IJBPAS, October, 2023, 12(10): 4601-4608

ISSN: 2277–4998

International Journal of Biology, Pharmacy and Allied Sciences (IJBPAS)

'A Bridge Between Laboratory and Reader'

www.ijbpas.com

NON-OBVIOUSNESS PATENT

R. NANDHAKUMAR[1*] AND K. KATHIRESAN[2]

1: PG Student, Department of Pharmacy, Annamalai University

2: Associate Professor, Department of Pharmacy, Annamalai University

[*]**Corresponding Author: Mr. R. Nandhakumar: E Mail:** nandha2722000@gmail.com

Received 20th July 2022; Revised 25th Sept. 2022; Accepted 29th Jan. 2023; Available online 1st Oct. 2023

https://doi.org/10.31032/IJBPAS/2023/12.10.7479

ABSTRACT

Focuses on the standard approach to court rulings and the selection quality practices of Japan, the United States and the EPO, in terms of criteria for determining the transparency of a patent requirement for a patent. The new standards utilised by granting of patent by the United States Patent and Trademark registry are examined with regard to legal and governmental issues. Using the post-criteria to grant a "non-obvious" invention patent. Discussing the patent act 1952 focused on condition of patentability in three sections. Determination of framework for inventive step and its application process explained. Lastly the final section of paper discusses about non patentable subject matters.

Keywords: Patent invention, Non-Obviousness, Trademark

INTRODUCTION

Lack of transparency in many ways draws the most important line between the heart of the patent system, the patent and the patented invention. As we saw in that chapter, if an invention is to be expected, every element of it must be in a pre-art reference. The person alleging expectation is effectively saying “we have already got it” and it is a single thing.

Innovative action is distinct. A claim that an invention is obvious does not necessarily imply that it is an existing invention. He contends that it is really a trivial reunion of prior art's elements and that anyone with average artistic skill (or PHOSITA) may create new inventions by borrowing ideas from earlier works. This is a task that is artificial by nature. Placing

oneself in the shoes of a hypothetical PHOSITA prior to the new invention requires that one take into account all of the resources available in the field of art to them as well as the opposite nature of the issue. It'll be resolved **[1]**.

Conditions of licence; non-obvious content

Even though the patented invention is not similarly revealed as required by section 102, a patent cannot be got if the distinction betwixt the hold invention and the previous art are such that the patented invention as an entire should have been obvious to someone with normal skill in the relevant field before the claimed invention's effective date of filling. The way the invention was created in conjunction with the claimed invention will not result in the patent being cancelled. The innovation method will not cause the patent to be cancelled. The history of the legislative requirement for non-obviousness is founded in some disputes between the courts and Congress. Many people thought that the standards that the courts, backed by the Supreme Court, had set for what constituted an innovation were excessively stringent.

They were described as requiring "a flash of genius" by some. It will be interesting to see how you respond to Graham v. John Deere after reading it in the perspective of non-obviousness **[2]**.

The Patent Act of 1952

Three sections of the statute specify the requirements for a patent. These three categories' organisational patterns can be used to analyse the three explicit conditions that apply to patents: innovation and application, as defined and defined in § 101 and § 102, and not as explicitly stated in § 103, but in new legal formulation. There is no need for an explanation for the "new and valuable" experiments that are always present in the legal system in the first two sections, which closely examine the 1874 law. The main area centred on the current controversy is 103. **[2]**

Non-obvious subject matter; conditions for patentability

"The differences between the object of the patent and the prior art are subject matter, and the invention may not be protected even if it is not universally represented or described as referred to in Section 102 of this book. When the idea was created, anyone with average talent in the field would have understood the entire process. The innovation method will not invalidate the patent. The section is written in relatively vague terms. Patent is, in addition to innovation and application, depend on the "non-explicit" nature of the subject matter for which person with normal talent in the pertinent art wants to obtain a patent.

The main difference is that Hotchkiss' less definite "inventive" language, which Congress considers to have led to "different" expressions in congressional decisions and writings, has been emphasized as "obviously non-existent" as a functional test of the division. In the title, Congress focuses on "non-explicit terms" rather than "patent conditions" and "inventions". That rule speaks the language most frequently used in court decisions, and this section has been added to the law for uniformity and certainty. This section ought to stabilise the work and lessen any significant departures that might occasionally occur **[3]**.

NON-OBVIOUSNESS PATENT

"Inventive steps" refers to a trait that prevents an innovation from becoming obvious to someone with the necessary expertise.

1. DEFINITION OF INVENTIVE STEP

1.1 Convention on Patents in Europe (EPC)

According to the present condition of the art, a step is considered to be an inventive if it is not clear to a professional in the field.

1.2 U.S. Patent Code

The distinctions between the topic seeking patent and the prior art, as well as the general subject at the time of the inventive, were clear to someone of ordinary ability, hence the patent may not be granted. Art.

1.3 The Japanese Patent Act

A person who is ordinarily knowledgeable in the art of invention will not be given a patent for such an invention if they can make an invention based on prior art with relative ease.

According to the invention is an aspect of an invention that involves technological advancement in comparison to existing knowledge or economic significance or both, which is not obvious to someone who is gifted in the arts in addition to the previously mentioned requirements, the definition of the innovation step has been enlarged to take into account the invention's economic importance.

If an invention is clear to a human competent in the field, it is not regarded as an inventive action under the current state of the art. "Explicit" does not go far away the naturally occurring advancement of technology, but rather follows directly or naturally from the previous art, one that doesn't require any skill or aptitude above that which is reasonable to expect of a gifted individual. In art.

For this purpose, the "talented person in the arts" should be considered a casual practitioner, knowing on a relevant date what the general knowledge is in the relevant art. In some cases, a person who is

talented in the arts can be considered as a group or a group of persons rather than as an individual. **[3, 4]**

The modern legal view on non-obviousness

From a contemporary outlook, a main turning point in patent law transpire in 1966 when United states Supreme Court decided that the following factors should have been solved in determining obviousness (and by elimination, non-obviousness)

The following criteria must be met:

• The purpose and details of the antecedent works;

• The earlier art's level of average talent;

• The distinction between the invention at issue and the antecedent knowledge; and

• Objective proof of integrity.

Additionally, the United States Supreme Court provided illustration of elements in Graham that demonstrate the so-called. "Objective proof that is not clear." Among these elements are:

- Success in business,
- Long-felt demands that haven't been met, and
- Other people's failures.

The EPO patent examiner is required to ascertain whether distinctions exist in between the invention and the nearest previous art, in contrary to the USPTO patent examiner who determines whether the invention is non-obvious. If there aren't any significant distinctions, the invention is considered to be unoriginal; when there are, the patent examiner assesses what specific technical issues is successfully addressed by combining these characteristics into the body of previous art knowledge. The patents examiner analyses whether the claim is "accessible" to the competent person (referred to as "transparent") or whether the claim solution to the relevant technical issue simply not transparent.

If the patent researcher is unable to diagnose the technical problem, the invention will not involve an invention step. Conversely without making an effort to create an objective, the USPTO patent examiner immediately starts analysing whether the use of innovative components is explicit. Technical issue.

The Court of Appeals of the Federal Circuit (CAFC) has both gradually and overtly altered US patent law's environment. Its effects have increased the range of inventions that can be patented, decreased the quality of patenting, raised the possibility of a previously issued patent being challenged in court, and given patent owners with more valuable legal benefits in the form of limitations. In opposition to rivals and tempting financial rewards.

The predictable outcome is that patent owners will sue competitors more

frequently, and those being sued will be more eager to comply when facing legal repercussions. In Section Four of the article, the patent debate regarding the summary of "non-obviousness" problems discussed above will be further discussed. However, the next section offers policy recommendations based on national reports on patent policy about the use the legal concept of "Non obviousness". **[2]**

United States Patent Policies Reports: suggestions about non-obviousness standards

On the subject of "non-obviousness" in the granted, two nationwide reviews have been conducted. Many of the hearing attendees voiced worries about the quality of patents and the legal requirements, saying that they could unintentionally lead to market domination and hinder industrial innovation. The Federal Circuit's TSM test seeks to establish the standard of evidence that such Federal Circuit is applicable to low-level factual detectors by requiring the USPTO examiners to "link the dots" in a very clear and convincing manner. The Federal Circuit's TSM test is acknowledged in the FTC report as a critical component of the "non-explicit" criterion's evaluation. In the following statement, the FTC requests that crucial legalized standard used to establish whether such a patent are "obvious" be reinforced.

The Commission emphasises that a person with average analytical aptitude should be able to integrate or modify earlier creative notations that are compatible with innovation and problem-solving skills in order to evaluate "transparency." average artistic ability. Concerns regarding the USPTO's claimed loose implementation of the "non-obviousness" test, not just between industrial patents specifically but it also among patents in generally, as well as recent court rulings that have led to a visible lowering of the standard, led the NRC to make this recommendation. **[6, 8]**

Patent policy discussion

The issue over the non-obviousness criteria has still yet been explicitly addressed by the United States Congress while neither bill includes provisions to restore analytical rigour to the USPTO's non-obviousness standard.

However, as was stated earlier in the article, the problems with the diluted application of the "non-obviousness" criteria have resulted in an increased in the number of patents with overly broad claims, increasing transaction costs and creating uncertainty regarding the true extent of protecting intellectual property offered by a given patent **[5, 6]**.

Inventive Step Determination Framework

1) It is important to study all prior works of art (known works of art) while determining the structural innovation phase of determination. Such a critique is really challenging, though. As a result, it is believed that the review will approach it from the perspective of the patent system, patent processes, and innovation process.

Useful invention Constitution is a cited creation (problems, constitution) non-obviousness (inventive step): Using different ideas and methods to limit mentioned inventions in light of issues and the technological sector.

Relation to the issues that need to be resolved It is challenging to compare the actions of inventions itself betwixt both technologies for non-obviousness testing (inventions). Consequently, the first step is to establish a particular principle as a baseline for comparison. A clearer comparison will result from a standard that reduces the comparison's range. It also would be simpler to quantify the degree of similarity or distinction (commonality and similarity have similar meanings in this article, but the latter is used more extensively). The issue that has to be resolved is unrelated to the earlier invention's goal. **[1, 2]**

2) Application and Practice of Inventive Step Determination Processes

1. Acceptance of a used invention.
2. Selecting and recognising the cited invention's content.
3. In general, as in the cited inventions, earlier inventions that share characteristics with the applicable invention in technological disciplines and problem to be solved are chosen. There doesn't have to be a single invention for this to work. Both main and secondary inventions may be cited.
4. Recognizing similarities and differences between the cited and applied inventions.

a) There are many different ideas and characteristics in the constitution. Its notice of reasons for rejection, the examiner may state that a various point or feature is simply a compilation of the inventions that are referenced and the invention that was submitted.

b) The applicant may respond by arguing specifically how the concepts and their application in the submitted invention and also the cited invention differ. Due to the distinction indicated in Item, this is the case.

c) Is based on the variations in their guiding ideas and methods of application.

d) There are not many significant differences between the technological domains and the challenges to be tackled. They are utilised for references to their

guiding concepts and methods of application.

5. Non-obviousness can be anticipated based on the variances in the underlying principles and applications. **[1,2]**

UNPATENTED SUBJECT MATTER

An invention may not be eligible for patent protection even though it fits the criteria for novelty, creativity, and usefulness. The following are not inventions, according Section 3 of the Patents Act of 1970:

1. The creation that expressly says anything insignificant or in opposition to recognised natural laws.
2. The primary or intended application of an invention, or its commercial exploitation, may violate public order or discipline, or significantly harm people, animals, plants, or the environment.
3. The discovery of any living or inanimate item happening in nature, the development of a comprehensive hypothesis, or the discovery of a scientific concept.
4. A substance created through simple composition, which only produces the substance by combining the properties of its constituent parts; f) each simple arrangement, reorganisation, or duplication of existing devices that function independently of one another in a known manner; and g) substances exempted under the Patent (Amendment) Act of 2002.
5. Agriculture or horticultural system.
6. Medicine, surgical, diagnostic, preventative, therapeutic, or other therapies for humans, as well as any procedure that can cure an animal of a sickness or boost its economic or material value.
7. All plants and animals, with the exception of their microbes, as well as their seeds, variations, and species, as well as the biological processes involved in the growth or reproduction of those plants and animals.
8. A computer programme that has been integrated into the industry's technical software or hardware.
9. A literary, theatrical, musical or artistic work or any other aesthetic work, including cinematographic and television productions.
10. Just a plan, rule, or method for doing out a task or playing a game.
11. Information provision; o) the environment of integrated circuits.

An innovation of conventional wisdom or a collection or copy of well-known characteristics of a conventionally understood component or component **[9]**.

CONCLUSION

This experiment is obviously done from the perspective of a person with normal skills in the arts. Average abilities and lack of technological expertise when determining the invention step, the judge must assess the size and parameters of a person who is typically adept in that art

"according to the invention," even if the test is extremely crucial and subjective. To study the patent act 1952 and non-obviousness condition for patentability. Described the different country non obviousness patent and non-patentable subject matters. Elaborated the frame work of inventive step.

REFERENCES

[1] European Patent Office (2015). Guidelines for Examination in the European Patent Office. Part G, Chapter VII/5, Problem-and-Solution Approach http://documents.epo.org/projects/babylon/eponet.nsf/0/A62ECC3718E570B3C1257EF100351F38/$File/guidelines_for_examination_part_g_en.pdf

[2] John Deere Co (1966). 383 US 1, 148 USPQ 459.

[3] Federal Trade Commission. To promote innovation: the proper balance of competition and patent law and policy (a report by the Federal Trade Commission), Washington, D.C., October 28, 2003.

[4] Japan Patent Office (2015). Examination Guidelines for Patent and Utility Model in Japan. Part 3, Chapter 2, Section 2, Inventive Step. https://www.jpo.go.jp/e/toppage/tsukaikata/index.html

[5] KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. (2007). 550 US 398.

[6] United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) (2010). Examination Guidelines for Determining Obviousness under 35 USC 103 in View of the Supreme Court Decision in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/web/offices/com/sol/notices/72fr57526.pdf

[7] United States Patent and Trademark Office. The 21st Century Strategic Plan, Washington, D.C., February 3, 2003.

[8] United States Patent and Trademark Office. USPTO grants first patent under new accelerated review option, Press Release (#07-13), Washington, D.C., March 15, 2007a.

[9] Idris, K., Intellectual property: a power tool for economic growth (second ed.). World Intellectual Property Organization (WPO Publication No. 888.1), Geneva, Switzerland, June 2003.