXAMINER,

- applications are referred to, 32, 275
- appointment of, 256
- duties of, 32, 243, 275
- reports of, 33, 244, 275, 276
- specifications are referred to, 32, 275

EXECUTION, stay of,

- pending appeal in action for infringement, 220, 221
 - revocation proceeding, 122, 123

EXECUTOR : *see* LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE.

EXHIBITION, publication of invention by user at, 13, 300

EX PARTE,

- injunction, application for, 184
- fiat of Attorney-General, application for, 118, 119
- inspection, application for order for, 192

EXPEDITING TRIAL, action for infringement, of, 196

EXPERIMENT,

- abandonment is generally considered, 16
- infringement by, 165
- practice, difference between, and, 63
- publication by, 15
- specification must not leave workmen to, 62

EXPERTS,

- costs of, in action for infringement, 220
- evidence by, 199
- inspection by, 193

EXTENSION OF TERM OF GRANT: *see* PROLONGATION OF GRANT.

FALSE,

- entries in register, effect of, 112
- suggestions in the specification, effect of, 68

INDEX.

FEES,

- patent agents, payable by, 238
- prescribed, the, 239, 240
- renewal, 38
 - list of, 239, 240
 - non-payment of, effect of, 38
 - payment of, by assignee, 93
 - licensee, 100
 - time for, 38
- enlargement of, 39

FIAT OF ATTORNEY-GENERAL,

- obtained, how, 118
- required, when, 118

FIRST INVENTOR: *see* TRUE AND FIRST INVENTOR.

FOREIGN,

- applications: *see* COMMUNICATIONS FROM ABROAD: INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.
- book, publication by description in, 8
- inventor, rights of, under the Convention, 227, 228
- manufactory, inspection of, not ordered, 193
- specification, publication by, 8
- Sovereign, rights of, to infringing articles, 153, 154
- vessels, use of patented article on, 166, 254

FOREIGNER,

- infringement, is liable for, 153
- opposition to grant by, 50
- patentee may be a, 25, 227, 228

FORMS (Official), 292—302

FRAUD,

- register, entry in, obtained by, effect of, 112
- revocation, a ground for, 114, 115
- true and first inventor, application of, not affected by application in. 38

GRANT: *and see* LICENCE; REVOCATION OF PATENTS.

- area of, 38
- date of, 37
- letters patent, of, 37—54
- maintenance of, 38
- opposition to, 40 *et seq.*

HOUSE OF LORDS, appeal to, 223

IGNORANCE: *see* INNOCENCE.

ILLEGAL,

- applications, 33, 34
- grants, 1, 2

IMITATION: *see* INFRINGEMENT.

IMMORAL INVENTION, Comptroller may refuse grant for, 33, 34

INDEX.

IMPORTERS,

- grants to, 28
- inventions, of, are true and first inventors, 27, 28
- prolongation, application for, by, 138, 139, 140

IMPROVEMENTS,

- assignment of future, permissible, 92
- claim for, 75
- complete specification may include, 70
- infringement by use of, 160
- opposition to grant for, 46
- subject-matter for patent, are, 2

INFANT,

- declaration by, how made, 31
- patentee may be an, 25

INFRINGEMENT: *and see* ACTION FOR INFRINGEMENT.

- addition may be, 157, 160
- ambit of invention to be ascertained before determining whether any, 156
- based on the grant, is, 152
- carriers are liable in action for, 154, 165
- colourable imitation, by, 157
- combination patent, of, 161
- Crown, liability of, for, 155
- Curtis v. Platt*, principles of, 161
- Custom House agents not liable for, 151, 165
- directors, liability of, for, 154, 173
- doctrine of mechanical equivalents, 158
 - does not apply, when, 159
- employers, liability of, for, 154
- equivalents, substitution of, by, 158
- essence of invention material in determining whether any, 157, 158
- experimental user, whether any, 165
- exposure for sale is, 167
- foreigners, liability of, for, 153
- importation is, 165, 166
- improvements, use of, is, when, 160
- intention as to, not material, 153
- invitation to infringe may be, 167
- manufacturing is, 164
- master is liable for, 154
 - patent, wider ambit of, 156
- matters to be considered in determining whether any, 155, 156
- mechanical equivalents, by, 158
- mixed question of law and fact, is, 155
- offering for sale is, 167
- part of invention, taking, effect of, 162, 163
- possession of patented article is, 168
- principle, of invention involving a new, 163
- Procter v. Bennis*, principles of, 161
- repairing may be, 168
- sale is, 166
 - of component parts is not, when, 167
- subtraction may be, 157, 158

INDEX.

INFRINGEMENT—*continued.*

- threatened, 168, 169, 200
- transportation is, 165
- user is, when, 164, 165
- what amounts to, 157 *et seq.*
- what persons are liable for, 153—155

INJUNCTION,

- disobeying, motion to commit for, 205
- ex parte*,
 - action for infringement, in, 184
 - threats, in, 182
- interlocutory*,
 - account, defendant required to keep, if not granted, when, 187
 - application for, 184
 - appeal as to granting, 184
 - convenience, balance of, considered on motion for, 189
 - damages, undertaking as to, usually required on granting, 191
 - delay, effect on, on application for, 188, 189
 - evidence on motion for, 191
 - granted, will be, when, 184, 185
 - refused, will be, when, 188
- perpetual*,
 - contempt of, committal for, 205
 - damages in lieu of, will be awarded, when, 201
 - granted, will be, when, 203
 - refused, will be, when, 204

INNOCENCE,

- infringer, of, may affect question of costs, 170, 213
- no defence to action for infringement, 153
 - motion for committal, 205

INSPECTION, order for, 192—194

INTENTION: *see* INNOCENCE.

INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS,

- applications under the Convention, made, how, 228, 229
 - form of, 293
- colonial arrangements, 227
- communications from abroad, not patentable under, 229
- Convention, the, 228
- date of registration of patents under, 37, 38
- priority, applicant under, obtains, 227, 228
- rules as to, 282

INTERROGATORIES,

- action for infringement, in, 194, 195
- company, administration of, to, 195
- customers, as to, 194, 211, 212
- particulars, may be addressed to matters which should be stated in, 194
- privilege from, 196
- revocation proceedings, in, 119, 121

INVENTION,

- amount of, what is sufficient, to support a patent, 21
- analogous applications, patentable, when, 24

INDEX.

INVENTION—*continued.*

- cases of no, 23, 24
- difference between, and discovery, 20
- evidence of, 22, 23
- imported, may be patented, 27, 28
- insufficient, when, 20—24
- meaning of, 20
- new, must be, to be patentable, 7
- subject-matter, is essential to, 20
- tests of, 21, 22
- useful, must be, to be patentable, 16

INVENTOR: *see* TRUE AND FIRST INVENTOR.

IRELAND,

- jurisdiction of Courts in, 262, 263
- revocation proceedings in, 119
- specifications, copies of, to be sent to, 259
- statutory provisions as to, 262, 263

ISLE OF MAN,

- grant extends to, 38
- statutory provisions as to, 263

ISSUES, *separate,*

- costs of, 218, 219
- trial of, 197

JOINT

- applicants, disputes between, 30
- application for patent, 30
 - true and first inventor must join in, 26, 30
- owners, rights of, 91

JUDGMENT,

- shorthand notes of, 219

JURY,

- action for infringement, trial with, 197
 - threats, trial with, 134
- damages cannot be assessed by, 210

LANCASTER, Palatine Court of, 171

LAPSE OF PATENT,

- non-payment of fees, on, 38

LAW OFFICER,

- appeal to, as to acceptance of application, 33
 - amendment of specification, 33, 85, 224
 - grant of patent, 51, 224
 - title of invention, 33
- evidence on, 225, 226
- procedure on, 224—226
- rules as to, 224—226
- attendance of, petition for compulsory licence, on, 106
 - extension, on, 149, 150

INDEX.

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE,

- deceased applicant, of, grant of patent to, 25, 26
- deceased inventor, of, may apply for patent, 25, 26
- meaning of, in s. 11...42, 43
- petition for extension by, 146

LETTERS PATENT,

- area of grant of, 38
- chase in action, is, 90
- devolution of, 90
- disposition of, 90—96
- duration of, 38
- extension of, 137 *et seq.*
- grant of, 37 *et seq.*
- revocation of, 114 *et seq.*

LICENCE,

- agreement for, 97
- assignable, is not, 101
- before patent issued, may be granted, 97
- compulsory, 102 *et seq.*
- coupled with grant, effect of, 96, 97
- estoppel by, 99
- exclusive, 98
- form of, 97
- limited, 98
- manufacture, to, implies licence to sell, 98
- purchasers of patented article, to, is implied, 98
- registration of, 109, 110
- revocation of, 101
- royalties, payment of, under, 100
- verbal, may be, 97

LICENSEE,

- assign licence, cannot, 101
- infringements, cannot sue for, 99, 100
- manufacture, need not, 100
- oppose grant of patent, may, 50
- register licence, should, 101
- renewal fees, need not pay, 100
- validity of patent, cannot dispute, 99

LICENSOR,

- "beneficial owner," grant by, as, effect of, 97, 101
- royalties, action for, by, 100, 101
- validity of patent, cannot dispute, 99

LORD ADVOCATE, revocation of patents in Scotland is an instance of, 119

LOSS OF PATENT, 39, 299

LUNATIC,

- declaration by, 31
- grant of patent to, 25

MAINTENANCE OF PATENT,

- extension of time for payment of fees for, 39
- fees payable for, 38, 239, 240

INDEX.

- MANUFACTURE,**
infringement by, 164
licence to, imports licence to sell, 98
meaning of term, in Statute of Monopolies, 1 *et seq.*
subject-matter of patent must be a manner of, 1
- MANUFACTURER,**
judgment against, does not license use of articles in purchaser's hands,
208
purchasers, may be sued with, 172
- MARRIED WOMEN,**
patents may be granted to, 25
- MASTER,**
cannot claim invention discovered by servant, 26, 27, 41
improvements discovered by workman belong to, 26, 27, 41
liability of, for infringements of servants, 154
- MASTER PATENT,**
ambit of, 156
disclaimers required in the case of, 46
- MECHANICAL EQUIVALENTS:** *see* EQUIVALENTS; INFRINGEMENT.
- "MERIT":** *see* PROLONGATION OF GRANT.
- METHODS,** patentable, are, 4
- MODELS,**
patentee may be required to furnish, to Science and Art Department, 254
publication by, 12, 13
trial, at, 223
- MONOPOLIES:** *see* STATUTE OF MONOPOLIES.
- MORTGAGE,**
patent, of, 96
registration of, 109
- MORTGAGEE,**
plaintiff in action for infringement, need not be, 171
position of, 96
prolongation, party to, should be, 147
- MORTGAGOR,**
plaintiff in action for infringement, may be sole, 171
rights of, 96
- MOTION,**
amendment of specification, for leave to effect, 89
committal for contempt, for, 205
interlocutory injunction, for, 184
judgment, for, 174
order for inspection, for, 192
security for costs, for, 222
stay of execution, for, 220
- NATURE OF INVENTION.**
description of, in complete specification, 59
in provisional specification, 57
prolongation, is considered on petition for, 137

INDEX.

NOTICE,

- acceptance of complete specification of, of, 36
- action for infringement, before bringing, 170
- appeal, of, to Court of Appeal, 221
 - law officer, 224
- application to rectify register, of, 111
- assignment, prior, of, 93, 94
- exhibition of unpatented invention, of, 13, 300
- injunction, of, 205
- opposition to amendment, of, 83
 - grant of, 51
- petition for compulsory licence, of, 104, 105
 - extension, of, 147
- trusts, of, not entered in the register, 109

NOVELTY,

- claim to something possessing no, is generally fatal, 74, 75, 76
- combination, in, 75
- consideration for grant is novelty of all, 7
- part of invention, want of, in, is fatal, 7, 76
- prior publication defeats, 8—14
 - user defeats, 14—16
- subject-matter of patent, is essential to, 7
- want of, is defence to action for infringement, 178, 179
 - is ground for revocation, 115

OBJECTIONS : *see* PARTICULARS.

OFFENCES,

- assuming Royal Arms, 40
- register, making false entry in, 112
- representing unpatented invention as patented, 39, 40
- patent agents, by, 231, 234

OLD,

- claim to something, effect of, 74, 75, 76
- combinations of things which are, 3, 75
- subject-matter of patent must not be, 7 *et seq.*

OMISSION,

- complete specification, in, of something described in provisional specification, effect of, 71
- of distinct statement of invention claimed, effect of, 77
- machine, from a, may form good subject-matter, 2

OPPOSITION,

- amendment of specification, to, 83
- compulsory licence, to, form of notice of, 297
- grant, to, 40 *et seq.*
 - appeal from Comptroller on, 54
 - bogus, effect of, 50
 - foreigners, by, 50
 - joint-inventor, by, 42
 - master, by, 41
 - servant, by, 41
 - grounds of, 40, 43, 48
 - procedure on, 51—54
- prolongation, to, 149

INDEX.

PARTICULARS,

- amendment of, 183, 184
- breaches, of, in action for infringement, 175, 176, 177, 213--216
 - certificate as to, 213--216
 - costs of, 214
- objections, of, action for infringement, in, 178--183, 213
 - costs of, 213--216
 - revocation proceedings, in, 120

PARTIES,

- action for infringement, to, 171--173
- petition for compulsory licence, to, 103
 - extension, to, 146, 147

PATENT: *see* GRANT: LETTERS PATENT.

- use of the word, 39

PATENT AGENTS,

- communications to, not privileged, 196
- definition of, 271
- erasure of name of, from register, 231, 233
- examination of persons qualifying as, 231, 233
- fees payable by, 238
- form of declaration by, 237
 - register of, 237
- register of, 231, 237
 - rules, 231--238
- registration of, 230, 231
- what persons are capable of being registered as, 231, 232, 233

PATENT OFFICE,

- Comptroller of, 255
- creation of, 255
- documents in, how proved, 198
- examiners of, 256
- publications, 259
- reports of examiners of, 214, 275, 276
- seal, 37

PATENTED, representing article as, when not, penalty for, 39

PATENTEE: *see* TRUE AND FIRST INVENTOR.

- definition of, 255
- who may be, 25--28

PATENTS ACTS: *see* ACTS, PATENT.

PATENTS RULES, 1903...280 *et seq.*

PENALTIES: *see* OFFENCES.

PERPETUAL INJUNCTION: *see* INJUNCTION.

PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVES: *see* LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE.

PETITION,

- compulsory licence, for, 102--107, 296
- prolongation, for, 147
- revocation, for, 119

INDEX.

PLEADINGS,

- action for infringement, in, 173—175
- threats, in, 133, 134

POSSESSION,

- infringing article, of, is actionable, 168

PRINCIPLE

- coupled with mode of carrying into effect is patentable, 6
- per se* not patentable, 6

PRIOR GRANT,

- objection to validity of patent, is, 178, 182
- opposition to grant of patent on ground of, 43

PRIOR PUBLICATION: *and see* NOVELTY.

- abroad, effect of, 7
- book, by description in, 8
- common knowledge, need not be a matter of, 9
- communications to individuals, by, 13
- description sufficient to be, what is, 11
- documents in public libraries, by, 9
- drawings, by, 12
- exhibition, by, 12, 13
- fact, is a question of, 8, 9
- fatal to validity, is, 8
- foreign language, in, 8
- models, by, 12
- provisional specification, by, 8
- sales need not be shown to prove, 10
- specifications, by, 8
- s. 1 of the Act of 1902, effect of, as regards, 8, 277

PRIOR USER: *and see* NOVELTY.

- abroad, effect of, 7
- discontinued, effect of, 16
- established, how, 14
- experimental, effect of, 15
- fatal to validity, is, when, 14
- instances of, 15
- meaning of, 14
- not fatal to validity, is, when, 15, 16
- provisional specification, under, 16

PRIVY COUNCIL: *see* COMPULSORY LICENSES; PROLONGATION; RULES.

PROCESS,

- inspection of, 192—194
- patentable, is, 4

PRODUCT,

- per se* is not patentable, 7

PROFITS,

- account of, when ordered, 211
- when refused, 212
- petition for extension, on, 139 *et seq*

INDEX.

PROLONGATION OF GRANT,

- petition for, 137, 147
 - accounts on, 139
 - costs of, 150
 - matters considered on, 137
 - opposition to, 149
 - procedure on, 147 *et seq.*
 - terms, imposing, on, 145
 - who may, 146

PROPRIETOR,

- patent, of, who may be, 25, 26
- registration as, 108

PROTECTION,

- complete, 246
- provisional, 36, 246
- Convention, under the, 227 *et seq.*

PROVISIONAL SPECIFICATION,

- abandonment of, 8
- advantages in leaving, in first instance, 55
- amendment of, 33, 57
- complete specification may introduce improvements on invention disclosed in, 70
 - may omit matters not contained in, 71
- contents of, 56
- disadvantages in leaving, in first instance, 56
- disconformity between, and complete specification, 70
- drawings, may be accompanied by, 58
- examination of, 32—35
- nature of invention, must describe, 57
- office of, 57
- publication of, 36, 55
- refusal of acceptance of, 33
 - appeal from, 33
- relation of, to complete specification, 58

PUBLIC,

- disclosure: *see* PRIOR PUBLICATION.
- "reasonable requirements of," meaning of, 102
- register, inspection of, by, 113
- specifications, inspection of, by, 36
- user: *see* PRIOR USER.

PURCHASER,

- infringing article, of, discovery as to name of, 194, 211, 212
 - is liable in action for infringement, 172, 208
 - may be sued with the manufacturer, 172

REALM,

- meaning of, 7, 28

RECTIFICATION OF REGISTER, 111

REDUCTION, action of, for revocation, 119

REGISTER OF PATENTS,

- copies of entries in, 113

INDEX.

REGISTER OF PATENTS—*continued.*

- correction of errors in, 110
- entry in,
 - amendment, of, 110
 - assignments, of, 108
 - change of name, of, 110
 - extensions, of, 107, 108
 - grants of patents, of, 107
 - mortgages, of, 109
 - licences, of, 109
 - non-payment of fees, of, 107
 - trusts, of, 109
 - verbal agreements, of, 109
- evidence, *prima facie*, is, of entries, 107
- extracts from, 113
- false entries in, making, effect of, 112
- inspection of, 113
- kept, to be, 107

REGISTER OF PATENT AGENTS: *see* PATENT AGENTS.

REMEDIES,

- patentee, of, in action for infringement, 203 *et seq.*
- public, of: *see* REVOCATION OF PATENTS; THREATS.

RENEWAL FEES: *see* FEES.

REPAIRS, infringement, may amount to, 168

REPORTS,

- Board of Trade, of, on petition for compulsory licence, 104
- examiners, of, 33, 244, 275, 276
- patent cases, of, to be published, 254

REVOCATION OF PATENTS,

- appeal from decision as to, 123
- compulsory licence, on petition for, 102, 277
- costs in proceedings for, 123
- estoppel, no, in proceedings for, 122
- grounds for, 114 *et seq.*
- interrogatories in proceedings for, 121
- particulars of objections in proceedings for, 120
- petition for, 119
- proceedings for, do not lie, when, 111
- procedure on petition for, 119
 - in Scotland, 119, 263
- stay pending appeal from decision as to, 122, 123
- trial, 121

ROYAL ARMS, effect of use of, without authority, 40

ROYALTIES,

- action for, 100, 101
- defence to, 101

RULES,

- law officers, 224—226
- Patents, 1903...280—291
- Privy Council, 1897...303—305
- 1903...104—107

INDEX.

- SALE,
anticipation by prior, 14
infringement by, 166—168
patent, of: *see* ASSIGNMENT OF PATENT.
- SAMPLES, order to take, 192
- SCIRE FACIAS*, grounds on which patents formerly repealed by,
are available by way of defence to action for infringement, 178
grounds for revocation of patent, 114
- SCOTLAND,
proceedings in, 262, 263
revocation of patents in, 119
within the realm, *is*, 28
- SEAL,
Patent Office, of, effect of, 37
judicially noticed, *is*, 256
- SEALING OF PATENT,
opposition to, 40 *et seq.*
time for, 37
extension of, 37
- SEARCH AS TO NOVELTY,
Act of 1902, under, 31, 35, 275
present time, at, 31
- SECRET,
Secretary for War may order invention to be kept, 95
user does not invalidate patent, 15
- SECRETARY FOR WAR,
assignment of patent to, 95
- SECURITY FOR COSTS, 222
- SERVANT,
improvements made by, on master's invention, belong to whom, 26,
27, 41
inventions by, property in, 27, 41
opposition to grant of patent by, 41
- SERVICE,
documents to be sent to Patent Office, of, 31, 32
notice of motion for rectification of register, of, 112
writ, of, out of the jurisdiction, 173
- SHORTHAND NOTES, costs of, 219, 220
- SOLICITOR AND CLIENT COSTS,
plaintiff entitled to, when, 216
- SOLICITOR-GENERAL: *see* LAW OFFICER.
- SPECIFICATION: *see* AMENDMENT; COMPLETE SPECIFICATION; PRO-
VISIONAL SPECIFICATION.
- STATEMENT OF CLAIM,
action for infringement, in, 173, 174
threats, in, 133

INDEX.

STATEMENT OF DEFENCE,

- action for infringement, in, 175
- threats, in, 134

STATUTE OF MONOPOLIES,

- action under, for threats, 124
- "manufacture," meaning of, in, 1 *et seq.*
- provisions of s. 6 of, 1
- subject-matter of patents depends on, 1

STATUTES : *see* ACTS, PATENT.

STATUTORY DECLARATION : *see* DECLARATION.

STAY OF EXECUTION : *see* EXECUTION.

SUBJECT-MATTER OF PATENTS,

- combinations are, 3
- essentials of, 1 *et seq.*
- improvements are, 2
- invention, must involve, 20
- "manufacture," a, must be, 1
- new, must be, 7
- Statute of Monopolies, depends on, 1
- principles, applied, are, 6
- processes are, 4
- products, *per se*, are not, 7
- useful, must be, 16 *et seq.*

SUBORDINATE INTEGERS, claims for, 75, 76

TERM OF PATENT,

- commencement of, 37, 38
- extension of : *see* PROLONGATION OF GRANT.
- fourteen years, is, 38

THREATENED INFRINGEMENT, action to restrain, 168, 200

THREATS,

- action for, Assizes, may be tried at, 131
 - under Patents Act, 1883...125
 - Statute of Monopolies, 124
- defences to, 128
- particulars in, 133, 134
- pleadings in, 133, 134
- injunctions in, 132, 135
- stay of, 134
- definition of, 125, 126
- examples of, 127
- letter, by, 128
- remedies for, 135, 136
- what amounts to actionable, 125—127
- word of mouth, by, 128

TIME,

- complete specification, for accepting, 35
 - for leaving, 29
- enlargement of, generally, 289
 - petition for extension, for presenting, 147, 151
- register of patents, for inspection of, 113

INDEX.

- TITLE,**
invention, of, amendment of, 57
objection to by Comptroller, 33
by public, 56, 57
plaintiff's, in action for infringement, must be strictly proved, 198
- TRANSMISSION,**
letters patent, of, 90
registration of, 108
- TRIAL: *and see* ACTION FOR INFRINGEMENT.**
action for infringement, of, 197 *et seq.*
threats, of, 131
petition for revocation, of, 121
- TRUE AND FIRST INVENTOR,**
importer is, 27, 28
meaning of, 27
patentee must be, 26
plea that plaintiff is not, 179
who is, 26 -28
- TRUSTS,**
notice of, cannot be registered, 109
- UNDERTAKING,**
account, to keep, 187, 190, 221
costs, to repay, 221
damages, as to, 191
- UNPATENTED INVENTION,**
agreement as to, 91
property in, 90
- USE: *see* USER.**
- USEFUL: *and see* UTILITY.**
invention must be, 16, 17
- USER: *and see* PRIOR USER.**
abandoned, effect of, 16
exhibition, at, 13
infringement, is, 161, 165
invention, of, no, evidence of want of utility, 19
provisional protection, during, effect of, 16
- UTILITY,**
amount of, need not be great, 17
claim for something without, effect of, 71
evidence of, 18, 19
want of, 19
general, is sufficient, 19
meaning of, 17
prolongation, is considered on petition for, 138
subject-matter, is an essential of, 16, 17
- VALIDITY,**
action for infringement, raising question as to, in, 178
threats, raising question as to, in, 133

INDEX.

VALIDITY—*continued.*

- assignee cannot dispute, 91
- assignor cannot dispute, 91, 92
- evidence of, on motion for injunction, 185 *et seq.*
- guaranteed under Act of 1902, is not, 276, 277
- licensee cannot dispute, 99
- licensor cannot dispute, 99
- prolongation, not considered on petition for, 144

VARIANCE OF SPECIFICATIONS: *see* DISCONFORMITY.

VEND,

- licence to make includes licence to, 98
- sole right to, is conferred by the grant, 152

VENDOR,

- damages against, 208
- infringing article, of, is liable as infringer, 166, 167

VESSELS, FOREIGN, use of patented article on, 166

WAR, SECRETARY OF STATE FOR, assignments to, 95

WARRANTY: *see* VALIDITY.

WITNESSES,

- costs of, 220
- cross-examination of, should not be kept back, 122
- expert: *see* EXPERTS.
- list, petition for revocation may be ordered to go into, 121

WORKMAN: *see* SERVANT.

THE END.

SUPPLEMENT.

PATENTS RULES, 1905.

PATENTS RULES, 1905.

By virtue of the provisions of the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Acts, 1883 to 1902, the Board of Trade do hereby make the following Rules:—

SHORT TITLE.

1. These Rules may be cited as the Patents Rules, 1905.

COMMENCEMENT.

2. These Rules shall come into operation from and immediately after the 31st day of December, 1904.

INTERPRETATION.

3. In the construction of these Rules, any words herein used defined by the said Acts shall have the meanings thereby assigned to them respectively.

APPLICATIONS FOR PATENTS.

4. The statement of the invention claimed, with which a complete specification must end, shall be clear and succinct as well as separate and distinct from the body of the specification.

5. For Rule 9 of the Patents Rules, 1903, the following Rule shall be substituted:—

When a specification comprises several distinct matters, they shall not be deemed to constitute one invention by reason only that they are all applicable to or may form parts of an existing machine, apparatus, or process.

Where a person making application for a patent has included in his specification more than one invention, the Comptroller may require or allow him to amend such application and specification and drawings or any of them so as to apply to one invention only, and the applicant may make application for a separate patent for any invention excluded by such amendment.

Every such last-mentioned application may, if the Comptroller at any time so direct, bear the date of the original application, or such date between the date of the original application and the date of the application in question, as the Comptroller may direct, and shall otherwise be proceeded with as a substantive application in the manner prescribed by the said Acts and by any Rules thereunder for the time being in force.

Where the Comptroller has required or allowed any application, specification or drawings to be amended as aforesaid, such

SUPPLEMENT.

application shall, if the Comptroller at any time so direct, bear such date, subsequent to the original date of the application and not later than the date when the amendment was made, as the Comptroller shall consider reasonably necessary to give sufficient time for the subsequent procedure relating to such application.

PROCEDURE UNDER SECTION 1 OF THE PATENTS ACT, 1902.

6. If after the leaving of any complete specification the Examiner reports that the nature of the invention is not sufficiently disclosed and defined to enable him to make the investigation prescribed by sub-section 1, and the Comptroller has required amendment of the specification and drawings, or either of them, the application shall, if the Comptroller at any time so direct, bear such date, subsequent to its original date and not later than the date when the requirement is complied with, as the Comptroller may consider reasonably necessary to give sufficient time for the subsequent procedure relating to such application.

7. When the Examiner in prosecution of the investigation prescribed by sub-section 1, finds that the invention claimed in the specification under examination has been wholly claimed or described in one or more specifications within the meaning of the sub-section in question, he shall, without any further prosecution of the investigation, make a provisional report to that effect to the Comptroller.

If the provisional report of the Examiner made under this Rule be not reversed or altered, it shall be deemed a final report, and the application shall be dealt with as provided by sub-section 6. If, however, such provisional report be reversed or altered, the investigation prescribed by sub-section 1 shall be continued, and a further report shall be made to the Comptroller, and the specification shall be dealt with as provided in sub-section 5 or sub-section 6, as the case may require.

8. The time within which an applicant may leave his amended specification under sub-section 2 shall be two months from the date of the letter informing him that the invention claimed has been wholly or in part claimed or described in any specification or specifications within the meaning of sub-section 1.

In any special case the Comptroller may, if he think fit, enlarge the time prescribed by this Rule.

9. When the applicant for a patent has been informed of the result of the investigation of the Examiner, made under the provisions of sub-section 1, and the time allowed by Rule 8 for

PATENTS RULES, 1905.

amendment of his specification has expired, the Comptroller, if he is not satisfied that no objection exists to the specification on the ground that the invention claimed therein has been wholly or in part claimed or described in a previous specification within the meaning of that sub-section, shall inform the applicant accordingly, and appoint a time for hearing him, and shall give him ten days' notice at the least of such appointment. The applicant shall as soon as possible notify the Comptroller whether or not he desires to be heard. The Comptroller shall after hearing the applicant, or without a hearing, if the applicant has not attended a hearing appointed or has notified that he does not desire to be heard, determine whether reference ought to be made in the applicant's specification to any, and, if so, what, prior specification or specifications by way of notice to the public.

10. When under sub-section 6 the Comptroller determines that a reference to a prior specification ought to be made by way of notice to the public, the form of reference shall be as follows and shall be inserted after the claims :—

Reference has been directed in pursuance of section 1, sub-section 6, of the Patents Act, 1902, to the following specification of Letters Patent No. granted to .

Where the reference is inserted as the result of a provisional report under Rule 7, a statement to that effect shall be added to the reference.

APPEAL.

11. Every decision of the Comptroller under the foregoing Rules shall be subject to an appeal to the Law Officer.

SEALING OF PATENT AND PAYMENT OF FEE.

12. If the applicant for a patent desires to have a patent sealed on his application, he must, on or before the last day on which a patent can lawfully be sealed, pay the prescribed sealing fee; and if such fee be not paid, no patent shall be sealed.

The prescribed sealing fee should be paid by leaving at the Patent Office Form X in the Second Schedule to these Rules, duly stamped.

FEEES.

13. To the fees specified in the First Schedule to the Patents Rules, 1903, shall be added the Fee specified in the First Schedule hereto.

SUPPLEMENT.

FORMS.

14. To the forms contained in the Second Schedule to the Patents Rules, 1903, shall be added the Form X contained in the Second Schedule hereto; and in the Form C contained in the first mentioned Schedule the following direction shall be added in a marginal note, namely:—"In the preparation of the claim or claims careful attention should be paid to the terms of Rule 4 of the Patents Rules, 1905. Any unnecessary multiplicity of claims or prolixity of language should be avoided."

SIZE, &c., OF DOCUMENTS.

15. For Rule 17 of the Patents Rules, 1903, the following Rules shall be substituted:—

All documents and copies of documents, except drawings, sent to or left at the Patent Office or otherwise furnished to the Comptroller or to the Board of Trade shall be written, typewritten, lithographed or printed in the English language (unless otherwise directed) in large and legible characters with deep permanent ink upon strong white paper, and, except in the case of statutory declarations and affidavits, on one side only, of a size of approximately 13 inches by 8 inches, leaving a margin of at least one inch and a half on the left-hand part thereof, and the signatures thereto must be written in a large and legible hand. Duplicate documents shall at any time be left, if required by the Comptroller.

At the top of the first page of a specification a space of about two inches should be left blank.

DRAWINGS ACCOMPANYING SPECIFICATIONS.

16. For Rules 18 to 24 of the Patents Rules, 1903, the following Rules shall be substituted.

As the drawings are printed by a photolithographic process, the character of each original drawing must be brought as nearly as possible to a uniform standard of excellence, suited to the requirements of such process, and calculated to give the best results in the interests of inventors, of the Office, and of the public. The following requirements should, therefore, be strictly observed, as non-compliance therewith will be certain to cause delay in the progress of an application for a patent.

17. Drawings, when furnished, should accompany the provisional or complete specification to which they refer, except in the case provided for by Rule 24. No drawing or sketch

PATENTS RULES, 1905.

such as would require the preparation for the printer of a special illustration for use in the letterpress of the specification when printed should appear in the specification itself.

18. Drawings may be made by hand or lithographed, printed, &c. They must be made on pure white, hot-pressed, rolled, or calendered strong paper of smooth surface, good quality, and medium thickness without washes or colours, in such a way as to admit of being clearly reproduced on a reduced scale by photography. Mounted drawings must not be used.

19. Drawings must be on sheets which measure 13 inches from top to bottom and are either from 8 inches to $8\frac{1}{2}$ inches or from 16 inches to $16\frac{1}{2}$ inches wide, the narrower sheets being preferable.

If there are more figures than can be shown on one of the smaller sized sheets, two or more of these sheets should be used in preference to employing the larger size. When an exceptionally large drawing is required, it should be continued on subsequent sheets. There is no limit to the number of sheets that may be sent in, but no more sheets should be employed than are necessary, and the figures should be numbered consecutively throughout, and without regard to the number of sheets. The figures should not be more numerous than is absolutely necessary. They should be separated by a sufficient space to keep them distinct.

20. Drawings must be prepared in accordance with the following requirements:—

- (a) They must be executed with absolutely black ink.
- (b) Each line must be firmly and evenly drawn, sharply defined, and of the same strength throughout.
- (c) Section lines, lines for effect, and shading lines should be as few as possible, and must not be closely drawn.
- (d) Shade lines must not contrast too much in thickness with the general lines of the drawing.
- (e) Sections and shadings should not be represented by solid black or washes.
- (f) They should be on a scale sufficiently large to show the invention clearly, and only so much of the apparatus, machine, &c., should appear as effects this purpose. If the scale is given, it should be drawn, and not denoted by words.

Reference letters and figures, and index numerals used in conjunction therewith, must be bold, distinct, and not less than one-eighth of an inch in height. The same letters should be used in different views of the same parts. Where the reference letters

SUPPLEMENT.

are shown outside the figure, they must be connected with the parts referred to by fine lines.

21. Drawings must bear the name of the applicant (and, in the case of drawings left with a complete specification after a provisional specification, the number and year of the application) in the left-hand top corner; the number of sheets of drawings sent, and the consecutive number of each sheet, in the right-hand top corner; and the signature of the applicant or his agent in the right-hand bottom corner. Neither the title of the invention nor any descriptive matter should appear on the drawings.

22. A facsimile or "true copy" of the original drawings must be filed at the same time as the original drawings, prepared strictly in accordance with the above Rules, except that it may be on tracing cloth, and the reference letters and figures should be in black-lead pencil.

The words "original" or "true copy" must in each case be marked at the right-hand top corner, under the numbering of the sheet.

23. Drawings must be delivered at the Patent Office so as to be free from folds, breaks, or creases which would render them unsuitable for reproduction by photography.

24. If an applicant desires to adopt the drawings lodged with his provisional specification as the drawings for his complete specification, he should refer to them in the complete specification as those left with the provisional specification.

Dated the 20th day of October, 1904.

G. W. BALFOUR,
President of the Board of Trade.

THE FIRST SCHEDULE.

Fee payable on Sealing of Patent in respect of each application, £1.

THE SECOND SCHEDULE.

Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Acts, 1883 to 1902.

FORM X.

FORM OF NOTICE OF DESIRE TO HAVE PATENT SEALED.

I [*or we*] desire to have a patent sealed on my [*or our*] Application No. of 19 , and I [*or we*] hereby transmit the prescribed fee on sealing.

[*Name or names and address of applicant or applicants.*]

To the Comptroller.