

(b) *Unintentional*. Where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to this paragraph. A grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph must be accompanied by:

(1) The required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof;

(2) The petition fee as set forth in § 1.17(m);

(3) A statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

(4) Any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in § 1.20(d)) required pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section.

(c) In a design application, a utility application filed before June 8, 1995, or a plant application filed before June 8, 1995, any petition to revive pursuant to this section must be accompanied by a terminal disclaimer and fee as set forth in § 1.321 dedicating to the public a terminal part of the term of any patent granted thereon equivalent to the period of abandonment of the application. Any terminal disclaimer pursuant to this paragraph must also apply to any patent granted on any continuing application that contains a specific reference under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) to the application for which revival is sought. The provisions of this paragraph do not apply to lapsed patents.

(d) Any request for reconsideration or review of a decision refusing to revive an abandoned application or lapsed patent upon petition filed pursuant to this section, to be considered timely, must be filed within two months of the decision refusing to revive or within such time as set in the decision. Unless a decision indicates

otherwise, this time period may be extended under the provisions of § 1.136.

(e) A provisional application, abandoned for failure to timely respond to an Office requirement, may be revived pursuant to this section so as to be pending for a period of no longer than twelve months from its filing date. Under no circumstances will a provisional application be regarded as pending after twelve months from its filing date.

[62 FR 53194, Oct. 10, 1997]

§ 1.138 Express abandonment.

An application may be expressly abandoned by filing in the Patent and Trademark Office a written declaration of abandonment signed by the applicant and the assignee of record, if any, and identifying the application. An application may also be expressly abandoned by filing a written declaration of abandonment signed by the attorney or agent of record. A registered attorney or agent acting under the provision of § 1.34(a), or of record, may also expressly abandon a prior application as of the filing date granted to a continuing application when filing such a continuing application. Express abandonment of the application may not be recognized by the Office unless it is actually received by appropriate officials in time to act thereon before the date of issue.

[49 FR 48452, Dec. 12, 1984]

§ 1.139 [Reserved]

JOINDER OF INVENTIONS IN ONE APPLICATION; RESTRICTION

AUTHORITY: Secs. 1.141 to 1.147 also issued under 35 U.S.C. 121.

§ 1.141 Different inventions in one national application.

(a) Two or more independent and distinct inventions may not be claimed in one national application, except that more than one species of an invention, not to exceed a reasonable number, may be specifically claimed in different claims in one national application, provided the application also includes an allowable claim generic to all the claimed species and all the claims to species in excess of one are written in

§ 1.142

dependent form (§1.75) or otherwise include all the limitations of the generic claim.

(b) Where claims to all three categories, product, process of making, and process of use, are included in a national application, a three way requirement for restriction can only be made where the process of making is distinct from the product. If the process of making and the product are not distinct, the process of using may be joined with the claims directed to the product and the process of making the product even though a showing of distinctness between the product and process of using the product can be made.

[52 FR 20046, May 28, 1987]

§ 1.142 Requirement for restriction.

(a) If two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in a single application, the examiner in an Office action will require the applicant in the reply to that action to elect an invention to which the claims will be restricted, this official action being called a requirement for restriction (also known as a requirement for division). Such requirement will normally be made before any action on the merits; however, it may be made at any time before final action.

(b) Claims to the invention or inventions not elected, if not canceled, are nevertheless withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner by the election, subject however to reinstatement in the event the requirement for restriction is withdrawn or overruled.

[24 FR 10332, Dec. 22, 1959, as amended at 62 FR 53195, Oct. 10, 1997]

§ 1.143 Reconsideration of requirement.

If the applicant disagrees with the requirement for restriction, he may request reconsideration and withdrawal or modification of the requirement, giving the reasons therefor. (See §1.111.) In requesting reconsideration the applicant must indicate a provisional election of one invention for prosecution, which invention shall be the one elected in the event the requirement becomes final. The require-

37 CFR Ch. I (7-1-99 Edition)

ment for restriction will be reconsidered on such a request. If the requirement is repeated and made final the examiner will at the same time act on the claims to the invention elected.

§ 1.144 Petition from requirement for restriction.

After a final requirement for restriction, the applicant, in addition to making any reply due on the remainder of the action, may petition the Commissioner to review the requirement. Petition may be deferred until after final action on or allowance of claims to the invention elected, but must be filed not later than appeal. A petition will not be considered if reconsideration of the requirement was not requested (see § 1.181).

[62 FR 53195, Oct. 10, 1997]

§ 1.145 Subsequent presentation of claims for different invention.

If, after an office action on an application, the applicant presents claims directed to an invention distinct from and independent of the invention previously claimed, the applicant will be required to restrict the claims to the invention previously claimed if the amendment is entered, subject to reconsideration and review as provided in §§ 1.143 and 1.144.

§ 1.146 Election of species.

In the first action on an application containing a generic claim to a generic invention (genus) and claims to more than one patentably distinct species embraced thereby, the examiner may require the applicant in the reply to that action to elect a species of his or her invention to which his or her claim will be restricted if no claim to the genus is found to be allowable. However, if such application contains claims directed to more than a reasonable number of species, the examiner may require restriction of the claims to not more than a reasonable number of species before taking further action in the application.

[62 FR 53195, Oct. 10, 1997]