

copy
C#
99
TEXT-BOOK

OF

THE PATENT LAWS

OF

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

BY

ALBERT H. WALKER.

OF THE NEW YORK BAR.

FOURTH EDITION.

NEW YORK:
BAKER, VOORHIS AND COMPANY.

1904.

11/11/11

COPYRIGHT, 1883, 1889, 1895, and 1904.

BY

ALBERT H. WALKER.

Rec. March 21, 1904.

J. B. LYON COMPANY
PRINTERS AND BINDERS
ALBANY, N. Y.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THE Constitution and the statutes of the United States, together with twelve hundred and forty-six Federal and State judicial decisions, are the principal sources from which the materials for this text-book were drawn. The most extensive treatise heretofore published on the same subject, was published in 1873; but it cited only two hundred and eighty American cases, together with one hundred and sixty-one English adjudications. The inadequacy, to the needs of the profession, of a treatise so limited in scope, was clearly impressed upon me when I entered, in 1877, upon a somewhat extended practice in patent litigation. During the next four years, I was called upon to argue several patent cases in the Supreme Court, and many others in many of the Circuit Courts of the United States; and in preparing those arguments, I was forced to make many laborious researches, from which a complete text-book would have largely relieved me. Under these circumstances, I resolved, early in 1881, to undertake the production of a treatise so much needed by the profession. I began writing on the first day of May of that year, and soon became so much interested in the work, that I largely suspended my active practice of the law, in order to give the book the freshest of my efforts, and thus the greatest de-

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

gree of merit consistent with my abilities. The resulting treatise covers the entire field of the patent laws of the United States, as those laws were enacted in the statutes and developed in the decisions, from the foundation of the national government in 1789, down to the first day of September, 1883. How accurately and well it covers that field, is a question which belongs to the bar and to the bench; and to the generous judgment of the bench and of the bar, I commit the result of my long and interesting labor.

A. H. W.

HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT,
September 26, 1883.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE patent laws of the United States, as those laws exist at this beginning of the second century of the national government, are stated and explained in this edition of this book. The differences between it and the first edition, consist in omitting eleven whole sections which have become obsolete since 1883, together with parts of many other sections for the same reason; and in inserting three new sections, and many new points in many other sections, which have been enacted in the statutes or developed in the decisions since that year; and in so changing or qualifying the statements of law in many other places as to make them conform to those relevant and often radical decisions of the courts which have been rendered since the first edition of the book was published. The work of making these changes began as soon after the publication of the first edition as new decisions were published, and has continued from that time to this, and has involved my careful study and analysis of the more than six hundred new decisions which are incorporated with the more than twelve hundred old ones in the table of cited cases. The generous judgment which has been passed upon the first edition of the work, has been made known through numerous citations of the book in the decisions of the courts, and through numerous letters received by me from my professional

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

brethren. Sincere thanks for the exceeding generosity of that judgment are now returned; and I am thereby encouraged to propose a third edition of the book in 1895, and a fourth edition at the beginning of the twentieth century.

A. H. W.

HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT,

April 30, 1889.

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

THE Supreme Court of the United States has lately decided the last of the patent cases, which were taken to that tribunal before the judiciary act of 1891 put a practical period to nearly the whole of its patent law jurisdiction. At this distinguished stage of legal evolution, the existing patent statutes, together with the thousands of patent decisions which have been made by the Supreme Court, and by the lower Federal courts under its guidance, contain materials for a nearly complete and a beautifully symmetrical science of the subject. To the study of the laws thus embodied and developed, I have devoted enthusiastic efforts for twenty years; and during the last eighteen of those years, I have practiced in those laws, in fifteen of the United States. This edition of my book is a result of that experience, and of my careful revision and enlargement of the second edition, into accurate conformity with the present law. The differences between this edition and the second, are far more numerous and important than those between the second and the first. No book so old as the second edition, nor even one a year younger, can be a reliable guide through the patent laws of to-day; but it is not probable that any development of those laws during any six years of the future, until Congress enacts a new system of patent statutes, will be nearly so extensive or important, as that

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

of the six years which have passed since 1889. Except in the event of such an enactment, a necessity for another edition of this book, cannot now be foreseen; and therefore I present this edition to the bench and to the bar, as probably my final contribution to the literature of the patent law.

A. H. W.

HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT,
November 16, 1895.

PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION.

CONGRESS has enacted six statutes amending the patent laws, and the courts have decided two thousand patent cases, since the third edition of this book was published in 1895. Two-thirds of those decisions were confined to questions of fact, the judicial answers to which contain no new material for a law book. But nearly seven hundred of those cases were found, upon careful examination by me, to contain contributions to the patent law. Those contributions, together with the amendments made by the six statutes, have been collected by me, and have been written by my own hand, into this text-book, in their proper places. I have now conducted one side or the other of nearly three hundred patent litigations in most of the States of the Union, and I have delivered many courses of lectures on the patent laws, in Cornell University, and in the University of Michigan. These labors, and the writing, during twenty-three years, of four editions of this text-book, and the studies incident to the litigations, the lectures and the authorship, have made me well acquainted with the patent laws of the United States. The analysis and arrangement of those laws, in the first edition of my book, have proved to be suitable, and will probably prove to be permanent; but the second and third editions were much enriched in detail, by hundreds of new

PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION.

points collected from the sources of the law; and the fourth edition contains more than six hundred new and material differences from the third. Future years will bring still further evolution of the patent laws; and I hope that future editions of this book, written by my hand, or by the hands of others, will formulate that evolution from period to period.

A. H. W.

PARK ROW BUILDING,
MANHATTAN, N. Y.,
February 1, 1904.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE SUBJECTS OF PATENTS Pages 1-15

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Constitutional and statutory foundation of the patent laws. | 12. Illustrated by the five cases when compared. |
| 2. Patent law meaning of the word "discovery." | 13. Illustrated by the five cases when contrasted. |
| 3. Patent law meaning of the word "art." | 14. Deduced from the five cases as compared and contrasted. |
| 7. Difference between a "process" and a "principle" inquired into. | 15. Illustrated by the eighth claim of Morse. |
| 8. Illustrated by the case of <i>McClurg v. Kingsland</i> . | 16. Machines, and improvements of machines. |
| 9. Illustrated by the case of <i>O'Reilly v. Morse</i> . | 17. Manufactures. |
| 10. Illustrated by the case of <i>Mowry v. Whitney</i> . | 18. Compositions of matter. |
| 11. Illustrated by the case of <i>Tilghman v. Proctor</i> . | 19. Distinction between machines, manufactures, and compositions of matter. |
| 11a. Illustrated by the Telephone Cases. | 20. Designs. |
| | 21. Design patents, under statutes earlier than 1873. |
| | 22. Ornament and utility. |

CHAPTER II.

INVENTION Pages 16-49

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 23. Invention necessary to patentability. | 25. Mere skill is not invention. |
| 24. Many negative rules, but no affirmative rule, for determining the presence or absence of invention. | 26. Circumstances indicating difference between invention and skill. |
| | 27. Excellence of workmanship is not invention. |

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>28. Substitution of materials is not invention.</p> <p>29. Exceptions to the last rule.</p> <p>30. Enlargement is not invention.</p> <p>31. Change of degree is not invention.</p> <p>31a. Exception to the last rule.</p> <p>32. Aggregation is not invention.</p> <p>33. Simultaneousness of action is not necessary to invention.</p> <p>34. Duplication is not generally invention.</p> <p>35. Omission is not generally invention.</p> <p>36. Substitution of equivalents is not generally invention.</p> <p>37. New combination without new mode of operation, is not invention.</p> <p>38. Using old thing for new and analogous purpose is not invention.</p> <p>39. Cases to which the last rule does not apply.</p> | <p>40. Doubts relevant to invention, when otherwise insoluble, are solved by ascertaining comparative utility.</p> <p>41. Form.</p> <p>41a. Proportion.</p> <p>42. Questions of invention are questions of fact.</p> <p>43. Questions of invention are investigated in the light of the state of the prior art.</p> <p>44. Joint and sole inventions.</p> <p>45. How made.</p> <p>46. How distinguished.</p> <p>47. Suggestions to an inventor.</p> <p>48. Information sought by an inventor.</p> <p>49. Mechanical skill not necessary to invention.</p> <p>50. Sole patent to one joint inventor is void.</p> <p>51. Joint patent to sole inventor and another is void.</p> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

CHAPTER III.

NOVELTY Pages 59-71

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>52. Novelty necessary to patentability.</p> <p>53. Novelty defined.</p> <p>54. Not negatived by prior knowledge or use in a foreign country.</p> <p>55. Not negatived by any private patent granted in a foreign country.</p> <p>56. Prior printed publications.</p> <p>57. Fullness of prior patents and printed publications.</p> <p>58. Novelty not negatived by any prior abandoned application.</p> | <p>59. Qualification of the last rule.</p> <p>60. Successful prior applications.</p> <p>61. Novelty not negatived by any unpublished drawing, or prior model.</p> <p>62. Novelty not negatived by anything substantially different.</p> <p>63. Abandoned experiments.</p> <p>64. Novelty in cases of designs.</p> <p>65. Novelty not negatived by anything apparently similar, but comparatively useless.</p> <p>66. Novelty not negatived by antiquity of parts.</p> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>67 Novelty not negatived by prior accidental and not recognized production.</p> <p>68. Novelty not negatived by anything neither designed, nor apparently adapted, nor actually used for the same purpose.</p> <p>69. Comparative dates.</p> <p>70. Dates of patented inventions.</p> <p>71. Novelty is negatived by one instance of prior knowledge and use in this country.</p> | <p>72. Novelty is negatived by prior existence and knowledge in this country.</p> <p>73. Inventor's lack of knowledge of anticipating matter is immaterial.</p> <p>74. Old thing derived from new source, is not novel.</p> <p>75. Questions of novelty are questions of fact.</p> <p>76. Burden of proof relevant to novelty, and want of novelty.</p> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

CHAPTER IV.

UTILITY Pages 72-76

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>77. Utility necessary to patentability.</p> <p>78. Utility is negatived by lack of function.</p> <p>79. Perfection not necessary to utility.</p> <p>80. Beauty has utility.</p> <p>81. Utility is negatived where function is evil.</p> | <p>82. Functions which sometimes work evil, and sometimes work good.</p> <p>83. Functions thought by some to be good, and by others to be bad.</p> <p>84. Good functions in wrong places.</p> <p>85. Doubts relevant to utility to be solved against infringers.</p> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

CHAPTER V.

ABANDONMENT Pages 77-94

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>86. The several sorts of abandonment.</p> <p>87. Abandonment of inventions.</p> <p>88. Actual abandonment of inventions.</p> <p>89. Actual abandonment by express declaration.</p> <p>90. Actual abandonment by formal disclaimer.</p> | <p>91. Actual abandonment resulting from laches before application.</p> <p>92. Actual abandonment resulting from laches after application and before issue of letters patent.</p> <p>93. Constructive abandonment before application.</p> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>94. "Public use," defined and delineated.</p> <p>95. Experimental use.</p> <p>96. "On sale," delineated and defined.</p> <p>97. Sale of inchoate right to a patent.</p> <p>98. Degree of identity, necessarily involved between the thing constructively abandoned and the thing patented.</p> <p>99. Making, works no constructive abandonment.</p> <p>100. Public knowledge, works no constructive abandonment.</p> <p>101. Public use or sale in a foreign country.</p> | <p>103. Constructive abandonment after application, and before issue of letters patent.</p> <p>104. Rules of constructive abandonment are inflexible.</p> <p>104<i>a</i>. Constructive abandonment in four new classes of cases.</p> <p>105. Surrender of letters patent.</p> <p>106. Abandonment of invention after letters patent, unknown to the law.</p> <p>107. Acquiescence in unlicensed use of patented invention.</p> <p>108. Questions of abandonment are questions of fact.</p> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

CHAPTER VI.

APPLICATIONS Pages 95-134

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>109. Constituents of applications for patents.</p> <p>110. The petition.</p> <p>111. Constituents of specifications.</p> <p>112. The preamble.</p> <p>113. The general statement of the invention.</p> <p>114. The description of the drawings.</p> <p>115. The detailed description of the invention.</p> <p>116. The claim or claims.</p> <p>117. Claims in machine patents.</p> <p>117<i>a</i>. Methods of specifying parts in claims.</p> <p>118. Claims in patents for manufactures.</p> <p>119. Claims in patents for compositions of matter.</p> <p>120. Claims in process patents.</p> <p>120<i>a</i>. Claims in design patents.</p> <p>121. The signatures.</p> | <p>122. The form of the oath.</p> <p>123. The constituents of the oath.</p> <p>124. Affirmations.</p> <p>125. The Patent Office fees.</p> <p>126. Drawings.</p> <p>127. Models.</p> <p>128. Specimens of compositions of matter.</p> <p>129. Dates of applications.</p> <p>129<i>a</i>. The register of Patent Office attorneys.</p> <p>130. The examination by the Patent Office.</p> <p>131. Notification of rejection.</p> <p>132. Appeals in the Patent Office.</p> <p>133. Appeals to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.</p> <p>134. Bills in equity to compel the Commissioner to grant patents.</p> <p>135. Amendments of applications.</p> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>136. The foundation of the right of amendment.</p> <p>137. When an applicant may amend.</p> <p>138. How an applicant may amend.</p> <p>139. When an applicant must amend.</p> <p>140. Interferences.</p> <p>141. Interferences.</p> <p>141<i>a</i>. Interferences.</p> <p>141<i>b</i>. Interferences.</p> <p>141<i>c</i>. Interferences.</p> <p>141<i>d</i>. Appeals in interferences.</p> | <p>142. Decisions in interferences are not conclusive.</p> <p>143. Caveats.</p> <p>144. Appeals from decrees on bills in equity.</p> <p>145. Abandonment of applications.</p> <p>146. Constructive abandonment of applications.</p> <p>147. Constructive abandonment of applications working and not working constructive abandonment of inventions.</p> <p>148. Commissioner's actions on prerequisites to applications.</p> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

CHAPTER VII.

LETTERS PATENT Pages 135-185

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>149. No exclusive right to inventions at common law.</p> <p>149<i>a</i>. Exclusive possession by secrecy.</p> <p>150. Constitutional exclusive right to inventions in the United States.</p> <p>151. Patents are property.</p> <p>152. Dignity of property in patents.</p> <p>152<i>a</i>. Continuation of the same subject.</p> <p>153. Patents are not odious monopolies.</p> <p>154. Patent rights are absolute, not qualified.</p> <p>155. Patent rights are beyond State interference.</p> <p>156. Patent rights are not subject to common law executions, but may be subjected to creditors' bills in equity.</p> <p>157. Patent rights are as exclusive of the government, as they are of any citizen.</p> | <p>158. Patents do not cover specimens purchased of the inventor, or made with his knowledge and consent, before application therefor.</p> <p>159. The foregoing rule has no application to patents for processes.</p> <p>160. Territorial scope of United States patents.</p> <p>161. Operation of United States patents on the decks of ships.</p> <p>162. Duration of patents.</p> <p>163. Duration of United States patents for inventions first patented in a foreign country, according to the statute of 1870.</p> <p>170. Beginning of the terms of United States patents.</p> <p>171. To whom letters patent are granted by the government.</p> <p>172. Letters patent as documents.</p> <p>173. The specification.</p> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>174. The description.
 175. The description.
 176. The claim or claims.
 177. The claim or claims.
 177a. Generic claims and specific claims.
 178. Particularity in descriptions and claims, are conditions precedent to validity.
 179. Questions of sufficiency of particularity of descriptions and claims, are questions of fact, and not of law.
 180. Plurality of inventions in a single letters patent.
 180a. Double patenting.
 181. Construction of letters patent.
 182. Claims to be construed in the light of descriptions.
 182a. Construction of claims which employ reference letters or numerals.
 183. Construction of functional claims.</p> | <p>184. Claims construed in the light of the prior state of the same art.
 184a. The prior state of other arts.
 185. Proper liberality of construction.
 186. Proper strictness of construction.
 187. Construction in the light of application papers.
 187a. Patent Office limitations.
 188. Construction in the light of contemporaneous statutes.
 189. Questions of construction are questions of law, and not of fact.
 190. Letters patent presumed to be for same invention as the application therefor.
 191. Letters patent are constructive notice of their contents to every person.
 191a. Taxation of patents.</p> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

CHAPTER VIII.

DISCLAIMERS Pages 186-197

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>192. Statutory authorization of disclaimers.
 193. Statutory prescriptions, relevant to disclaimers.
 194. Errors which justify disclaimers.
 195. Mistakes of fact, relevant to novelty.
 196. Mistakes of law, relevant to invention.
 197. Claims void for want of utility.
 198. Proper disclaimers.
 199. Improper disclaimers.
 200. Immaterial parts.
 201. Reissue claims.</p> | <p>202. Fraudulent or deceptive intention.
 203. Effect of unreasonable delay to file a disclaimer.
 204. Beginning of unreasonable delay to file a disclaimer.
 205. Costs, where a necessary disclaimer has not been filed.
 206. Extent of disclaimant's interest.
 207. Construction of letters patent after a disclaimer.
 208. Disclaimers filed pending litigation.
 209. Disclaimers required by judicial decisions.</p> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

CHAPTER IX.

REISSUES Pages 198-222

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>210. Beginning of the history of reissues.</p> <p>211. First statute providing for reissues, 1832.</p> <p>212. Reissues under the Patent Act of 1836.</p> <p>213. Amendments made in the reissue law by the Patent Act of 1837.</p> <p>214. Reissues under the Patent Act of 1870.</p> <p>215. Reissues under the Revised Statutes.</p> <p>216. Subjects of reissues.</p> <p>216a. Narrowed reissues.</p> <p>217. The words "specification," "defective," and "insufficient" defined.</p> <p>218. Faults which justify reissues.</p> <p>218a. Reissues correcting patents without changing their scopes.</p> <p>219. Broadened reissues.</p> <p>220. Inadvertence, accident, and mistake.</p> <p>221. Question of the conclusiveness of the Commissioner's decision relevant to existence of reissuable faults, and relevant to the existence of inadvertence, accident, or mistake.</p> <p>226. The doctrine of the case of <i>Miller v. Brass Co.</i></p> <p>227. The length of the delay contemplated by the doctrine of <i>Miller v. Brass Co.</i></p> <p>229. The statute relevant to two years' prior use or sale has no application to reissues as such.</p> | <p>230. Surrender of patent.</p> <p>231. Effect of surrender with, and also without, reissue.</p> <p>232. Reissues of reissued patents and of extended patents, but not of expired patents, are proper.</p> <p>233. Same invention.</p> <p>239. "Where there is neither model nor drawing."</p> <p>240. New matter.</p> <p>242. Reissues must be for same invention as prior reissues, and also for same invention as originals.</p> <p>243. Legal presumption of sameness of invention.</p> <p>244. Omission, as it affects sameness of invention.</p> <p>245. Reissues for sub-combinations.</p> <p>246. Reissues for single devices.</p> <p>247. Reissues as affected by substitution of equivalents.</p> <p>248. Reissues entitled to a liberal construction.</p> <p>249. Reissued patents may be valid as to some claims while void as to others.</p> <p>250. Executors, administrators, and assigns may procure reissues.</p> <p>251. One of several executors may procure a reissue.</p> <p>252. Rights of assignees in reissues.</p> <p>253. The rights of grantees in reissues.</p> <p>254. The legal effect of reissued patents.</p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

CHAPTER X.

EXTENSIONS Pages 223-233

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>255. Constitutional foundation of extensions.</p> <p>256. Congressional extensions.</p> <p>257. Mode of Congressional extension.</p> <p>258. Effect of Congressional extensions.</p> <p>259. Patent Office extensions.</p> <p>260. Statutory foundation of Patent Office extensions.</p> <p>261. Who might apply for Patent Office extensions.</p> <p>262. Points of time whereon Patent Office extensions were grantable.</p> <p>263. Patent Office extension might be granted to an inventor-patentee, even if he had parted with all interest in the first term of his patent.</p> <p>264. Patent Office extensions grantable only where inventors would possess, or at least</p> | <p>participate in, the benefit thereof.</p> <p>265. Patent Office extension, how effectuated.</p> <p>266. Force of the Commissioner's decision in extension cases.</p> <p>267. Facts which justified extensions.</p> <p>268. Proceedings preliminary to extensions.</p> <p>269. Remedy for fraud in procuring or in granting extensions.</p> <p>270. "The benefit of the extension of a patent shall extend to the assignees and grantees of the right to use the thing patented, to the extent of their interest therein."</p> <p>271. Adjudged meaning of the statute quoted in the last section.</p> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

CHAPTER XI.

TITLE Pages 234-257

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>272. The nature of titles, and the methods of their acquisition.</p> <p>273. Title by occupancy.</p> <p>274. Title by assignment.</p> <p>274a. Special tenures and incomplete estates.</p> <p>275. Characteristics, authentication, and effect of assignments.</p> <p>276. Consideration for assignments.</p> | <p>277. Assignments of rights of action for past infringements.</p> <p>278. Construction of assignments.</p> <p>279. Reformation of assignments.</p> <p>280. Assignments of extensions.</p> <p>281. Recording and notice.</p> <p>282. Warranty of title.</p> <p>283. No implied warranty of validity.</p> <p>284. Express warranties of validity.</p> <p>285. Equitable titles: how created.</p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>286. Equitable titles; how treated.
 287. Title by grant.
 288. Extra-territorial rights conveyed by grants.
 288a. Mortgages of patents.
 289. Title by creditor's bill.
 290. Title by bankruptcy.</p> | <p>291. Title by death.
 292. Tenancy in common.
 294. Rights of tenants in common as against each other.
 295. Partition, and removal of clouds.</p> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

CHAPTER XII.

LICENSES Pages 258-277

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>296. Licenses defined and described.
 297. Express licenses to make, with implied leave to use, or implied leave to sell the things made.
 298. Express licenses to use, with implied leave to make for use.
 299. Express licenses to sell, with implied leave to the vendees to use and to sell the things they purchase.
 300. Licenses to make and use, without implied leave to sell.
 301. Licenses to make and sell, or to use and sell, with implied leave to the vendees to use and to sell the articles they buy.
 302. Express licenses so restricted as not to convey implied rights.
 302a. Implied licenses to repair or improve.</p> | <p>303. Written and oral licenses.
 304. Recording and notice.
 305. Licenses given by one of several owners in common, and licenses given to one of several joint users.
 306. Construction of licenses.
 307. Warranty of validity of patent, and eviction.
 307a. Warranty of validity of license.
 308. Clauses of forfeiture.
 309. Effects of forfeiture.
 310. Assignability of licenses.
 311. Purely implied licenses.
 312. Implied licenses from conduct, and first by acquiescence.
 313. Implied license from conduct by estoppel.
 313a. Implied license from employment of inventor.
 314. Implied license from actual recovery of a full license fee.</p> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

CHAPTER XIII.

INTERFERING PATENTS Pages 278-283

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>315. Characteristics and causes of interfering patents.
 316. Actions in equity between interfering patents.
 317. The questions and issues in such actions.</p> | <p>318. The evidence in such actions.
 319. Injunctions in such actions.
 320. The proper decrees in such actions.</p> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

CHAPTER XIV.

REPEAL OF PATENTS Pages 284-286

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>321. Patents obtained by fraud, or granted by mistake.</p> <p>322. Jurisdiction of equity to re-</p> | <p>peal patents so obtained or so granted.</p> <p>323. Practice in such cases.</p> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

CHAPTER XV.

QUI TAM ACTIONS Pages 287-293

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>324. <i>Qui tam</i> actions, defined and described as they exist in the patent laws.</p> <p>325. The wrongs which are the foundations of such actions.</p> <p>326. The first two of those three classes of wrongs.</p> <p>327. The third of those three classes of wrongs.</p> <p>328. Wrongs of either class are completed when the articles are illegally marked, without any subsequent using or selling.</p> | <p>329. The amount of the recoverable penalty.</p> <p>330. The parties in <i>qui tam</i> patent cases.</p> <p>331. The forum for <i>qui tam</i> patent actions.</p> <p>332. The form of the suit, and the requisites of a declaration, in such an action.</p> <p>333. Injunctions to restrain the commission of wrongs of either of the first two classes.</p> <p>334. Appeals in <i>qui tam</i> patent cases.</p> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

CHAPTER XVI.

INFRINGEMENT Pages 294-324

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>335. Infringement of process patents, illustrated by the case of <i>Tilghman v. Proctor</i>.</p> <p>336. Illustrated by the case of <i>Mowry v. Whitney</i>.</p> <p>337. Illustrated by the case of <i>Cochrane v. Deener</i>.</p> <p>338. Equivalents in processes and additions thereto.</p> <p>339. Infringement of patents for machines or manufactures.</p> | <p>340. Comparative results.</p> <p>341. Comparative modes of operation.</p> <p>342. Comparative modes of operation as illustrated by the case of the Cawood patent.</p> <p>343. As illustrated by the <i>Driven-Well</i> cases.</p> <p>344. As illustrated by <i>Blanchard's</i> patent for turning irregular forms.</p> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>345. As illustrated by Hayden's Brass-Kettle machine.</p> <p>346. As illustrated by the case of Burr v. Duryee.</p> <p>346a. As illustrated by The Electric Signal case.</p> <p>347. Addition.</p> <p>348. Transposition of parts.</p> <p>349. Omission.</p> <p>350. Substitution of equivalents.</p> <p>352. The test of sameness of function.</p> <p>353. The test of substantial sameness of way of performance.</p> <p>354. Question of the necessity of age in equivalents.</p> <p>359. Primary and secondary inventions in respect of the doctrine of equivalents.</p> <p>362. Review of the matters considered in Section 359.</p> <p>363. Changes of form considered in respect of questions of infringement.</p> <p>365. Subject of the last section illustrated by the case of Ives v. Hamilton.</p> | <p>366. Illustrated by the case of Morey v. Lockwood.</p> <p>367. Illustrated by the case of the American Diamond Rock Boring Co. v. The Sullivan Machine Co.</p> <p>368. Illustrated by the case of Elizabeth v. Pavement Co.</p> <p>369. Infringement of patents for compositions of matter.</p> <p>370. Substitution of ingredients.</p> <p>370a. Equivalent, and non-equivalent, ingredients.</p> <p>371. Substitution of ingredients, as illustrated by the Giant-Powder cases.</p> <p>372. Disclaimers of particular equivalents.</p> <p>373. Changes of proportion in compositions of matter.</p> <p>375. Infringements of patents for designs.</p> <p>376. Comparative utility as a criterion of infringement.</p> <p>377. Knowledge of a patent by an infringer, not a necessary element in its infringement.</p> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

CHAPTER XVII.

COURTS, PARTIES AND CAUSES Pages 325-356

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>378. Introductory explanation.</p> <p>379. Jurisdiction of United States courts of first resort in patent cases.</p> <p>380. Non-jurisdiction of State courts in patent cases.</p> <p>388. Jurisdiction of State courts over controversies growing out of contracts relevant to patents.</p> <p>389. Jurisdiction of individual United States courts of first resort in patent cases.</p> | <p>390. Qualification of the rule of the last section.</p> <p>391. Jurisdiction of the Court of Claims.</p> <p>392. Absence of jurisdiction of the Court of Claims over causes of action based on unauthorized making, using, or selling by the United States Government of specimens of a patented process or thing.</p> <p>393. Presence of jurisdiction of United States Circuit Courts</p> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

- over actions brought against agents of the United States Government, and based on unauthorized making, using, or selling, by those agents, on behalf of the Government, of specimens of a patented process or thing.
394. Who may be a plaintiff or complainant in a patent action.
395. Who may be plaintiff or complainant in an action based on an assigned accrued right of action for infringement.
396. Executors and administrators as plaintiffs and complainants.
397. Assignees of executors or administrators as plaintiffs and complainants.
398. Attorneys in fact cannot be nominal plaintiffs or complainants.
399. Owners in common as joint plaintiffs or complainants.
400. Licensees cannot be nominal plaintiffs, nor sole nominal complainants.
401. Who may be made a defendant in a patent action.
402. Minors and married women as defendants.
403. Agents, salesmen, and other employed persons, as defendants.
404. Employers as defendants.
405. Persons as defendants who have caused others to infringe.
406. Joint infringers as defendants.
407. Contributory infringement.
408. Partners as defendants.
409. Private corporations as defendants.
410. Officers, directors, and stockholders of corporations as defendants.
411. The same subject continued.
412. Stockholders of corporations.
413. Officers of corporations.
414. Directors of corporations.
415. Statutory liability of officers, directors, and stockholders of corporations.
416. Consolidated corporations as defendants in actions based on infringements committed by their constituent corporations.
417. Causes of action based on a plurality of patents or on both terms of an extended patent, or on a patent and a trade-mark.

CHAPTER XVIII.

ACTIONS AT LAW Pages 357-433

421. Forms of actions.
422. Declarations in trespass on the case.
423. The statement of the right of action, in respect of the inventor.
424. In respect of the novelty and utility of the invention.
425. In respect of the absence of public use or sale more than two years before application for a patent.

426. In respect of the patentee, where he is another than the inventor.
427. In respect of the application for the patent.
428. In respect to the letters patent.
429. In respect of a reissue.
430. In respect of a disclaimer.
431. In respect of an extension.
432. In respect of the plaintiff's title.
433. In respect of profert of title.
- 433a. In respect of marking "patented."
434. In respect of infringement.
435. In respect of the time of infringement.
436. In respect of the damages.
437. The conclusion of the declaration.
438. Substantial and not technical accuracy required in declarations.
439. Dilatory pleas.
440. Twenty-seven defences pleadable in bar in patent actions.
441. The twenty-seven defences reviewed in respect of their natures and effects.
442. Special pleading.
443. The general issue accompanied by a statutory notice of special matter.
444. Notices of special matter.
445. Defences based on facts of which courts take judicial notice, need not be pleaded.
446. The first and second defences.
447. The third defence.
448. The fourth defence.
449. The fifth and sixth defences.
450. The seventh defence.
451. The eighth defence.
452. The ninth and tenth defences.
453. The eleventh defence.
454. The twelfth defence.
455. The thirteenth defence.
456. The fourteenth defence.
457. The fifteenth defence.
458. The sixteenth defence.
459. The seventeenth defence.
460. The eighteenth defence.
461. The nineteenth defence.
462. The twentieth defence.
463. The twenty-first defence.
464. The twenty-second defence.
465. The twenty-third and twenty-fourth defences.
466. The twenty-fifth defence.
467. The twenty-sixth defence: estoppel.
468. Estoppel by matter of record: *res judicata*.
469. Estoppel by matter of deed.
470. The twenty-sixth defence; how pleaded.
471. The twenty-seventh defence; statutes of limitations.
472. The national statute of limitation.
476. State statutes of limitations do not apply to any right of action which is attended to by a national statute of limitation.
477. State statutes do apply to all rights of action which are not attended to by a national statute of limitation.
478. Replications, rejoinders, and sur-rejoinders, where licenses or releases are pleaded.
481. The similiter.
482. Demurrers.
483. Demurrers to declarations.
484. Demurrers to pleas.
486. Joinders in demurrer.
487. Trial of actions at law for infringement of patents.
488. Trial by jury.
489. Rules of practice.

490. Rules of evidence.
491. Letters patent as evidence.
492. Reissue letters patent as evidence.
494. Letters patent presumed to be in force till the end of the term expressed on their face.
495. Evidence of title.
496. Neither licenses, nor releases, need be negatived in a plaintiff's *prima facie* evidence.
497. Evidence of the defendant's doings.
498. Expert evidence of infringement.
499. Hypothetical questions for experts.
500. Expert testimony relevant to the state of the art.
501. Cross-examination of experts.
502. Evidence of damages.
503. Defendant's evidence in chief.
504. Evidence to sustain the first defence.
505. To sustain the second defence.
506. To sustain the third defence, when based on prior patents.
507. When based on prior printed publications.
508. When based on prior knowledge or use.
509. Rebutting evidence to the third defence, when based on prior knowledge or use.
510. Rebutting evidence to the third defence, however based.
511. Evidence to sustain the fourth defence.
512. To sustain the fifth defence.
513. The sixth defence.
514. The seventh defence.
515. The eighth defence.
516. The ninth defence.
517. The tenth defence.
518. The eleventh defence.
519. The twelfth defence.
520. The thirteenth defence.
521. The fourteenth defence.
522. The fifteenth defence.
523. The sixteenth defence.
524. The seventeenth defence.
525. The eighteenth defence.
526. The nineteenth defence.
527. The twentieth defence.
528. The twenty-first defence.
529. The twenty-second defence.
530. The twenty-third defence.
531. The twenty-fourth defence.
532. The twenty-fifth defence.
533. The twenty-sixth defence.
534. The twenty-seventh defence.
535. How testimony is taken in actions at law.
536. When the judge may direct the jury to return a verdict for the defendant.
537. Instructions to juries.
538. Verdicts.
539. New trials.
540. Trials by a judge without a jury.
541. Trial by referee.
542. Judgments.
543. Costs.
544. Costs under the statutes and rules.
545. Attorney's docket fees.
546. Clerk's fees.
547. Magistrate's fees.
548. Witness fees.
549. Taxation of costs.
550. Writs of error.
551. Bills of exception.
552. Erroneous instructions, and refusals to instruct.
553. Exception to instructions, and to refusals to instruct.
554. Time when exceptions must be noted, and time when bills of exception must be drawn up and signed.

CHAPTER XIX.

DAMAGES Pages 434-448

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>555. The generic measure of damages.</p> <p>556. Established royalties as specific measures of damages.</p> <p>557. Tests applied to royalties on behalf of defendants.</p> <p>558. Tests applied to royalties on behalf of plaintiffs.</p> <p>559. Money paid for infringement already committed, is no measure of damages in another case.</p> <p>560. Royalties reserved on sales of patents.</p> <p>561. Royalties for licenses to make and use, and royalties for licenses to make and sell.</p> <p>562. Proportion of licensed to unlicensed practice of an invention.</p> | <p>563. Hurtful competition in the absence of an established royalty, causes recoverable damages.</p> <p>564. Damages for unlicensed making, without unlicensed selling or using.</p> <p>565. Evidence of damages.</p> <p>566. Indirect consequential damages.</p> <p>567. Exemplary damages.</p> <p>568. Increased damages.</p> <p>569. Actual damages not affected by infringement being unintended.</p> <p>570. Counsel fees and other expenses.</p> <p>571. Interest on damages.</p> <p>571a. Damages in design cases.</p> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

CHAPTER XX.

ACTIONS IN EQUITY Pages 449-515

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>572. Jurisdiction of equity in patent causes.</p> <p>573. Jurisdiction of equity to assess and decree damages.</p> <p>574. The complainant.</p> <p>575. The defendant.</p> <p>576. Original bills.</p> <p>577. The title of the court.</p> <p>578. The introductory part.</p> <p>579. The stating part.</p> <p>580. The prayer for relief.</p> <p>581. The interrogating part.</p> <p>582. The prayer for process.</p> <p>583. The signature.</p> <p>584. The oath.</p> <p>585. Bills to perpetuate testimony.</p> | <p>585a. Bills to abridge the freedom of speech and of the press.</p> <p>586. Amendments to bills, when allowed.</p> <p>587. Amendments to bills, when necessary.</p> <p>588. Demurrers, pleas and answers.</p> <p>589. Pleas in equity.</p> <p>590. Arguments upon pleas, and replications to pleas.</p> <p>591. Defences in equity cases.</p> <p>592. Non-jurisdiction of equity.</p> <p>593. The same subject continued.</p> <p>594. Non-jurisdiction in equity, how set up as a defence.</p> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

595. Prior adjudication at law is not necessary to jurisdiction in equity.
596. Laches.
597. Laches, how set up.
598. The first of the twenty-seven defences.
599. The second defence.
600. The third defence.
601. The fourth defence.
602. The fifth and sixth defences.
603. The seventh defence.
604. The eighth defence.
605. The ninth and tenth defences.
606. The eleventh defence.
607. The twelfth defence.
608. The thirteenth defence.
609. The fourteenth defence.
610. The fifteenth defence.
611. The sixteenth defence.
612. The seventeenth defence.
613. The eighteenth defence.
614. The nineteenth defence.
615. The twentieth defence.
616. The twenty-first defence.
617. The twenty-second defence.
618. The twenty-third defence.
619. The twenty-fourth defence.
620. The twenty-fifth defence.
621. The twenty-sixth defence.
622. The twenty-seventh defence.
623. Replications.
624. Subordinate bills in aid of original bills.
625. Supplemental bills.
626. Bills in the nature of supplemental bills.
627. Bills of revivor.
628. Bills in the nature of bills of revivor.
629. Bills of revivor and supplement.
630. Leave of court to file supplemental bills, and bills in the nature of supplemental bills.
631. Demurrers, pleas and answers to supplemental bills, and to bills in the nature of supplemental bills.
632. Hearings.
633. Interlocutory hearings.
634. Questions of law arising on hearings.
635. Questions of fact arising on hearings.
636. Evidence in support of the bill.
637. Evidence in support of defences.
638. Testimony.
639. Depositions.
640. Depositions taken in other cases.
641. Documentary evidence.
642. Trial by jury in equity cases.
643. Hearings by masters in chancery.
644. Interlocutory decrees.
- 644a. Appeals from interlocutory decrees.
645. Petitions for rehearings.
646. Rehearings for matter apparent on the record.
647. Rehearings on account of newly discovered evidence.
648. Supplemental bills in the nature of bills of review.
649. Final decrees.
650. Bills of review.
651. Bills of review to correct errors apparent on the pleadings or final decree.
652. Bills of review to introduce evidence discovered after the entry of the final decree.
653. Bills in the nature of bills of review.
654. Appeals.
655. Hearings on appeals.
656. Decisions on appeals.
657. Certificates of division of opinion.
- 657a. Certificates and writs of certiorari.

CHAPTER XXI.

INJUNCTIONS Pages 516-558

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>658. Jurisdiction to grant injunctions.</p> <p>659. Preliminary injunctions.</p> <p>660. Bills for preliminary injunctions.</p> <p>661. Notices of motions for preliminary injunctions.</p> <p>662. Motions for preliminary injunctions.</p> <p>663. Suspensions of motions for preliminary injunctions.</p> <p>664. Temporary restraining orders.</p> <p>665. Elements of <i>prima facie</i> rights to preliminary injunctions.</p> <p>666. Prior adjudication.</p> <p>667. Public acquiescence.</p> <p>668. Duration of public acquiescence in a strict monopoly.</p> <p>669. Duration of public acquiescence in a licensed monopoly.</p> <p>670. Public acquiescence need not be universal to be efficacious.</p> <p>671. Decrees <i>pro confesso</i>.</p> <p>672. Consent decrees.</p> <p>673. Defendant's admission of validity.</p> <p>674. Interference decision.</p> <p>675. The complainant's title.</p> <p>676. Infringements.</p> <p>677. Defences to motions for preliminary injunctions; and first by way of traverse.</p> <p>678. Defences by way of confession and avoidance.</p> <p>679. Averting effect of prior adjudication.</p> <p>680. Averting effect of public acquiescence.</p> <p>681. Averting preliminary injunction by proving repeal or ex-</p> | <p>piration of patent, or fault in title thereto.</p> <p>682. Averting preliminary injunction by proving license.</p> <p>683. By proving estoppel.</p> <p>684. By showing laches.</p> <p>685. Preliminary injunction must generally follow a cause and an application therefor.</p> <p>686. Bonds instead of injunctions, where complainant grants licenses.</p> <p>687. Where infringing machinery embodies non-infringing features, also in some other cases.</p> <p>688. Bonds required from complainants in certain cases.</p> <p>689. Injunctions not averted by the existence of a remedy at law.</p> <p>690. Injunctions <i>pro confesso</i> on withdrawal of opposition to a motion for an injunction.</p> <p>691. Discretion of the court in granting or refusing injunctions.</p> <p>692. Motions to dissolve preliminary injunctions.</p> <p>693. Motions to dissolve for error in point of law.</p> <p>694. Motions to dissolve on account of newly discovered evidence.</p> <p>695. Reinstatement of dissolved injunctions.</p> <p>696. Consequences of obedience or disobedience to injunctions which are subsequently dissolved.</p> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>696a. Appeals from preliminary injunctions.</p> <p>697. Permanent injunctions.</p> <p>698. Refusal of permanent injunction, because the patent has expired.</p> <p>699. Because the complainant has assigned the patent.</p> <p>700. Because the defendant is dead, or, if a corporation, is dissolved.</p> <p>701. Cessation of infringement no ground for refusal to enjoin.</p> <p>702. Postponement of permanent injunctions.</p> <p>703. Suspension of permanent injunctions pending appeals therefrom.</p> | <p>704. Dissolution of permanent injunctions.</p> <p>705. Injunctions granted independent of other relief, and against complainants in certain cases.</p> <p>706. The duration of injunctions generally limited by the term of the patent.</p> <p>707. The duration of injunctions granted by district judges in vacation.</p> <p>708. Attachments for contempt.</p> <p>709. Improper defences to motions for attachments.</p> <p>710. Penalties for violations of injunctions.</p> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

CHAPTER XXII.

PROFITS Pages 559-583

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>711. The infringer's profits recoverable in equity.</p> <p>712. In cases of joint infringement.</p> <p>713. In cases of infringement partly unprofitable.</p> <p>714. What spaces of time an account of profits may cover.</p> <p>715. The generic rule for ascertaining infringer's profits.</p> <p>716. Complainant's damages no criterion of defendant's profits.</p> <p>717. Defendant's profits in cases of unlawfully making and selling articles covered by the complainant's patent.</p> <p>718. Method of ascertaining cost of making and selling infringing articles.</p> <p>719. Burden of proof when it is necessary to separate profits due to patented features,</p> | <p>from profits due to other features of an infringing article.</p> <p>720. Method of making the separation where defendant made and sold the patented invention separately, as well as in connection with other things.</p> <p>721. Method where defendant pays royalty for right to make and sell the features not covered by the patent in suit.</p> <p>722. Cases where no separation is required or allowed.</p> <p>723. Method of making the separation by the criterion of comparative cost.</p> <p>723a. Defendant's profits in design cases.</p> <p>724. Defendant's profits in cases</p> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>of unlawfully selling articles partly or wholly covered by complainant's patent.</p> <p>725. Defendant's profits in cases of unlawful using of patented processes or things.</p> <p>729. Affirmative gain.</p> <p>730. Saving from loss.</p> <p>731. Affirmative gain and saving from loss.</p> <p>732. Standard of comparison need not have been used by the infringer.</p> <p>734. Method of selecting the proper standard of comparison.</p> <p>734a. Credits due to defendant's improvements.</p> <p>735. The rule as to using has only a limited application to cases of infringement by making or by selling.</p> <p>736. Interest on infringer's profits.</p> | <p>739. Proceedings before masters.</p> <p>740. Evidence before masters.</p> <p>741. Objections to evidence before masters.</p> <p>742. Questions of the extent of the defendant's infringement.</p> <p>743. Questions relevant to different sorts of defendant's alleged infringement.</p> <p>744. Master's reports.</p> <p>745. Exceptions to master's report.</p> <p>746. Defendants' exceptions to master's reports.</p> <p>747. Defendants' affirmative exceptions to master's reports.</p> <p>748. Defendants' negative exceptions to master's reports.</p> <p>749. Complainants' exceptions to master's reports.</p> <p>750. Outline of practice relevant to master's findings.</p> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

APPENDIX.

THE PATENT STATUTES.

THE REPEALED STATUTES..... Pages 587-668

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Patent Act of 1790.....	587	Patent Act of 1849.....	631
“ 1793.....	591	“ 1852.....	631
“ 1794.....	596	“ Feb. 18, 1861..	632
“ 1800.....	597	“ March 2, 1861..	633
“ 1819.....	598	“ 1862.....	640
“ July 3, 1832 ...	599	“ 1863.....	640
“ July 13, 1832 ..	601	“ 1864.....	641
“ 1836.....	602	“ 1865.....	642
“ 1837.....	616	“ 1866.....	642
“ 1839.....	623	“ 1870.....	643
“ 1842.....	627	“ March 3, 1871..	667
“ 1848.....	629	“ March 24, 1871.	667

THE REVISED STATUTES Pages 668-694

SECTION.	SECTION.
440. Clerks and employees.	486. Library.
441. Secretary of the Interior.	487. Patent-agents may be refused recognition.
475. Establishment of the Patent Office.	488. Printing of papers filed.
476. Officers and employees.	489. Printing copies of claims, laws, decisions, &c.
477. Salaries.	490. Printing specifications and drawings.
478. Seal.	491. Additional specifications and drawings.
479. Bonds of Commissioner and Chief Clerk.	492. Lithographing and engraving.
480. Restrictions upon officers and employees.	493. Price of copies of specifications and drawings.
481. Duties of Commissioner.	494. Annual report of the Commissioner.
482. Duties of examiners-in-chief.	496. Disbursements for Patent Office.
483. Establishment of regulations.	629. Jurisdiction of Circuit Courts.
484. Arrangement and exhibition of models, &c.	
485. Disposals of models on rejected applications.	

SECTION.

- 699. Writs of error and appeals, without reference to amount.
- 892. Copies of records, &c., of Patent Office.
- 893. Copies of foreign letters patent.
- 894. Printed copies of specifications and drawings of patents.
- 973. Costs where disclaimers are necessary.
- 4883. Patents, how issued, attested, and recorded.
- 4884. Their contents and duration.
- 4885. Date of patent.
- 4886. What inventions are patentable.
- 4887. Patents for inventions previously patented abroad.
- 4888. Requisites of specification and claim.
- 4889. Drawings, when requisite.
- 4890. Specimens of ingredients, &c.
- 4891. Model, when requisite.
- 4892. Oath required from applicant.
- 4893. Examination and issuing patent.
- 4894. Limitation upon time of completing application.
- 4895. Patents granted to assignees.
- 4896. When, and on what oath, executor or administrator may obtain patent.
- 4897. Renewal of application in cases of failure to pay fees in season.
- 4898. Assignment of patents.
- 4899. Persons purchasing of inventor before application may use or sell the thing purchased.
- 4900. Patented articles must be marked as such.
- 4901. Penalty for falsely marking or labeling articles as patented.

SECTION.

- 4902. Filing and effect of caveats.
- 4903. Notice of rejection of claim for patent to be given to applicant.
- 4904. Interferences.
- 4905. Affidavits and depositions.
- 4906. Subpœnas to witnesses.
- 4907. Witness fees.
- 4908. Penalty for failing to attend or refusing to testify.
- 4909. Appeals from primary examiners to examiners-in-chief.
- 4910. From examiners-in-chief to Commissioner.
- 4911. From the Commissioner to the Supreme Court, D. C.
- 4912. Notice of such appeal.
- 4913. Proceedings on appeal to Supreme Court, D. C.
- 4914. Determination of such appeal and its effect.
- 4915. Patents obtainable by bill in equity.
- 4916. Reissue of defective patents.
- 4917. Disclaimer.
- 4918. Suits touching interfering patents.
- 4919. Suits for infringement; damages.
- 4920. Pleading and proof in actions for infringement.
- 4921. Power of courts to grant injunctions and estimate damages.
- 4922. Suit for infringement where specification is too broad.
- 4923. Patent not void on account of previous use in foreign country.
- 4924. Extension of patents granted prior to March 2, 1861.
- 4925. What notice of application for extension must be given.
- 4926. Applications for extension to whom to be referred.

<p>SECTION. 4927. Commissioner to hear and decide the question of extension. 4928. Operation of extension. 4929. Patents for designs authorized. 4930. Models of designs. 4931. Duration of patents for designs.</p>	<p>SECTION. 4932. Extension of patents for designs. 4933. Patents for designs subject to general rules of patent law. 4934. Fees in obtaining patents, &c. 4935. Mode of payment. 4936. Refunding.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	PAGE.
THE PATENT ACT OF 1875.....	694
THE PATENT ACT OF 1887.....	695
THE PATENT ACT OF 1888.....	696
THE JUDICIARY ACT OF 1891.....	697
THE JUDICIARY ACT OF 1893.....	699
THE JURISDICTION ACT OF 1897.....	701
THE PATENT ACT OF 1897.....	701
THE PATENT ACT OF 1899.....	706
THE PATENT ACT OF APRIL, 1902.....	708
THE PATENT ACT OF MAY, 1902.....	708
THE PATENT ACT OF 1903.....	709

INDEX	715-775
-------------	---------

TABLE OF FEDERAL REPORTS.

ABBOTT'S U. S. REPORTS: Two volumes of selected cases, from all the United States District Courts, and United States Circuit Courts, from 1865 to 1871.

APP. D. C.: The first twenty volumes of the reports of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, from the beginning of that Court in 1893, until 1903.

BALDWIN: One volume of reports of decisions in Circuit Courts of the United States, in the third circuit, from 1827 to 1833.

BANN. & ARD.: Five volumes of patent cases, decided by the Circuit Courts of the United States, from 1874 to 1880, and collected by Hubert A. Banning and Henry Arden.

BISSELL: Nine volumes of reports of decisions in District Courts and Circuit Courts of the United States, in the seventh circuit, from 1851 to 1880.

BLACK: The reports of the Supreme Court of the United States, in two volumes, from 1861 to 1862.

BLATCH.: The reports in eighteen volumes, by Samuel Blatchford, of the Circuit Courts of the United States, in the second circuit, from 1845 to 1881.

BOND: Two volumes of reports of decisions in District Courts and Circuit Courts of the United States, in the sixth circuit, from 1856 to 1871.

BROCK.: Two volumes of reports of decisions of Chief Justice Marshall, in Circuit Courts of the United States, in the fourth circuit, from 1802 to 1836.

C. C. A.: The first fifty-seven volumes of Circuit Courts of Appeals reports, from 1891 to 1903, published by the Lawyers' Co-operative Publishing Association. All the cases contained in these volumes are also contained in the "Federal Reporter," and are cited from the "Federal Reporter" in this book, and not from the "C. C. A.;" because the "Federal Reporter" is more numerously and widely distributed, and is always cited by the courts, even in the exceptional cases wherein C. C. A. is also cited.

CHASE: One volume of reports of decisions of Chief Justice Chase, in Circuit Courts of the United States, in the fourth circuit, from 1865 to 1869.

CLIFF.: Four volumes of reports of decisions of Justice Clifford, in the Circuit Courts of the United States, in the first circuit, from 1858 to 1878.

COURT OF CLAIMS: The first thirty-eight volumes of the decisions of the Court of Claims of the United States, from 1863 to 1903.

CRANCH: The reports of the Supreme Court of the United States, in nine volumes, from 1801 to 1815.

CRANCH'S C. C. REPORTS: Five volumes of reports by Judge Cranch, of decisions in the United States Circuit Court of the District of Columbia, from 1801 to 1840. These volumes are sometimes cited as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 D. C. R.

CURTIS: Two volumes of reports, by Justice Curtis, of decisions in the Circuit Courts of the United States, in the first circuit, from 1851 to 1856.

D. C. R.: Volumes 6 and 7 of reports of decisions in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, from 1863 to 1873; and volume 21 of reports of decisions in the same court, from 1892 to 1893.

DEADY: One volume of reports by Judge Deady, of decisions in Circuit Courts of the United States, in the ninth circuit, from 1861 to 1869.

DILLON: Five volumes of reports by Judge Dillon, of decisions in sundry Circuit Courts of the United States, in the eighth circuit, from 1870 to 1879.

F. C.: Thirty volumes of "Federal Cases," being a series of secondary reports of decisions in the United States District Courts and the United States Circuit Courts, rendered prior to the time of the "Federal Reporter." All the important patent cases in the "Federal Cases" were previously reported in other reports specified in this table; and they are cited in this book from those other reports, and not from the "Federal Cases."

FISHER: Six volumes of patent cases, decided by the Circuit Courts of the United States, from 1848 to the end of 1873, and collected by S. S. Fisher, from periodicals and manuscripts and other authentic sources.

FISHER'S REPORTS: One volume of patent cases, from 1821 to 1851, collected by W. H. Fisher, from official reports specified in this table. Those cases are cited in this book from the official reports, and not from this collection of W. H. Fisher.

FLIPPIN: One volume of reports of decisions in Circuit Courts of the United States, in the sixth circuit, from 1859 to 1877.

F. R.: The first one hundred and twenty-three volumes of the Federal Reporter, containing all the decisions of the District Courts of the United States, and of the Circuit Courts of the United States, and of the Circuit Courts of Appeals of the United States, from 1879 to 1903.

GALLISON: Two volumes of reports of decisions in the Circuit Courts of the United States, in the first circuit, from 1812 to 1815.

GILPIN: One volume of reports of decisions in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, from 1828 to 1836.

HEMPSTEAD: One volume of reports of decisions in the United States District Court, and the United States Circuit Court, for the District of Arkansas, from 1836 to 1855.

HEYWOOD & HAZLETON: Two volumes of reports of decisions in the Circuit Court of the District of Columbia, from 1840 to 1863.

HOLMES: One volume of reports, by Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., of decisions in the Circuit Courts of the United States, in the first circuit, from 1870 to 1875.

HOWARD: The reports of the Supreme Court of the United States, in twenty-four volumes, from 1843 to 1860.

HUGHES: Three volumes of reports by Judge Hughes, of decisions in District Courts and Circuit Courts of the United States, in the fourth circuit, from 1870 to 1879.

LOWELL: Two volumes of reports by Judge John Lowell, of decisions in the United States District Court, for the District of Massachusetts, from 1865 to 1877.

MACKAY: The reports of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, in nine volumes, from 1880 to 1892. These volumes are sometimes cited as 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 D. C. R.

MASON: The reports in five volumes, of the United States Circuit Courts, in the first circuit, from 1816 to 1830.

McALLISTER: One volume of reports of decisions in Circuit Courts of the United States, in the ninth circuit, from 1855 to 1859.

McARTHUR: The reports of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, in three volumes, from 1873 to 1879. These volumes are sometimes cited as 8, 9, 10 D. C. R.

McARTHUR & MACKEY: The reports of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, in one volume, from 1879 to 1880. This volume is sometimes cited as 11 D. C. R.

McARTHUR'S PATENT CASES: One volume of reports of patent cases, decided in the Circuit Court of the District of Columbia, from 1840 to 1859, on appeal from the Commissioner of Patents; reported by Frank MacArthur, Examiner of Interferences.

McCRARY: Two volumes of reports by Judge McCrary, of decisions in Circuit Courts of the United States, in the eighth circuit, from 1877 to 1881.

McLEAN: Six volumes of reports, by Justice McLean, of decisions in sundry United States Circuit Courts, from 1829 to 1855.

O. G.: The first one hundred and six volumes of the Official Gazette of the Patent Office, from 1872 to 1903.

OLCOTT: One volume of reports of admiralty cases, decided in the United States District Courts in New York, from 1843 to 1847.

PAINE: Two volumes of reports of decisions in Circuit Courts of the United States, in the second circuit, from 1810 to 1840.

PETERS: The reports of the Supreme Court of the United States, in sixteen volumes, from 1828 to 1842.

PETERS' C. C. REPORTS: One volume of reports of decisions in Circuit Courts of the United States, in the third circuit, from 1803 to 1818.

ROBB: Two volumes of patent cases, decided prior to 1850, and collected from official reports specified in this table. Those cases are cited in this book from the official reports, and not from Robb's collection.

SAWYER: The reports in seven volumes, by Judge Sawyer, of decisions in Circuit Courts of the United States, in the ninth circuit, from 1870 to 1882.

STORY: Three volumes of reports, by Justice Story, of decisions in the Circuit Courts of the United States, in the first circuit, from 1839 to 1845.

SUMNER: Three volumes of reports, by Charles Sumner, of decisions in Circuit Courts of the United States, in the first circuit, from 1829 to 1839.

TANEY: One volume of reports of decisions of Chief Justice Taney, in Circuit Courts of the United States, in the fourth circuit, from 1836 to 1861.

U. S.: The reports of the Supreme Court of the United States, in one hundred volumes, from 1875 to 1903, beginning with 91 U. S. and ending with 190 U. S.

U. S. APP.: Sixty-three volumes of United States Circuit Courts of Appeals reports, from 1891 to 1899. All the cases contained in this series are also contained in the "Federal Reporter," and are cited from the "Federal Reporter" in this book, rather than from "U. S. App.," because the "Federal Reporter" is more widely and numerously distributed, and is always cited by the courts; and because U. S. App. covers only a few years of the work of the Circuit Courts of Appeals.

WALLACE: The reports of the Supreme Court of the United States, in twenty-three volumes, from 1863 to 1874.

WALLACE, JR.: Three volumes of reports of decisions in Circuit Courts of the United States, in the third circuit, from 1842 to 1862.

WASHINGTON: Four volumes of reports of decisions of Justice Washington, in Circuit Courts of the United States, in the third circuit, from 1803 to 1827.

WHEATON: The reports of the Supreme Court of the United States, in twelve volumes, from 1816 to 1827.

WHITMAN: Two volumes of patent cases collected by C. S. Whitman from the official reports of the Supreme Court of the United States, from 1810 to 1874. This collection contains all of the patent cases decided by the Supreme Court, prior to 21 Wallace; but they are cited in this book from the Supreme Court reports, and not from Whitman's collection.

WOODBURY & MINOT: Three volumes of reports in the Circuit Courts of the United States, in the first circuit, from 1845 to 1847.

WOODS: Three volumes of reports by Justice William B. Woods, of decisions in Circuit Courts of the United States, in the fifth circuit, from 1870 to 1879.

WOOLWORTH: One volume of reports of decisions of Justice Miller, in Circuit Courts of the United States, in the eighth circuit, from 1863 to 1869.

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

A.

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Abbett v. Zusi	5 Bann. & Ard.....	250
Abbott Machine Co. v. Bonn.....	51 F. R.	30
A. B. Dick Co. v. Belke & Wagner Co.	80 F. R.	61
A. B. Dick Co. v. Henry.....	75 F. R.	303
A. B. Dick Co. v. Wichelman.....	74 F. R.	43
Accumulator Co. v. Edison Illumi- nating Co.	63 F. R.	537
Accumulator Co. v. Julien Electric Co.	57 F. R.	153
Accumulator Co. v. Storage Co.	53 F. R.	533, 541, 555
Aemo Hay Harvesting Co. v. Martin.....	33 F. R.	42
Adam v. Folger	120 F. R.	270, 315, 316, 458, 522
Adams v. Brown	7 Cushing (Mass.).....	583
Adams v. Burke	17 Wallace.....	156, 252, 259, 262
Adams v. Howard	19 F. R.	424, 465
Adams v. Howard	22 F. R.	270, 272
Adams v. Iron Co.	26 F. R.	465, 467
Adams v. Jones	1 Fisher	100
Adams v. Keystone Mfg. Co.	41 F. R.	566, 578
Adams v. Loft	4 Bann. & Ard.....	42
Adams v. Mfg. Co.	3 Bann. & Ard.....	306
Adams v. Stamping Co.	28 F. R.	436
Adams v. Stamping Co.	141 U. S.	32, 44, 62
Adams Co. v. Schreiber & Conchar Mfg. Co.	111 F. R.	315
Adams Electric Ry. Co. v. Lindell Ry. Co.	63 F. R.	42
Adee v. Peck	42 F. R.	24
Adee v. Thomas	41 F. R.	383
Adriance v. McCormick Mach. Co.	55 F. R.	339
Adriance. Platt & Co. v. National Harrow Co.	121 F. R.	459
Agawam Co. v. Jordan	7 Wallace.	47, 81, 222, 224, 225, 230, 236, 375, 406, 472
Ager v. Murray	105 U. S.	145, 253, 254
Aiken v. Bemis	3 Woodbury & Minot, 309, 419, 420, 421	420
Aiken v. Dolan	3 Fisher	44
Aiken v. Print Works	2 Cliff.	233
Alabastine Co. v. Payne	27 F. R.	345
Alaska Packers' Association v. Let- son	119 F. R.	312
Alaska Packers' Association v. Pa- cific Steam Whaling Co.	93 F. R.	263
Albany Steam Trap Co. v. Felt- housen	20 F. R.	421

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Albright <i>v.</i> Teas	106 U. S.	328
Alden <i>v.</i> Dewey	1 Story	419
Allen <i>v.</i> Blunt	2 Woodbury & Minot.....	419, 420
Allen <i>v.</i> Culp	166 U. S.	213
Allen <i>v.</i> Deacon	21 F. R.	369
Allen <i>v.</i> Steele	64 F. R.	45
Allington & Curtis Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Booth	78 F. R.	450, 538, 542
Allington & Curtis Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Globe Co.	73 F. R.	495
Allington & Curtis Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Globe Co.	89 F. R.	169
Allington & Curtis Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Glor.	83 F. R.	169
Allington & Curtis Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Lynch	71 F. R.	533, 534
Allis <i>v.</i> Buckstaff	13 F. R.	473
Allis <i>v.</i> Stowell	5 Bann. & Ard.....	501
Allis <i>v.</i> Stowell	16 F. R.	552
Allis <i>v.</i> Stowell	19 O. G.	554
Allison <i>v.</i> Brooklyn Bridge	29 F. R.	168, 170
Allred <i>v.</i> Bray	41 Mo.	342
Alvin Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Scharling.....	100 F. R.	383
Am Ende <i>v.</i> Seabury	43 F. R.	441, 563
American Bell Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> Al- bright	32 F. R.	276
American Bell Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> Brown Tel. Co.	58 F. R.	535
American Bell Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> Cushman	57 F. R.	150, 341
American Bell Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> Cushman Telephone Co.	35 F. R.	77
American Bell Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> Cushman Telephone Co.	36 F. R.	549
American Bell Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> Dolbear	15 F. R.	316
American Bell Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> Globe Telephone Co.	31 F. R.	70
American Bell Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> Kitsell	35 F. R.	499
American Bell Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> McKeesport Tel. Co.	57 F. R.	523
American Bell Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> National Telephone Co.	27 F. R.	286, 382
American Bell Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> National Telephone Mfg. Co.	109 F. R.	11
American Bell Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> People's Telephone Co.	22 F. R.	69
American Bell Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> Service Co.	45 O. G.	142
American Bell Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> Southern Telephone Co.	34 F. R.	454, 469, 491
American Bell Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> Spencer	8 F. R.	195, 316
American Bell Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> United States	68 F. R.	82
American Box Machine Co. <i>v.</i> Day.	32 F. R.	308
American Cable Ry. Co. <i>v.</i> Chicago City Ry. Co.	41 F. R.	466

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

XXXV

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
American Cable Ry. Co. v. New York	56 F. R.	24
American Cotton Tie Co. v. Simmons	106 U. S.	264
American Cotton Tie Supply Co. v. McCready	17 Blatch.	551
American Diamond Drill Co. v. Machine Co.	32 F. R.	575
American Diamond Rock Boring Co. v. Marble Co.	2 F. R.	548
American Diamond Rock Boring Co. v. Sheldon	18 Blatch.	500
American Diamond Rock Boring Co. v. Sheldon	1 F. R.	548
American Diamond Rock Boring Co. v. Sullivan Machine Co.	14 Blatch.	318
American Dunlop Tire Co. v. Erie Rubber Co.	66 F. R.	171
American Electrical Novelty Co. v. Newgold	99 F. R.	527
American Electric Co. v. Consumers' Gas Co.	47 F. R.	267
American Feather Duster Co. v. Levy	43 F. R.	24
American Fibre-Chamois Co. v. Buckskin-Fibre Co.	72 F. R.	471
American Fur Refining Co. v. Cimitotti Unhairing Co.	118 F. R.	547
American Fur Refining Co. v. Cimitotti Unhairing Mach. Co.	123 F. R.	299
American Graphophone Co. v. Amet	74 F. R.	344
American Graphophone Co. v. Edison Phonograph Works	72 O. G.	464
American Graphophone Co. v. Hawthorne	92 F. R.	345
American Graphophone Co. v. Leeds	77 F. R.	533
American Graphophone Co. v. Leeds	87 F. R.	59, 344
American Graphophone Co. v. Walcutt	86 F. R.	555
American Graphophone Co. v. Walcutt	87 F. R.	338
American Hide & Leather Splitting Machine Co. v. Machine Co.	4 Fisher	109
American Insurance Co. v. Canter	1 Pet.	512
American Linoleum Co. v. Nairn Linoleum Co.	44 F. R.	394
American Middlings Purifier Co. v. Atlantic Milling Co.	3 Bann. & Ard.	539
American Middlings Purifier Co. v. Christian	3 Bann. & Ard.	488, 491, 522, 536, 538, 550
American Middlings Purifier Co. v. Vail	15 Blatch.	543
American Nicholson Pavement Co. v. Elizabeth	1 Bann. & Ard.	564
American Nicholson Pavement Co. v. Elizabeth	4 Fisher	533, 541

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
American Paper Bag Co. v. Van Nortwick	52 F. R.	264
American Paper Pail Co. v. National Folding Box Co.	51 F. R.	547
American Pneumatic Tool Co. v. Bigelow Co.	77 F. R.	531
American Pneumatic Tool Co. v. Fisher	69 F. R.	43
American Pneumatic Tool Co. v. Philadelphia Pneumatic Tool Co.	123 F. R.	311
American Road Machine Co. v. Pen- nock & Sharp Co.	45 F. R.	42
American Road Machine Co. v. Pen- nock & Sharp Co.	164 U. S.	28
American Roll-Paper Co. v. Knopp. .	44 F. R.	279
American Roll Paper Co. v. Weston, .	45 F. R.	52, 311
American Roll Paper Co. v. Weston, .	51 F. R.	59
American Roll Paper Co. v. Weston, .	59 F. R.	70
American Saddle Co. v. Hogg.	6 Fisher	502
American Saddle Co. v. Sager Gear Co.	122 F. R.	424
American School Furniture Co. v. J. M. Sauder Co.	106 F. R.	458, 552
American Shoe-Tip Co. v. Protector Co.	2 Bann. & Ard.	207
American Steel & Wire Co. v. Mayer & Englund Co.	121 F. R.	487
American Street Car Advertising Co. v. Jones	122 F. R.	268, 469, 489
American Sulphite Pulp Co. v. Bur- gess Sulphite Fibre Co.	103 F. R.	531, 533, 538
American Sulphite Pulp Co. v. How- land Falls Pulp Co.	70 F. R.	43, 175, 209, 376, 475
American Sulphite Pulp Co. v. How- land Falls Pulp Co.	80 F. R.	52, 65
American Well Works v. F. C. Austin Mfg. Co.	98 F. R.	26, 41
Ames v. Howard	1 Sumner	165, 420, 421
Ames & Frost Co. v. Woven Wire Mach. Co.	59 F. R.	473
Anderson v. Collins	122 F. R.	52, 167
Anderson v. Eiler	46 F. R.	83, 94
Anderson v. Eiler	50 F. R.	275
Anderson v. Monroe	55 F. R.	87
Anderson v. Pittsburgh Lumber Co., .	47 F. R.	447, 568
Anderson v. Saint	46 F. R.	17, 60, 98, 447
Anderson Foundry & Mach. Works v. Potts	108 F. R.	181
Andrews v. Carman	2 Bann. & Ard.	62
Andrews v. Hovey	123 U. S.	83, 86, 405
Andrews v. Landers	72 F. R.	270
Andrews v. Long	12 F. R.	301
Andrews v. Spear	3 Bann. & Ard.	538
Anilin v. Higgin	15 Blatch.	206
Anson v. Woodbury	12 O. G.	123

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

xxxvii

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Ansonia Brass & Copper Co. v. Electrical Supply Co.	32 F. R.	42
Ansonia Co. v. Electrical Supply Co.	144 U. S.	41
Antisdell v. Bent	122 F. R.	42
Antisdell v. Chicago Hotel Cabinet Co.	89 F. R.	30, 269, 544
Aquarama Co. v. Old Mill Co.	124 F. R.	540
Arey v. De Loria	55 F. R.	418
Armat Moving Picture Co. v. Edison Mfg. Co.	121 F. R.	535
Armstrong, Whitworth & Co. v. Norton	15 App. D. C.	335
Arnold v. Bishop	1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 49, ...	123
Arnold v. Chesebrough	35 F. R.	495
Arnold v. Phelps	20 F. R.	297
Aron v. Manhattan Ry. Co.	26 F. R.	42
Aron v. Manhattan Railway Co.	132 U. S.	40, 177
Arrott v. Standard Sanitary Mfg. Co.	113 F. R.	472
Arthur v. Griswold	55 New York	353
Asbestine Mfg. Co. v. Hepp.	39 F. R.	340
Asbestos Felting Co. v. Salamander Felting Co.	13 Blatch.	552
Ashcroft v. Walworth	1 Holmes	244, 246, 254
Ashton Valve Co. v. Muffler Co.	8 U. S. App.	161
Asmus v. Alden	27 F. R.	24
Asmus v. Freeman	34 F. R.	437, 440
Aspinwall Mfg. Co. v. Gill.	32 F. R.	243, 248, 257
Atherton Mach. Co. v. Atwood-Morrison Co.	102 F. R.	237, 329, 330
Atkins v. Park	61 F. R.	251
Atlantic Dynamite Co. v. Climax Powder Mfg. Co.	72 F. R.	322
Atlantic Giant Powder Co. v. Dittmar Powder Mfg. Co.	9 F. R.	554
Atlantic Giant Powder Co. v. Goodyear	3 Bann. & Ard.	321, 534
Atlantic Giant Powder Co. v. Mowbray	2 Bann. & Ard.	320
Atlantic Works v. Brady.	107 U. S.	17, 21
Atlas Glass Co. v. Simonds Mfg. Co.	102 F. R.	151
Attorney General v. Rumford Chemical Works	2 Bann. & Ard.	285
Atwood v. Portland Co.	10 F. R.	217
Austin v. Johnson.	18 App. D. C.	126
Austin v. Johnson.	95 O. G.	127

B.

Babcock v. Clarkson.	63 F. R.	383
Babcock v. Degener.	1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 79, ...	405
Babcock & Wilcox Co. v. Pioneer Iron Works	34 F. R.	42
Badische Anilin & Soda Fabrik v. Cummins	4 Bann. & Ard.	68
Badische Anilin & Soda Fabrik v. Hamilton Mfg. Co.	3 Bann. & Ard.	153

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Badische Anilin & Soda Fabrik <i>v.</i> Kalle	94 F. R.....	21, 26, 54
Bailey <i>v.</i> Bussing.....	28 Connecticut	412
Bailey Wringing Machine Co. <i>v.</i> Adams	3 Bann. & Ard.....	533
Baker <i>v.</i> Whiting.....	1 Story	502
Baker Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Washburn & Moen Mfg. Co.....	18 F. R.....	269
Baldwin <i>v.</i> Bernard.....	5 Fisher	539
Baldwin <i>v.</i> Kresl.....	76 F. R.....	27
Baldwin <i>v.</i> Sibley.....	1 Clifford	270
Ball <i>v.</i> Langles.....	102 U. S.....	209
Ball & Socket Fastener <i>v.</i> Cohn.....	90 F. R.	458
Ball Glove Fastening Co. <i>v.</i> Socket Fastener Co.....	53 F. R.	577
Ballard <i>v.</i> McCluskey.....	58 F. R.	197
Ballard <i>v.</i> Pittsburg.....	12 F. R.	81, 550
Baltimore & Potomac Railroad Co. <i>v.</i> Fifth Baptist Church.....	108 U. S.....	347
Baltimore Car-Wheel Co. <i>v.</i> Bemis.....	29 F. R.....	459
Bancroft <i>v.</i> Acton.....	7 Blatch.	451
Bank of Orleans <i>v.</i> Skinner.....	9 Paige (N. Y.).....	457
Bank of United States <i>v.</i> Daniel.....	12 Peters	481
Bantz <i>v.</i> Frantz.....	105 U. S.....	211
Barbed Wire Patent.....	143 U. S.. 44, 64, 69, 70, 170,	177
Barker <i>v.</i> Shoots.....	18 F. R.....	496
Barker <i>v.</i> Stowe.....	4 Bann. & Ard.....	501
Barker <i>v.</i> Stowe.....	15 Blatch.	473
Barnard <i>v.</i> Gibson.....	7 Howard	550
Barnes Sprinkler Co. <i>v.</i> Walworth Mfg. Co.....	51 F. R.....	56, 490
Barney <i>v.</i> Peck.....	16 F. R.....	356
Barrett <i>v.</i> Hall.....	1 Mason	49, 394
Barron <i>v.</i> Baltimore.....	7 Peters	138, 146
Bartlett <i>v.</i> Holbrook.....	1 Gray (Mass.).....	266
Barton <i>v.</i> White.....	144 Mass.	254
Bate Refrigerating Co. <i>v.</i> Eastman.....	11 F. R.....	555
Bate Refrigerating Co. <i>v.</i> Eastman.....	24 F. R.....	181
Bate Refrigerating Co. <i>v.</i> Gillett.....	13 F. R.....	150
Bate Refrigerating Co. <i>v.</i> Gillett.....	20 F. R.....	152
Bate Refrigerating Co. <i>v.</i> Gillett.....	24 F. R.....	554
Bate Refrigerating Co. <i>v.</i> Gillett.....	28 F. R.....	575
Bate Refrigerating Co. <i>v.</i> Gillett.....	30 F. R.....	346, 554, 555
Bate Refrigerating Co. <i>v.</i> Gillett.....	31 F. R.....	323
Bate Refrigerating Co. <i>v.</i> Ham- mond	129 U. S.....	151, 152
Bate Refrigerating Co. <i>v.</i> Sulz- berger	157 U. S.....	150
Bates <i>v.</i> Coe.....	98 U. S.....	61, 355, 472
Bates <i>v.</i> Railroad Co.....	32 F. R.....	440
Bath <i>v.</i> Caton.....	37 Michigan	352
Battin <i>v.</i> Taggart.....	17 Howard	68, 80, 92, 94, 166, 207, 217
Beach <i>v.</i> Box-Machine Co.....	63 F. R....	22, 122, 209, 312, 316, 374
Beach <i>v.</i> Hobbs.....	82 F. R.....	209, 500
Beale <i>v.</i> Spate.....	74 F. R.....	413
Bean <i>v.</i> Smallwood.....	2 Story	42

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

XXXIX

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Bechman <i>v.</i> Wood.....	89 O. G.....	128
Bedford <i>v.</i> Hunt.....	1 Masor	66, 74
Beecher Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Atwater Mfg. Co.....	114 U. S.	32
Beedle <i>v.</i> Bennett.....	122 U. S.	81, 85, 465
Beer <i>v.</i> Walbridge.....	100 F. R.....	471
Belding <i>v.</i> Turner.....	8 Blatch.....	271
Belknap <i>v.</i> Schild.....	161 U. S.. 145, 333, 560, 561,	562
Bell <i>v.</i> Daniels.....	1 Bond	94
Bell <i>v.</i> Daniels.....	1 Fisher	73, 130
Bell <i>v.</i> Hearne	19 Howard	156
Bell <i>v.</i> Stamping Co.....	32 F. R.....	442, 575
Bellas <i>v.</i> Hays.....	5 Sergeant & Rawle (Penn.)..	401
Bell Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> Pennsylvania.	7 Eastern Reporter.....	143
Bement <i>v.</i> National Harrow Co....	186 U. S.....	143
Bene <i>v.</i> Jeantet.....	129 U. S.....	165
Bennet <i>v.</i> Fowler	8 Wallace	414
Bennett <i>v.</i> Schooley.....	77 F. R.....	501
Bernardin <i>v.</i> Northall.....	78 O. G..... 116, 117, 118,	128
Bernardin <i>v.</i> Seymour.....	10 App. D. C.....	123
Berry <i>v.</i> Stockwell.....	9 O. G.....	123, 124
Bettendorf Patents Co. <i>v.</i> J. R. Little Metal Wheel Co.....	123 F. R.....	42
Bevin <i>v.</i> Bell Co.....	9 Blatch.	132
Bevin Bros. Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Starr Bros. Bell Co.	114 F. R.....	41, 322
Bibb <i>v.</i> Allen.....	149 U. S.....	417
Bicknell <i>v.</i> Todd.....	5 McLean	261
Bieree <i>v.</i> Stocking.....	11 Gray (Mass.).....	395
Bigelow <i>v.</i> Louisville.....	3 Fisher	265
Bignall <i>v.</i> Harvey.....	5 Bann. & Ard.....	69
Bignall <i>v.</i> Harvey	18 Blatch.	548
Billings & Spencer Co. <i>v.</i> Van Wag- oner & Williams Hardware Co.....	98 F. R.....	44
Birdsall <i>v.</i> Coolidge	93 U. S.....	440
Birdsall <i>v.</i> McDonald.....	1 Bann. & Ard.....	81, 94
Birdsall <i>v.</i> Mfg. Co.....	2 Bann. & Ard.....	554
Birdsall <i>v.</i> Mfg. Co.....	1 Hughes	552
Birdsall <i>v.</i> Perego.....	5 Blatch.	266
Birdsell <i>v.</i> Shaliol.....	112 U. S.....	276, 499
Birmingham Cement Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Gates Iron Works.....	78 F. R.....	491
Bischoff <i>v.</i> Wethered.....	9 Wallace	69, 405, 410
Bissell Carpet-Sweeper Co. <i>v.</i> Goshen Sweeper Co.....	72 F. R.....	548
Black <i>v.</i> Hubbard.....	3 Bann. & Ard.....	233
Black <i>v.</i> Munson.....	14 Blatch.....	437, 438
Black <i>v.</i> Stone.....	33 Alabama	244
Black Diamond Coal Co. <i>v.</i> Excel- sior Coal Co.....	156 U. S.....	169, 307
Blackledge <i>v.</i> Weir & Craig Mfg. Co.....	108 F. R.....	257
Blades <i>v.</i> Rand.....	27 F. R.....	168, 170
Blagrove <i>v.</i> Ringgold	2 Cranch's Circuit Court Re- ports	429
Blair <i>v.</i> Lippincott Glass Co.....	52 F. R.....	338
Blake <i>v.</i> Robertson.....	94 U. S.....	311, 566

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Blake <i>v.</i> San Francisco.....	113 U. S.....	40
Blakey <i>v.</i> Kurtz.....	78 F. R.....	537
Blanchard <i>v.</i> Eldridge.....	1 Wallace, Jr.....	338
Blanchard <i>v.</i> Putnam.....	8 Wallace.....	414, 431
Blanchard <i>v.</i> Reeves.....	1 Fisher.....	302, 530
Blanchard <i>v.</i> Sprague.....	1 Cliff.....	273
Blanchard's Gun-Stock Turning Factory <i>v.</i> Warner.....	1 Blatch.....	225
Blandy <i>v.</i> Griffith.....	3 Fisher.....	132, 475
Blandy <i>v.</i> Griffith.....	6 Fisher.....	501, 502
Blauvelt <i>v.</i> Interior Conduit & Insulation Co.	80 F. R.....	275
Blessing <i>v.</i> Copper Works.....	34 F. R.....	361, 471
Bliss <i>v.</i> Brooklyn.....	8 Blatch.....	222
Bliss <i>v.</i> Brooklyn.....	10 Blatch.....	72, 73
Bliss <i>v.</i> Brooklyn.....	4 Fisher.....	340
Bliss <i>v.</i> Haight.....	3 Fisher.....	310
Bliss <i>v.</i> Merrill.....	33 F. R.....	52
Bliss <i>v.</i> Read.....	106 F. R.....	503
Bloomer <i>v.</i> Gilpin.....	4 Fisher.....	272
Bloomer <i>v.</i> McQuewan.....	14 Howard.....	144, 183, 224, 225, 233, 262
Bloomer <i>v.</i> Millinger.....	1 Wallace.....	233
Bloomer <i>v.</i> Stolley.....	5 McLean.....	224
Blount <i>v.</i> Societe.....	53 F. R.....	524, 527, 547
Blumenthal <i>v.</i> Burrell.....	43 F. R.....	28
Board of Commissioners <i>v.</i> Gorman.....	19 Wallace.....	509
Boesch <i>v.</i> Graff.....	133 U. S.....	237, 252, 441, 442, 511, 580
Bogart <i>v.</i> Hinds.....	25 F. R.....	338
Bonnette Are Lawn Sprinkler Co. <i>v.</i> Koehler.....	82 F. R.....	173
Bonsack Machine Co. <i>v.</i> Cigarette Co.	64 F. R.....	555
Bonsack Machine Co. <i>v.</i> Elliot.....	63 F. R.....	3
Bonsack Mach. Co. <i>v.</i> Hulse.....	57 F. R.....	249
Bonsack Mach. Co. <i>v.</i> Smith.....	70 F. R.....	142, 151, 410
Boomer <i>v.</i> Powder Press Co.	13 Blatch.....	549
Booth <i>v.</i> Seevers.....	19 O. G.....	276
Boston & R. Electric Ry. Co. <i>v.</i> Bemis Car-Box Co.....	80 F. R.....	316
Boston & Revere Electric Street-Railway Co. <i>v.</i> Bemis Car-Box Co.	98 F. R.....	508
Boston Electric Co. <i>v.</i> Holtzer.....	41 F. R.....	531
Boston Iron Co. <i>v.</i> King.....	2 Cushing (Mass.).....	583
Boston Lasting Mach. Co. <i>v.</i> Woodward.....	53 F. R.....	175, 313
Boston Lasting Mach. Co. <i>v.</i> Woodward.....	82 F. R.....	342
Boston Woven Hose Co. <i>v.</i> Star Rubber Co.	40 F. R.....	348, 349
Bottle Seal Co. <i>v.</i> De La Vergne Co.	47 F. R.....	471
Bourne <i>v.</i> Goodyear.....	9 Wallace.....	285
Bowers <i>v.</i> Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Co.	104 F. R.....	330, 349, 350

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

xli

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Bowers v. Pacific Coast Co.	81 F. R.	533
Bowers v. San Francisco Bridge Co.	69 F. R.	207, 374, 533
Bowers v. San Francisco Bridge Co.	91 F. R.	63
Bowers v. Von Schmidt	63 F. R.	31, 56, 66, 316
Bowers Dredging Co. v. New York Dredging Co.	77 F. R.	344, 528, 531, 534
Bowers Dredging Co. v. New York Dredging Co.	80 F. R.	491, 529
Bowker v. Dows	3 Bann. & Ard.	346
Bowman v. De Graw	60 F. R.	70
Boyd v. Cherry	50 F. R.	345
Boyd v. Janesville Hay Tool Co.	158 U. S.	315, 414
Boyd v. McAlpin	3 McLean	244, 530
Boyden v. Burke	14 Howard	184
Bracewell v. Passaic Print Works.	107 F. R.	99, 196
Braddock Glass Co. v. Macbeth.	64 F. R.	557
Bradford v. Bradford	5 Connecticut	382
Bradley v. Dull	19 F. R.	255
Bradley & Hubbard Mfg. Co. v. The Charles Parker Co.	17 F. R.	534
Bradley Mfg. Co. v. Eagle Mfg. Co.	57 F. R.	381, 382, 383, 455
Bradley Mfg. Co. v. Eagle Mfg. Co.	58 F. R.	481
Bragg v. City of Stockton	27 F. R.	452
Bragg Mfg. Co. v. Hartford	56 F. R.	465, 466
Brainard v. Cramme	12 F. R.	3, 197, 218
Brammer v. Jones	3 Fisher	541
Brammer v. Schroeder	106 F. R.	101, 316
Brander Hanger Co. v. Waterbury Button Co.	106 F. R.	465
Branson v. Kutz	105 F. R.	300
Bray v. Denning	56 F. R.	344
Bray v. Hartshorn	1 Cliff.	419
Brickill v. Baltimore	60 F. R.	434, 436
Brickill v. Hartford	49 F. R.	377, 384, 475, 481
Brickill v. Hartford	57 F. R. ...	37, 370, 373, 374, 385, 471
Brickill v. New York	112 F. R.	275, 574
Bridgeport Wood Finishing Co. v. Hooper	5 F. R.	60
Briggs v. Central Ice Co.	54 F. R.	395
Briggs v. Duell	93 F. R.	42, 43
Brig Struggle v. United States ...	9 Cranch	289
Brill v. Delaware County Electric Ry. Co.	109 F. R.	424
Brill v. Peckham Motor Truck Co.	189 U. S.	548
Brill v. St. Louis Car Co.	80 F. R.	136, 530
Brinkerhoff v. Aloe	146 U. S.	32
Brislin v. Carnegie Steel Co.	118 F. R.	141, 305, 306
Britton v. White Mfg. Co.	61 F. R.	53, 104, 373, 402
Broadnax v. Transit Co.	5 Bann. & Ard.	216
Bromley Bros. Carpet Co. v. Stew- art	51 F. R.	22
Bronson v. Kinzie	1 Howard	139
Brooks v. Ashburn	9 Georgia	343
Brooks v. Bicknell	3 McLean	231, 391, 541
Brooks v. Byam	2 Story	244, 264, 272

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Brooks <i>v.</i> Fiske	15 Howard	162, 306
Brooks <i>v.</i> Jenkins	3 McLean	194, 195, 231, 255 392, 401, 413
Brooks <i>v.</i> Miller	28 F. R.	465
Brooks <i>v.</i> Norcross	2 Fisher	52
Brooks <i>v.</i> Sacks	81 F. R.	71
Brown <i>v.</i> Davis	116 U. S.	307, 311
Brown <i>v.</i> Deere	6 F. R.	550
Brown <i>v.</i> District of Columbia	3 Mackey	343
Brown <i>v.</i> District of Columbia	130 U. S.	22, 25
Brown <i>v.</i> Duchesne	19 Howard	136, 138, 149
Brown <i>v.</i> Hall	6 Blatch.	473
Brown <i>v.</i> Jackson	3 Wheaton	246
Brown <i>v.</i> Lapham	27 F. R.	269
Brown <i>v.</i> Piper	91 U. S.	41, 399, 470, 512
Brown <i>v.</i> Puget Sound Reduction Co.	110 F. R.	308
Brown <i>v.</i> Shannon	20 Howard	328
Brown H. & C. Mach. Co. <i>v.</i> King Bridge Co.	107 F. R.	30
Brown Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Bradley Mfg. Co.	51 F. R.	162
Brown Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Deere	21 F. R.	24
Brown Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Deere	51 F. R.	501
Brown Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Mast	53 F. R.	43, 489
Browning <i>v.</i> Colorado Telephone Co.	61 F. R.	41
Brownson <i>v.</i> Dodson-Fisher-Brock- mann Co.	71 F. R.	43
Bruise <i>v.</i> Peck	54 F. R.	381
Brunner's Appeal	1 O. G.	114
Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co. <i>v.</i> Koehler & Hinrichs	115 F. R.	522, 533
Brush <i>v.</i> Condit	132 U. S.	66, 310
Brush Electric Co. <i>v.</i> Accumulator Co.	47 F. R.	25, 152, 197, 297
Brush Electric Co. <i>v.</i> Accumulator Co.	50 F. R.	541
Brush Electric Co. <i>v.</i> California Electric Light Co.	52 F. R.	246, 259, 264, 268, 272 339
Brush Electric Co. <i>v.</i> Electric Co.	43 F. R.	316
Brush Electric Co. <i>v.</i> Electric Co. of San José	49 F. R.	339
Brush Electric Co. <i>v.</i> Electric Co. of San José.	51 F. R.	510
Brush Electric Co. <i>v.</i> Electric Imp. Co.	52 F. R.	102, 175, 316
Brush Electric Co. <i>v.</i> Ft. Wayne Electric Co.	40 F. R.	102, 187, 316
Brush Electric Co. <i>v.</i> Ft. Wayne Electric Co.	44 F. R.	78
Brush Electric Co. <i>v.</i> Julien Elec- tric Co.	41 F. R.	25, 152, 297
Brush Electric Co. <i>v.</i> Storage Bat- tery Co.	64 F. R.	529, 531, 536, 537
Brush Electric Co. <i>v.</i> Western Elec- tric Co.	43 F. R.	102

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

xliii

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Brush Electric Co. v. Western Electric Co.	76 F. R.	381, 498
Brush-Swan Electric Light Co. v. Electric Co.	48 F. R.	339
Buck v. Timony	78 F. R.	240
Buckingham v. Iron Co.	51 F. R.	42
Buerk v. Imhaeuser	2 Bann. & Ard.	555
Buffington's Iron Building Co. v. Eustis	65 F. R.	162, 298
Buhl v. Stephens	84 F. R.	264
Bull v. Pratt	1 Connecticut	270
Bullock Printing-Press Co. v. Jones.	3 Bann. & Ard.	550
Bundy Mfg. Co. v. Columbian Co.	59 F. R.	171
Bundy Mfg. Co. v. Detroit Time-Register Co.	94 F. R.	308, 313
Bundy Mfg. Co. v. Time Recorder Co.	64 F. R.	315
Bunker v. Stevens	26 F. R.	425
Burdell v. Comstock	15 F. R.	466
Burdell v. Denig	92 U. S.	265, 397, 411
Burden v. Corning	2 Fisher	194, 475
Burdett v. Estey	5 Bann. & Ard.	194
Burdett v. Estey	15 Blatch.	197
Burdett v. Estey	3 F. R.	574
Burdsall v. Curran	31 F. R.	383
Burns v. Myer	100 U. S.	180
Burr v. De La Vergne	102 N. Y.	237
Burr v. Duryee	2 Fisher	266, 269
Burr v. Duryee	1 Wallace	209, 303, 310, 312
Burrall v. Jewett	2 Paige	72
Burrell v. Hackley	35 F. R.	213, 463
Burt v. Ivory	133 U. S.	17, 37, 62
Busch v. Jones	184 U. S.	3
Buss v. Putney	38 N. H.	264
Bussard v. Catalino	2 Cranch's Circuit Court Reports	427
Bussell Trimmer Co. v. Stevens	137 U. S.	40
Bussey v. Mfg. Co.	110 U. S.	32
Butler v. Bainbridge	29 F. R.	375, 406
Butler v. Steckel	137 U. S.	22, 24
Butterworth v. Hill	114 U. S.	117
Butterworth v. Hoe	112 U. S.	114, 118
Button Fastener Co. v. Lucas	28 F. R.	49
Butz Thermo-Electric Co. v. Electric Co.	36 F. R.	313, 315
Buzzell v. Fifield	7 F. R.	25
Byam v. Eddy	2 Blatch.	319
Byam v. Farr	1 Curtis	321
Byram v. Friedberger	87 F. R.	61, 322

C.

Cahoon v. Ring.	1 Cliff.	56, 312, 395
Cahoone Barnet Mfg. Co. v. Rubber & Celluloid Harness Co.	45 F. R.	17, 41, 342
Cain v. Park.	14 App. D. C.	126

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Caldwell <i>v.</i> Jackson.....	7 Cranch.	426
Caldwell <i>v.</i> Waters.....	4 Cranch's Circuit Court Re- ports	543
California Electric Works <i>v.</i> Fink..	47 F. R.....	479
California Electric Works <i>v.</i> Henzel.	48 F. R.....	529, 550
California Paving Co. <i>v.</i> Molitor...	113 U. S.....	514, 555
Callaghan <i>v.</i> Myers.....	128 U. S.....	561, 565, 582
Cammack <i>v.</i> Johnson.....	2 New Jersey Equity.....	543
Cammeyer <i>v.</i> Newton.....	94 U. S.....	138, 145
Campbell <i>v.</i> Bailey.....	45 F. R.....	62
Campbell <i>v.</i> City of New York....	81 F. R.....	393
Campbell <i>v.</i> Day.....	16 Vermont	244
Campbell <i>v.</i> Haverhill.....	155 U. S.....	354, 384, 484
Campbell <i>v.</i> New York.....	35 F. R.....	83, 110, 500, 504
Campbell <i>v.</i> New York.....	36 F. R.....	88
Campbell <i>v.</i> New York.....	47 F. R.....	86
Campbell <i>v.</i> New York.....	105 F. R.....	575
Campbell <i>v.</i> Ward.....	12 F. R.....	466
Campbell Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Manhattan Ry. Co.....	49 F. R.....	489
Campbell Printing-Press Co. <i>v.</i> Du- plex Printing-Press Co.....	86 F. R.....	311, 404
Campbell Printing-Press Co. <i>v.</i> Man- hattan Ry. Co.....	49 F. R.....	142
Campbell Printing-Press Co. <i>v.</i> Mar- den	64 F. R....	70, 101, 163, 171, 173
Campbell Printing-Press Co. <i>v.</i> Prieth	77 F. R.....	533
Canan <i>v.</i> Mfg. Co.....	23 F. R.....	152
Cansler <i>v.</i> Eaton.....	2 Jones' Equity Cases (N. C.)..	247
Canter <i>v.</i> Insurance Companies....	3 Peters	428
Canton Steel Roofing Co. <i>v.</i> Kanne- berg	51 F. R.....	454
Cantrell <i>v.</i> Wallick.....	117 U. S.....	12, 61, 69, 312
Capital Sheet Metal Co. <i>v.</i> Kinnear & Gager Co.....	87 F. R.....	42
Carew <i>v.</i> Fabric Co.....	1 Holmes	220
Carey <i>v.</i> Miller.....	34 F. R.....	530
Carey <i>v.</i> Spring Bed Co.....	26 F. R.....	543
Carlton <i>v.</i> Bokee.....	17 Wallace	100, 163, 175, 377
Carnegie Steel Co. <i>v.</i> Brislin.....	124 F. R.....	315
Carnegie Steel Co. <i>v.</i> Cambria Iron Co.	89 F. R.....	54
Carnegie Steel Co. <i>v.</i> Cambria Iron' Co.	185 U. S.....	3, 62, 190, 496
Carnrick <i>v.</i> McKesson	8 F. R.....	472, 473, 474
Carpenter Machine Co. <i>v.</i> Searle...	52 F. R.....	215
Carr <i>v.</i> Rice.....	1 Fisher	160, 222, 305
Carroll <i>v.</i> Goldschmidt.....	83 F. R.....	382
Carroll <i>v.</i> Morse.....	9 O. G.....	222
Carsteadt <i>v.</i> Corset Co.....	13 Blatch.....	557
Carter <i>v.</i> Baker.....	4 Fisher	443
Carter <i>v.</i> Baker.....	1 Sawyer	323, 395
Carter <i>v.</i> Fry.....	54 F. R.....	533
Carter <i>v.</i> Wollschlaeger.....	53 F. R.....	524, 526, 527, 538
Carter-Crume Co. <i>v.</i> Ashley.....	68 F. R.....	527, 530, 535
Carter Mach. Co. <i>v.</i> Hanes.....	70 F. R.....	72, 310

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

xlv

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Cartridge Co. v. Cartridge Co.....	112 U. S.....	196, 322
Carty v. Kellogg.....	7 App. D. C.....	126
Carver v. Hyde.....	16 Peters	161
Carver v. Mfg. Co.....	2 Story	99, 354
Cary v. Lovell Mfg. Co.....	31 F. R.....	489
Cary Mfg. Co. v. Acme Flexible Clasp Co.....	108 F. R.....	556, 558
Cary Mfg. Co. v. De Haven.....	88 F. R.....	470
Cary Mfg. Co. v. Neal.....	98 F. R.....	17
Case v. Brown.....	2 Wallace	169, 307
Case v. Morey.....	1 New Hampshire.....	238
Case v. Redfield.....	4 McLean	244
Cash Register Co. v. Cash Indicator Co.....	156 U. S.....	43
Castle v. Hutchinson.....	25 F. R.....	143
Caverly v. Deere.....	52 F. R.	28, 71
Cawood Patent	94 U. S....	54, 301, 498, 569, 570, 578
Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. American Zy- lonite Co	35 F. R.....	26
Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Arlington Mfg. Co.....	44 F. R.....	313
Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Cellonite Mfg. Co.....	40 F. R.....	571, 576, 579, 580
Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Cellonite Mfg. Co.....	42 F. R.....	175
Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Chandler....	27 F. R.....	426
Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Chrolithion Collar & Cuff Co.....	23 F. R.....	24
Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Crane Chemical Co.....	36 F. R.....	26
Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Crofut.....	24 F. R.....	80
Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Eastman Dry Plate Co.....	42 F. R.....	531
Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Mfg. Co.....	34 F. R.....	531
Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Noyes.....	25 F. R.....	42
Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Russell.....	37 F. R.....	158, 376
Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Tower.....	26 F. R.....	36, 490
Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Vulcanite Co.	13 Blatch.	458
Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Zylonite Co.	27 F. R.....	214
Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Zylonite Co.	30 F. R.....	345
Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Zylonite Co.	34 F. R.....	360
Cerealine Mfg. Co. v. Bates.....	77 F. R.	191
Cerealine Mfg. Co. v. Bates.....	101 F. R.....	158
Chaffee v. Belting Co.	22 Howard	233, 262
Chambers v. Smith.....	5 Fisher	261, 264, 272
Chambers-Bering-Quinlan Co. v. Fa- rics	75 F. R.....	101, 161
Chandler v. Ladd	1 McArthur's Patent Cases....	18
Chase v. Fillebrown.....	58 F. R.	54, 62, 376, 390
Chase v. Tuttle.....	27 F. R.....	459
Chase v. Walker.....	3 Fisher	243
Chauche v. Pare.....	75 F. R.....	239
Cheever v. Wilson.....	9 Wallace	415
Chicago Fruit House Co. v. Busch..	2 Bissell	323
Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co. v. Phila- delphia Pneumatic Tool Co....	118 F. R.....	531

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Child <i>v.</i> Adams.....	1 Fisher	107
Child <i>v.</i> Iron Works	10 F. R.	435, 451
Chinnoek <i>v.</i> Paterson, P. & S. Tel. Co.	110 F. R.	455
Chinnoek <i>v.</i> Paterson, P. & S. Tel. Co.	112 F. R.	471
Chisholm <i>v.</i> Johnson	106 F. R. . 338, 339, 342, 343, 356	
Christman <i>v.</i> Rumsey.....	17 Blatch.	197
Cimiotti Unhairing Co. <i>v.</i> American Fur Refining Co.....	117 F. R.	518
Cimiotti Unhairing Co. <i>v.</i> American Fur Refining Co.....	120 F. R.	457, 496
Cimiotti Unhairing Co. <i>v.</i> American Unhairing Mach. Co.....	99 F. R.	503
Cimiotti Unhairing Co. <i>v.</i> Frolochr.	121 F. R.	555
Cincinnati Ice Machine Co. <i>v.</i> Brew- ing Co.	31 F. R.	300
City of Concord <i>v.</i> Norton.....	16 F. R.	380
City of Seattle <i>v.</i> McNamara.....	81 F. R.	442
Clark <i>v.</i> Deere & Mansur Co.....	80 F. R.	513
Clark <i>v.</i> Wilson.....	30 F. R.	315
Clark <i>v.</i> Wooster.....	119 U. S.	391, 435, 465, 466
Clark Thread Co. <i>v.</i> Willimantic Linen Co.....	140 U. S.	63, 65, 71
Clodfelter <i>v.</i> Cox.....	1 Sneed (Tenn.).....	244
Clough <i>v.</i> Mfg. Co.....	106 U. S.	312
Clow <i>v.</i> Baker	36 F. R.	282, 495
Cluett <i>v.</i> Claffin.....	140 U. S.	22
Clum <i>v.</i> Brewer	2 Curtis .. 231, 257, 523, 529,	530 532
Coburn <i>v.</i> Clark.....	15 F. R.	530
Cochrane <i>v.</i> Badische Anilin & Soda Fabrik	111 U. S.	68
Cochrane <i>v.</i> Deener	94 U. S. . 3, 63, 297, 305, 311, 312, 326, 468	
Cochrane <i>v.</i> Waterman.....	1 McArthur's Patent Cases....	12 36, 130
Coddington <i>v.</i> Propfe.....	112 F. R.	567
Coes <i>v.</i> Collins Co.....	9 F. R.	174
Coffee <i>v.</i> Guerrant.....	68 O. G.	65
Coffin <i>v.</i> Ogden.....	18 Wallace	66, 67, 69
Cohansey Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Wharton	28 F. R.	70
Cohn <i>v.</i> Corset Co.....	93 U. S.	55
Cohn <i>v.</i> Rubber Co.....	3 Bann. & Ard.....	269
Coleman <i>v.</i> Grubb.....	23 Penn. St.....	241
Colgate <i>v.</i> Compagnie Francaise....	23 F. R.	393
Colgate <i>v.</i> Gold & Stock Telegraph Co.	4 Bann. & Ard.	537
Colgate <i>v.</i> Gold & Stock Telegraph Co.	16 Blatch.	539
Colgate <i>v.</i> Mfg. Co.....	28 F. R.	439
Colgate <i>v.</i> Ocean Telegraph Co.....	17 Blatch.	148
Colgate <i>v.</i> Telegraph Co.	19 F. R.	503
Collar Co. <i>v.</i> Van Dusen.....	23 Wallace	209
Collignon <i>v.</i> Hayes.....	8 F. R.	536, 537
Collins Chemical Co. <i>v.</i> Capitol City Mfg. Co.....	42 F. R.	480

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

xlvii

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Collins <i>v.</i> Gleason.....	68 F. R.....	43
Collins <i>v.</i> Hathaway.....	Olcott's Reports	428
Colt <i>v.</i> Arms Co.	1 Fisher	299
Colt <i>v.</i> Young.....	2 Blatch.	231, 538
Columbia Wire Co. <i>v.</i> Freeman Wire Co.	71 F. R.....	144, 326, 344, 541
Columbus Watch Co. <i>v.</i> Robbins...64	F. R.....	174, 499
Columbus Watch Co. <i>v.</i> Robbins...148	U. S.....	514
Commercial Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Fairbank Co.	135 U. S.	150, 152, 153
Commissioners of Hamilton County <i>v.</i> Mighels	7 Ohio State.....	340
Commissioner of Patents <i>v.</i> White- ley	4 Wallace	114, 115, 221
Commonwealth <i>v.</i> Petty.....	96 Ky.	143
Computing Scale Co. <i>v.</i> Keystone Store-Service Co.....	88 F. R.....	170
Comstock <i>v.</i> Sandusky Seat Co....3	Bann. & Ard.....	88, 94
Cone <i>v.</i> Morgan Envelope Co.4	Bann. & Ard.....	39
Conover <i>v.</i> Mers.....	3 Fisher	538
Conover <i>v.</i> Mers.....	11 Blatch.	571
Conover <i>v.</i> Rapp.....	4 Fisher	395
Conover <i>v.</i> Roach.....	4 Fisher	73, 310, 395
Consolidated Apparatus Co. <i>v.</i> Brew- ing Co.	28 F. R.....	523
Consolidated Apparatus Co. <i>v.</i> Woerle	29 F. R.....	406
Consolidated Brake-Shoe Co. <i>v.</i> Chicago, P. & St. L. Ry. Co....69	F. R.	349
Consolidated Brake-Shoe Co. <i>v.</i> De- troit Spring Co.	47 F. R.....	362
Consolidated Brake-Shoe Co. <i>v.</i> De- troit S. & S. Co.....	59 F. R.....	122
Consolidated Bunging Apparatus Co. <i>v.</i> Brewing Co.....	60 F. R.....	42
Consolidated Cable Co. <i>v.</i> Pacific Ry. Co.....	58 F. R.....	499
Consolidated Car Heating Co. <i>v.</i> American Electric Heating Corp.	82 F. R.....	43, 163, 346
Consolidated Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Edison Electric Light Co.....	25 F. R.....	153, 235
Consolidated Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Electric Light Co.	20 F. R.....	355
Consolidated Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> McKeesport Light Co.....	34 F. R.....	153
Consolidated Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> McKeesport Light Co.....	40 F. R.....	374
Consolidated Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> McKeesport Light Co.....	159 U. S.....	163, 174, 320
Consolidated Electric Storage Co. <i>v.</i> Accumulator Co.....	55 F. R.....	547
Consolidated Fastener Co. <i>v.</i> Ameri- can Fastener Co.....	94 F. R.....	525
Consolidated Fastener Co. <i>v.</i> Colum- bian Fastener Co.....	79 F. R.....	183
Consolidated Fastener Co. <i>v.</i> Hays.100	F. R.....	547

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Consolidated Fastener Co. v. Lita- tauer	84 F. R.....	547
Consolidated Fastener Co. v. Top- pen	113 F. R.....	544
Consolidated Fruit Jar Co. v. Stamping Co.....	27 F. R.....	79, 82
Consolidated Fruit Jar Co. v. Whitney	1 Bann. & Ard.....	272, 541
Consolidated Fruit Jar Co. v. Whitney	2 Bann. & Ard.....	250, 264, 382
Consolidated Fruit Jar Co. v. Wright	94 U. S....	79, 80, 83, 85, 87, 138
Consolidated Middlings Purifier Co. v. Guilder	9 F. R.....	383
Consolidated Oil Well Packer Co. v. Eaton	12 F. R.....	335
Consolidated Purifier Co. v. Wolf..	28 F. R.....	268, 270
Consolidated Roller-Mill Co. v. Barnard & Leas Mfg. Co.....	43 F. R.....	489
Consolidated Roller-Mill Co. v. Coombs	39 F. R.....	61, 142, 179, 306
Consolidated Roller-Mill Co. v. Richmond Mill Works	40 F. R.	540
Consolidated Roller-Mill Co. v. Walker	43 F. R.	151
Consolidated Roller-Mill Co. v. Walker	138 U. S.	22, 171, 173
Consolidated Rubber Tire Co. v. Fin- ley Rubber Tire Co.	116 F. R.	270, 383
Consolidated Rubber Tire Co. v. Fin- ley Rubber Tire Co.	119 F. R.	347
Consolidated Store Service Co. v. Siegel-Cooper Co.	107 F. R.	36
Consolidated Valve Co. v. Valve Co.	113 U. S.	159
Consumers' Gas Co. v. Electric Co.	50 F. R.	267
Continental Gin Co. v. F. H. Lum- mus Sons' Co.	110 F. R.	356
Continental Store Service Co. v. Clark	100 N. Y.	328
Continental Windmill Co. v. Empire Windmill Co.	8 Blatch.....	244, 245, 248, 265
Cook v. Bidwell	8 F. R.	249
Cook v. Sterling Electric Co.	118 F. R.	237, 250, 463
Coon v. Wilson	113 U. S.	205, 209, 211
Coop v. Physical Institute	47 F. R.	361, 456
Cooper v. Mattheys	3 Penn. Law Journal Rep..	520, 532
Corbin Cabinet Lock Co. v. Eagle Lock Co.	150 U. S.	167, 182, 215
Corbin Lock Co. v. Eagle Lock Co.	37 F. R.	24
Corbin Lock Co. v. Yale & Towne Mfg. Co.	58 F. R.	383, 526
Cornely v. Marekwald	32 F. R.	438
Cornely v. Marekwald.....	131 U. S.....	441, 442
Corning v. Burden	15 Howard.....	3, 161, 184, 414
Corning v. Troy Iron & Nail Fac- tory	15 Howard	512
Corn-Planter Patent	23 Wallace....	55, 56, 67, 171, 207 217, 311

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

xlix

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Corser v. Overall Co.	59 F. R.	522
Cortelyou v. Lowe	111 F. R.	262
Cote v. Moffitt	15 F. R.	219, 419
Cotter v. Copper Co.	13 F. R.	297
Cottier v. Stimson	18 F. R.	359
Cottle v. Kremenz	31 F. R.	68
Coupe v. Royer	155 U. S.	72, 183, 418, 434, 560
Coupe v. Weatherhead	37 F. R.	500
Covert v. Covert	106 F. R.	87
Covert v. Curtis	25 F. R.	524
Covert v. Sargent	38 F. R.	276, 436, 442, 561
Covert v. Sargent	42 F. R.	451
Covert v. Travers Bros. Co.	70 F. R.	471
Covert v. Travers Bros. Co.	96 F. R.	469
Cowing v. Rumsey	8 Blatch.	420, 434
Cox v. Griggs	1 Bissell	395
Craig v. Michigan Lubricator Co.	72 F. R.	87
Cramer v. Fry	68 F. R.	341, 417
Cramer v. Singer Mfg. Co.	93 F. R.	381
Crandall v. Piano Mfg. Co.	24 F. R.	270
Cranson v. Smith	37 Mich.	143
Crary v. Smith	2 Comstock (N. Y.)	542
Craver v. Weyhrich	31 F. R.	80
Crawford v. Heysinger	123 U. S.	173, 181
Creamer v. Bowers	30 F. R.	466
Creamer v. Bowers	35 F. R.	441, 443, 447, 562
Crescent Brewing Co. v. Gottfried.	127 U. S.	172
Crescent Brewing Co. v. Gottfried.	128 U. S.	40, 177
Crittenden v. White	23 Minn.	143
Crompton v. Belknap Mills.	3 Fisher	105, 229
Crompton v. Knowles.	7 F. R.	45
Crosby Valve Co. v. Safety Valve Co.	141 U. S.	441, 560, 561, 567, 575
Croskey v. Atterbury	9 App. D. C.	127
Croskey v. Atterbury	76 O. G.	125
Cross v. Evans	167 U. S.	430, 514
Cross v. Mackinnon	11 F. R.	311
Crouch v. Roemer	103 U. S.	36
Crowell v. Parmeter	3 Bann. & Ard.	536
Crown Cork & Seal Co. v. Alumi- num Stopper Co.	108 F. R.	73, 76, 79, 82, 93, 94, 141, 212, 323, 404, 512
Crown Cork & Seal Co. v. Ideal Stopper Co.	123 F. R.	60
Crown Cork & Seal Co. v. Imperial Bottle Cap Co.	123 F. R.	311
Cummings v. Plaster Co.	6 Blatch	427
Curran v. Arkansas	15 Howard	350, 355
Curran v. Burdsall	20 F. R.	274
Curran v. Car Co.	32 F. R.	346
Curtis v. Atlanta Street Railway Co.	56 F. R.	71
Curtis v. Overman Wheel Co.	58 F. R.	548
Cushman Paper Box Mach. Co. v. Goddard	95 F. R.	492
Cutter Co. v. Sheldon.	10 Blatch.	245
Cutting v. Myers	4 Washington	362
C. W. Siemens' Appeal.	11 O. G.	214

D.

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Dable Grain Shovel Co. v. Flint.....	137 U. S.	136, 145
Dade v. Boorum & Pease Co.....	121 F. R.	475
Dale v. Roosevelt	1 Paige (N. Y.).....	382, 406
Dale Tile Mfg. Co. v. Hyatt.....	125 U. S.	328
Dalton v. Nelson	13 Blatch.	26
Dalzell v. Dueber Mfg. Co.....	149 U. S.....	236, 237, 249, 464
Daniel v. United Shoe Mach. Co....	120 F. R.	461
Daniel v. Miller	81 F. R.	383
Dare v. Boylston	6 F. R.	269
Dashiell v. Grosvenor	162 U. S.	315
Davey Pegging Mach. Co. v. Prouty.	107 F. R.	300
Davidson v. Lewis	1 McArthur's Patent Cases...	66
Davis v. Fredericks	19 F. R.	23
Davis v. Murphy	2 Rich. (S. C.)	382
Davis v. Palmer	2 Brock	44
Davis v. Smith	19 F. R.	466
Davis v. United States	23 Court of Claims	332
Davis Electrical Works v. Edison Electric Light Co.	60 F. R.	264
Davis Wheel Co. v. Davis Wagon Co.	20 F. R.	245
Davison's Ex'rs v. Johnson.....	16 New Jersey Equity	463
Davock v. Chicago & Northwestern R. R. Co.	69 F. R.	471
Dawes v. Taylor	14 Reporter	467
Day v. Car-Spring Co.....	3 Blatch.	371, 519
Day v. Hartshorn	3 Fisher	534
Day v. Railroad Co.	132 U. S.	22
Day v. Rubber Co.	20 Howard	418
Day v. Stellman	1 Fisher	418
Day v. Woodworth	13 Howard	424, 445, 446
Dayton Crupper Co. v. Ruhl	55 F. R.	472
Dayton Fan & Motor Co. v. West- inghouse Electric & Mfg. Co....	118 F. R.	169
Dean v. Mason	20 Howard	511, 560
Deane v. Hodge	35 Minn.	266, 273
De Beaumont v. Williams	71 F. R.	238
Dedekam v. Vose	3 Blatch.	425, 429
Dederick v. Fox	56 F. R.	132, 168, 278, 467
Dederick v. Seigmund	51 F. R.	175, 313, 315
Dederick v. Whitman Agricultural Co.	26 F. R.	392
Deere & Co. v. Rock Island Plow Co.	84 F. R.	40
Deering v. Harvester Works	155 U. S.	64, 70, 77
Deering v. Winona Harvester Works.	155 U. S.	101, 161
De Florez v. Reynolds	14 Blatch.	105
De Florez v. Reynolds	17 Blatch.	410, 478
De Lamar v. Deeley	53 F. R.	87
De Lamar v. De Lamar Mining Co.	110 F. R.	40
De Lamar v. De Lamar Mining Co.	117 F. R.	28
Delamater v. Reinhardt	43 F. R.	393
Delano v. Scott	Gilpin	342
De Laval Separator Co. v. Vermont Farm-Mach. Co.	109 F. R.	392

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

li

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
De La Vergne Machine Co. v. Featherstone	49 F. R.	390
De La Vergne Mach. Co. v. Featherstone	147 U. S.	154, 255
Delaware Coal & Ice Co. v. Packard	5 Bann. & Ard.	168, 170
Delaware Telephone Co. v. Delaware	50 F. R.	143
Delemater v. Heath	58 F. R.	84
De Loria v. Whitney	63 F. R.	417
Dennis v. Eddy	12 Blatch.	427
Densmore v. Tanite Co.	32 F. R.	268
Dental Vulcanite Co. v. Davis	102 U. S.	308
Dental Vulcanite Co. v. Van Antwerp	2 Bann. & Ard.	435
Dental Vulcanite Co. v. Wetherbee	2 Cliff.	212
Denton v. Commissioner of Patents	83 O. G.	207
Derby v. Thompson	146 U. S.	68, 169, 307
Despeaux v. Pennsylvania Railroad Co.	81 F. R.	416
Detroit Lubricator Mfg. Co. v. Renchard	9 F. R.	56
Detweiler v. Voegel	8 F. R.	262
Detwiller v. Bosler	58 F. R.	500
De Ver Warner v. Bassett	7 F. R.	528
Devlin v. Paynter	64 F. R.	306
De Witt v. Mfg. Co.	5 Hun (N. Y.)	257
Dexter v. Arnold	5 Mason	501, 507, 508
Dexter v. Arnold	2 Sumner	583
Dey v. Stellman	1 Fisher	265
Diamond Drill & Mach. Co. v. Kelly Bros.	120 F. R.	43, 52, 70, 171, 300
Diamond Match Co. v. Ohio Match Co.	80 F. R.	356, 361, 455
Diamond Match Co. v. Oshkosh Match Works	63 F. R.	492
Diamond State Iron Co. v. Goldie	84 F. R.	44
Dibble v. Augur	7 Blatch.	335
Dick v. Struthers	25 F. R.	337, 465
Dick v. Supply Co.	25 F. R.	471
Dickerson v. Colgrove	100 U. S.	380
Dickerson v. Machine Co.	35 F. R.	522, 523
Dickerson v. Matheson	57 F. R.	252
Dickerson v. Tinling	84 F. R.	252
Dittmar v. Rix	1 F. R.	297
Dixon-Woods Co. v. Pfeifer	55 F. R.	159
Dobson v. Carpet Co.	114 U. S.	566
Dobson v. Cubley	149 U. S.	169, 307
Dobson v. Dornan	118 U. S.	98, 104, 442, 566
Dobson v. Graham	49 F. R.	492
Dobson v. Hartford Carpet Co.	114 U. S.	104
Dobson v. Lees	137 U. S.	208, 209, 408
Dodge v. Card	2 Fisher	529
Dodge v. Fowler	11 App. D. C.	128
Dodge v. Post	76 F. R.	70
Donnell v. Insurance Co.	2 Sumner	583
Dorlon v. Guie	25 F. R.	62

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Dorman <i>v.</i> Keefer	49 F. R.	124
Dorsey Rake Co. <i>v.</i> Marsh.....	6 Fisher	539, 540, 550
Dorsey Rake Co. <i>v.</i> Mfg. Co.....	12 Blatch.	259, 263
Doubleday <i>v.</i> Sherman	4 Fisher	558
Doughty <i>v.</i> West	6 Blatch.	284
Doughty <i>v.</i> West	2 Fisher	472, 523, 525
Douglas <i>v.</i> Abraham	50 F. R.	182
Dow <i>v.</i> Harkin	67 N. H.	237
Dowagiac Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Brennan.....	118 F. R.	413
Dowagiac Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Minnesota Moline Plow Co.	118 F. R.	24, 316
Dowagiac Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Superior Drill Co.	115 F. R.	167, 172, 316
Dowell <i>v.</i> Mitchell	105 U. S.	466
Downton <i>v.</i> Allis	9 F. R.	238, 242
Downton <i>v.</i> Mfg. Co.	9 F. R.	238
Downton <i>v.</i> Milling Co.	108 U. S.	54
Doyle <i>v.</i> Spalding	19 F. R.	52
Drainage Construction Co. <i>v.</i> Chel- sea	41 F. R.	273
Drainage Construction Co. <i>v.</i> Engle- wood Sewer Co.	67 F. R.	471
Drake Castle Pressed Steel Lug Co. <i>v.</i> Brownell	123 F. R.	25, 471
Draper <i>v.</i> Hudson	1 Holmes	549
Draper <i>v.</i> Potomska Mills	3 Bann. & Ard.	56
Draper <i>v.</i> Wattles	3 Bann. & Ard.	88, 110
Drawbaugh <i>v.</i> Seymour	77 O. G.	113
Dredging Co. <i>v.</i> Miller	20 App. D. C.	257
Dreskill <i>v.</i> Parish	5 McLean	427
Dreyfus <i>v.</i> Schneider	25 F. R.	69
Dreyfus <i>v.</i> Searle	124 U. S.	40
Dryfoos <i>v.</i> Friedman	18 F. R.	322
Dryfoos <i>v.</i> Wiese	124 U. S.	310
Du Bois <i>v.</i> Kirk	158 U. S.	23, 509, 513, 549
Duboise <i>v.</i> Railroad Co.	5 Fisher	381, 382
Dudley E. Jones Co. <i>v.</i> Munger Mfg. Co.	49 F. R.	103
Dudley E. Jones Co. <i>v.</i> Munger Mfg. Co.	50 F. R.	498
Dueber Watch Case Co. <i>v.</i> Dalzell..	38 F. R.	245
Duer <i>v.</i> Lock Co.	149 U. S.	22, 44, 45
Duff <i>v.</i> Pump Co.	107 U. S.	315
Duffy <i>v.</i> Reynolds	24 F. R.	69
Dukes <i>v.</i> Bauerle	41 F. R.	17, 104
Dunbar <i>v.</i> Eastern Elevating Co....	75 F. R.	207
Dunbar <i>v.</i> Eastern Elevating Co....	81 F. R.	42
Dunbar <i>v.</i> Myers	94 U. S. .. 33, 169, 196, 307, 380,	471
Dunham <i>v.</i> Bent	72 F. R.	270
Dunham <i>v.</i> Dennison Mfg. Co.	154 U. S.	211
Dunham <i>v.</i> Railroad Co.	7 Bissell	257, 265
Dunlap <i>v.</i> Schofield	152 U. S.	364, 379, 393, 478
Duplex Printing-Press Co. <i>v.</i> Camp- bell Printing-Press Co.	69 F. R.	540, 547
Duponti <i>v.</i> Mussy	4 Washington	461
Durand <i>v.</i> Schulze	61 F. R.	163
Durham <i>v.</i> Seymour	71 O. G.	117, 118

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

liii

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Durham <i>v.</i> Seymour	161 U. S.	131
Dyer <i>v.</i> Rich	1 Metcalf (Mass.)	239, 246
Dyson <i>v.</i> Danforth	4 Fisher	407

E.

Eachus <i>v.</i> Broomall	115 U. S.	217, 380
Eager <i>v.</i> United States	35 Court of Claims	46
Eagle Lock Co. <i>v.</i> Corbin Lock Co.	64 F. R.	500
Eagle Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Bradley Mfg. Co.	50 F. R.	382
Eagle Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Miller	41 F. R.	382
Eagle Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Plow Co.	36 F. R.	539
Eagle Pencil Co. <i>v.</i> American Pencil Co.	53 F. R.	17
Eagleton Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> West Mfg. Co.	111 U. S.	122
Eames <i>v.</i> Andrews	122 U. S.	3, 54
Eames <i>v.</i> Cook	2 Fisher	300
Eames <i>v.</i> Godfrey	1 Wallace	169, 307, 310
Earle <i>v.</i> Hall	22 Pickering (Mass.)	386
Eastern Paper Bag Co. <i>v.</i> Nixon.	35 F. R.	489, 539
Eastman <i>v.</i> Bodfish	1 Story	365
Eastman <i>v.</i> Hinckel	5 Bann. & Ard.	322
Eastman <i>v.</i> Houston	95 O. G.	125
Eastman Co. <i>v.</i> Getz	84 F. R.	428
Eaton <i>v.</i> Lewis	115 F. R.	15
Eby <i>v.</i> King	158 U. S.	209, 213
Ecaubert <i>v.</i> Appleton	47 F. R.	474
Ecaubert <i>v.</i> Appleton	67 F. R.	71, 78, 429, 483, 493
Eclipse Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Adkins	36 F. R.	471
Eclipse Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Adkins	44 F. R.	17
Eclipse Windmill Co. <i>v.</i> Windmill Co.	24 F. R.	271
Edison <i>v.</i> American Mutoscope Co.	110 F. R.	84, 132, 550
Edison <i>v.</i> American Mutoscope Co.	114 F. R.	24, 164, 170
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Beacon Electrical Co.	54 F. R.	522, 533
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Bloom- ingdale	65 F. R.	489
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Boston Lamp Co.	62 F. R.	312
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Buck- eye Electric Co.	59 F. R.	157, 544
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> E. G. Bernard Co.	88 F. R.	42
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Elec- tric Mfg. Co.	57 F. R.	533
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Elec- tric Supply Co.	60 F. R.	410
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Elec- tric Supply Co.	66 F. R.	513
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Equi- table Life Co.	55 F. R.	464, 469, 470
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Goelet.	65 F. R.	262
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Mt. Morris Electric Light Co.	57 F. R.	142, 469
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Mt. Morris Electric Light Co.	58 F. R.	537, 540

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> New Haven Electric Co.	35 F. R.	249
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Peninsular Light, Power & Heat Co.	95 F. R.	260, 345
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Peninsular L., P. & H. Co.	101 F. R.	262
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Perkins Electric Lamp Co.	42 F. R.	152
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Philadelphia Trust Co.	60 F. R.	208, 523
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Sawyer-Man Electric Co.	53 F. R.	142, 537, 539
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> United States Electric Lighting Co.	35 F. R.	150
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> United States Electric Lighting Co.	45 F. R.	497
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> U. S. Electric Lighting Co.	47 F. R.	181
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> U. S. Electric Lighting Co.	52 F. R.	26, 29, 156, 158, 171
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Waring Electric Co.	59 F. R.	150
Edison Electric Light Co. <i>v.</i> Westinghouse Electric Co.	54 F. R.	556
Edison Phonograph Co. <i>v.</i> Hawthorne & Sheble Mfg. Co.	108 F. R.	454
Edison Phonograph Co. <i>v.</i> Kaufmann	105 F. R.	262
Edison Phonograph Co. <i>v.</i> Pike.	116 F. R.	262
Edison Phonograph Co. <i>v.</i> Victor Talking Mach. Co.	120 F. R.	356
Edward Barr Co. <i>v.</i> Sprinkler Co.	32 F. R.	522, 528
Egbert <i>v.</i> Lippmann	104 U. S.	85
Elastic Fabrics Co. <i>v.</i> Smith	100 U. S.	192, 428, 513
Eldred <i>v.</i> Kessler	106 F. R.	315
Electrical Accumulator Co. <i>v.</i> Brush Electric Co.	44 F. R.	280
Electrical Accumulator Co. <i>v.</i> Brush Electric Co.	52 F. R.	190
Electrical Accumulator Co. <i>v.</i> Julien Electric Co.	38 F. R.	34, 44, 52, 59, 188, 190
Electrical Accumulator Co. <i>v.</i> Julien Electric Co.	47 F. R.	543
Electrical Accumulator Co. <i>v.</i> New York & Harlem R. R. Co.	50 F. R.	204
Electric Boot & Shoe Finishing Co. <i>v.</i> Little	75 F. R.	376
Electric Gas Lighting Co. <i>v.</i> Boston Electric Co.	139 U. S.	209
Electric Gas Lighting Co. <i>v.</i> Fuller.	59 F. R.	511
Electric Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Edison Electric Light Co.	61 F. R.	533
Electric Ry. Co. <i>v.</i> Jamaica R. R. Co.	61 F. R.	24, 39
Electric Signal Co. <i>v.</i> Hall Signal Co.	114 U. S.	304
Electric Smelting & Aluminum Co. <i>v.</i> Carborundum Co.	102 F. R.	43, 159

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

lv

Names or cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Electric Smelting & Aluminum Co. v. Pittsburg Reduction Co.	111 F. R.	298
Electric Vehicle Co. v. Winton Motor-Carriage Co.	104 F. R.	471
Elgin Butter Tub Co. v. Creamery Package Mfg. Co.	80 F. R.	173
Elgin Wind Power Co. v. Nichols.	65 F. R.	261, 328, 330, 464
Elgin Wind Power Co. v. Nichols.	105 F. R.	566
Elizabeth v. Pavement Co.	97 U. S. ... 63, 84, 85, 89, 276, 318 344, 349, 560, 561, 563, 567, 574	318
Elliot v. Piersol	1 Peters	545
Elliott & Hatch Book-Typewriter Co. v. Fisher Typewriter Co.	109 F. R.	361
Ellithorp v. Robertson	4 Blatch.	56
Elm City Co. v. Wooster	6 Fisher	88
Elmendorf v. Taylor	10 Wheaton	481
Ely v. Mfg. Co.	4 Fisher	520, 538
Emack v. Kane	34 F. R.	459
Emerson v. Hogg	2 Blatch.	109
Emerson v. Hubbard	34 F. R.	483
Emerson v. Lippert	31 F. R.	150
Emerson v. Simm	6 Fisher	435, 446
Emerson Co. v. Nimocks	88 F. R.	395
Emerson Co. v. Nimocks	99 F. R.	99, 159
Enigh v. Chamberlin	2 Fisher	271
Enigh v. Railroad Co.	6 F. R. 438, 451, 562, 572, 573	573
E. M. Miller Co. v. Meriden Bronze Co.	80 F. R.	54
Empire State Nail Co. v. American Button Co.	61 F. R.	524, 529
Empire State Nail Co. v. Faulkner.	55 F. R.	246
Engle Sanitary & Cremation Co. v. City of Elwood	73 F. R.	310
Enterprise Mfg. Co. v. Deisler.	46 F. R.	489
Enterprise Mfg. Co. v. Sargent	28 F. R.	36
Enterprise Mfg. Co. v. Sargent	48 F. R.	556
Enterprise Mfg. Co. v. Snow.	72 F. R.	413
Enterprise Mfg. Co. v. Snow.	89 F. R.	300
Erie Railway Co. v. Ramsay	45 New York	545
Erie Rubber Co. v. American Dunlop Tire Co.	70 F. R.	374
Estey v. Burdett	109 U. S.	27
Esty v. Newton	14 App. D. C.	124
Eunson v. Dodge	18 Wallace	233
Evans v. Eaton	3 Wheaton 183, 371, 373,	403
Evans v. Eaton	7 Wharton	432
Evans v. Hettich	7 Wheaton	417
Evans v. Jordan	9 Cranch.	224
Evans v. Suess Glass Co.	83 F. R.	513
Everest v. Oil Co.	20 F. R.	69
Everest v. Oil Co.	22 F. R.	500
Everett v. Hauleubeek	68 F. R.	330
Everett v. Thatcher	3 Bann. & Ard.	527
Evory v. Bart	15 F. R.	312
Ewart Mfg. Co. v. Baldwin Cycle- Chain Co.	91 F. R.	439

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Ewart Mfg. Co. v. Iron Co.	31 F. R.	316
Excelsior Wooden Pipe Co. v. Allen.	104 F. R.	339
Excelsior Wooden Pipe Co. v. City of Seattle	117 F. R.	339
Excelsior Wooden Pipe Co. v. Pacific Bridge Co.	185 U. S.	330
Expanded Metal Co. v. Board of Education	103 F. R.	174
Ex parte Messenger	78 O. G.	133
Ex parte Robinson	2 Bissell	143
Ex rel. Bigelow	2 McArthur	119

F.

Facer v. Midvale Steel-Work Co.	38 F. R.	550
Fairbanks Wood Rim Co. v. Moore.	78 F. R.	26
Falley v. Giles	29 Indiana	242
Farley v. Steam Gauge Co.	1 McArthur's Patent Cases.	64
Farmers' Mfg. Co. v. Corn-Planter Co.	128 U. S.	212
Farmers' Mfg. Co. v. Spruks Mfg. Co.	119 F. R.	309, 310, 349
Farrell v. Boston, etc., Silver Mining Co.	121 F. R.	40, 177
Farrell v. United Verde Copper Co.	121 F. R.	465
Farrington v. Detroit	4 Fisher	233
Farrington v. Gregory	4 Fisher	264
Faulks v. Kamp	17 Blatch.	246
Fay v. Cordesman	109 U. S.	162, 169, 307
Fay v. Mason.	120 F. R.	206, 207
F. C. Austin Mfg. Co. v. American Wellworks	121 F. R.	547
Featherstone v. Cycle Co.	53 F. R.	163, 344, 347
Featherstone v. Cycle Co.	57 F. R.	209
Feder v. A. B. Fiedler & Sons.	116 F. R.	330
Fefel v. Stocker	17 App. D. C.	124
Fenton Metallic Mfg. Co. v. Office Specialty Co.	12 App. D. C.	577
Fermentation Co. v. Maus.	122 U. S.	3
Ferrett v. Atwill	1 Blatch.	291, 292
Fetter v. Newhall	17 F. R.	240
Field v. De Comeau.	116 U. S.	300
Filley v. Stove Co.	30 F. R.	196, 305
Fischer v. Hayes	6 F. R.	393, 482
Fischer v. Hayes.	16 F. R.	579
Fischer v. Hayes.	39 F. R.	562
Fischer v. Neil	6 F. R.	236
Fish v. Manning	31 F. R.	292
Fisher v. Amador Mine.	25 F. R.	276
Fisk Clark & Flagg v. Hollander.	MacArthur & Mackay.	166, 239
Fitch v. Bragg	16 F. R.	441
Florsheim v. Schilling	137 U. S.	25, 37, 62, 175
Flower v. Detroit	127 U. S.	215
Fond Du Lac County v. May.	137 U. S.	32, 40
Foos Mfg. Co. v. Thresher Co.	44 F. R.	171
Foot v. Silsby	1 Blatch.	374
Foot v. Stein	35 F. R.	501

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

lvii

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Forbes v. Stove Co.....	2 Cliff.	220
Forbush v. Bradford.....	1 Fisher	534, 539
Forbush v. Cook	2 Fisher	33, 101
Force v. Sawyer-Boss Mfg. Co.....	111 F. R.	383
Ford v. Bancroft	98 F. R.	300
Ford Morocco Co. v. Tannage Pat- ent Co.	84 F. R.	298
Forchand v. Porter	15 F. R.	465
Forgie v. Oil Well Supply Co.....	57 F. R.	42, 177
Forgie v. Oil Well Supply Co.....	58 F. R.	47
Forncrook v. Root	127 U. S.	310
Forschner v. Baumgarten	26 F. R.	25
Forsyth v. Hammond	166 U. S.	515
Fosdick v. Lowell Machine Shop....	58 F. R.	469
Foss v. Herbert	1 Bissell	299
Foss v. Herbert	2 Fisher	309
Foster v. Antisdell.....	14 App. D. C.....	124
Foster v. Crossin	23 F. R.	60, 522, 528
Foster v. Crossin	44 F. R.	17, 42
Foster v. Moore	1 Curtis	526, 541
Fougeres v. Murbarger	44 F. R.	459, 460
Fowler v. City of New York.....	121 F. R.	17, 455
Fox v. Perkins	52 F. R.	44
Fraim v. Iron Co.....	27 F. R.	533
Francis v. Flinn	118 U. S.	460
Frank v. Geiger	121 F. R.	447
Frederick R. Stearns & Co. v. Rus- sell	85 F. R.	42, 172, 177, 183
Freeman v. Asmus	145 U. S.	167, 215
Freese v. Swartchild	35 F. R.	394
French v. Carter	137 U. S.....	28, 45
French v. Edwards	21 Wallace	422
French v. Rogers	1 Fisher	214
Fresno Home-Packing Co. v. Fruit- Cleaning Co.	101 F. R.	239
Fruit-Cleaning Co. v. Fresno Home- Packing Co.	94 F. R.	154, 334
Fry v. Quinlan	13 Blatch.	116
Fry v. Yeaton	1 Cranch's Circuit Court Rep..	426
Ft. Wayne, Cincinnati & Louisville R. R. Co. v. Haberkorn.....	1 Ind. App.....	258, 264
Fuller v. Berger	120 F. R.	75
Fuller v. Field	82 F. R.	568
Fuller v. Gilmore	121 F. R.	538
Fuller v. Yentzer	94 U. S.	169, 174, 307
Fuller & Johnson Mfg. Co. v. Bart- lett	68 Wis.	275

G.

Gage v. Herring	107 U. S.	192, 219, 419
Gage v. Kellogg	26 F. R.	501
Gallahue v. Butterfield	10 Blatch.	218
Galliher v. Cadwell.....	145 U. S.	468
Gamewell Fire Alarm Telegraph Co. v. Brooklyn	14 F. R.	259, 338

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Gamewell Fire-Alarm Telegraph Co. <i>v. Chillicothe</i>	7 F. R.	355
Gamewell Fire-Alarm Tel. Co. <i>v.</i> Municipal Signal Co.	61 F. R.	548, 552
Gandy <i>v. Belting Co.</i>	28 F. R.	89
Gandy <i>v. Belting Co.</i>	143 U. S.	23, 44, 76, 89, 361
Gandy <i>v. Marble</i>	122 U. S.	118, 119
Gardner <i>v. Herz</i>	118 U. S.	17, 25
Gardner <i>v. Howe</i>	2 Cliff.	149
Garretson <i>v. Clark</i>	4 Bann. & Ard.	575
Garretson <i>v. Clark</i>	111 U. S.	566
Gates Iron Works <i>v. Fraser</i>	42 F. R.	39
Gates Iron Works <i>v. Fraser</i>	153 U. S.	41, 177
Gates Iron Works <i>v. Kimbell &</i> Cobb Stone Co.	79 F. R.	490
Gay <i>v. Cornell</i>	1 Blatch.	117, 235
Gayler <i>v. Wilder</i>	10 Howard... ..	59, 67, 235, 236, 237 251, 258, 338
Gear <i>v. Fitch</i>	3 Bann. & Ard.	244
Gear <i>v. Grosvenor</i>	1 Holmes	229, 230
Geis <i>v. Kimber</i>	36 F. R.	345
General Electric Co. <i>v. Brooklyn</i> Heights R. Co.	118 F. R.	300
General Electric Co. <i>v. Star Brass</i> Works	109 F. R.	479
General Electric Co. <i>v. Wagner Elec-</i> tric Mfg. Co.	123 F. R.	496
General Electric Co. <i>v. Winsted Gas</i> Co.	110 F. R.	323
General Electric Co. <i>v. Wise</i>	119 F. R.	542
Geo. Ertel Co. <i>v. Stahl</i>	65 F. R.	524, 525, 529
George Frost Co. <i>v. Cohn</i>	119 F. R.	26
Gerard <i>v. Safe & Lock Co.</i>	48 F. R.	480
Germain <i>v. Wilgus</i>	67 F. R.	458
German-American Filter Co. <i>v. Erd-</i> rich	98 F. R.	61
German-American Filter Co. <i>v. Loew</i> Filter Co.	103 F. R.	345
Giant Powder Co. <i>v. Nitro Powder</i> Co.	19 F. R.	206, 214, 464
Gibbs <i>v. Hoefner</i>	19 F. R.	74, 271
Gibson <i>v. Cook</i>	2 Blatch.	242, 244
Gibson <i>v. Gifford</i>	1 Blatch.	214
Gibson <i>v. Harris</i>	1 Blatch.	214
Gibson <i>v. Van Dresar</i>	1 Blatch.	538, 541
Gilbert & Barker Mfg. Co. <i>v. Buss-</i> ing	12 Blatch.	275, 541
Giles <i>v. Heysinger</i>	150 U. S.	36
Gill <i>v. United States</i>	160 U. S.	273, 275
Gill <i>v. Wells</i>	22 Wallace	100, 217, 306
Gillespie <i>v. Cummings</i>	3 Sawyer	355
Gilmore <i>v. Anderson</i>	38 F. R.	531
Gilmore <i>v. Golay</i>	3 Fisher	283
Gilpin <i>v. Consequa</i>	3 Washington	447
Gimbel <i>v. Hogg</i>	97 F. R.	447, 448
Gindorff <i>v. Deering</i>	81 F. R.	3
Glaenzer <i>v. Wiederer</i>	33 F. R.	533

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

lix

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Glenn <i>v.</i> Adams	12 App. D. C.	128
Gloucester Isinglass Co. <i>v.</i> Brooks..	19 F. R.	123
Gloucester Isinglass Co. <i>v.</i> Le Page,	30 F. R.	42, 382
Glue Co. <i>v.</i> Upton	97 U. S.	27
Godell <i>v.</i> Wells & French Co.	70 F. R.	266
Godfrey <i>v.</i> Eames	1 Wallace	132
Goebel <i>v.</i> Supply Co.	55 F. R.	361, 456
Gold & Silver Ore Co. <i>v.</i> Disintegrat- ing Ore Co.	6 Blatch.	168, 278
Gold & Stock Telegraph Co. <i>v.</i> Pearce	19 F. R.	555
Gold & Stock Telegraph Co. <i>v.</i> Telegram Co.	23 F. R.	150
Goldie <i>v.</i> Diamond State Iron Co..	81 F. R.	306
Goldie <i>v.</i> Iron Co.	64 F. R.	44, 414
Goldsmith <i>v.</i> Collar Co.	18 Blatch.	337
Good <i>v.</i> Deland	121 N. Y.	142
Goodyear <i>v.</i> Allyn	6 Blatch.	410, 478, 533
Goodyear <i>v.</i> Berry	3 Fisher	531
Goodyear <i>v.</i> Bishop	4 Blatch.	339
Goodyear <i>v.</i> Bishop	2 Fisher	434, 442, 446
Goodyear <i>v.</i> Cary	4 Blatch.	243
Goodyear <i>v.</i> Hills	3 Fisher	541
Goodyear <i>v.</i> Hullihen	3 Fisher	219
Goodyear <i>v.</i> McBurney	3 Blatch.	338
Goodyear <i>v.</i> Mullee	5 Blatch.	342, 557
Goodyear <i>v.</i> Mullee	3 Fisher	523
Goodyear <i>v.</i> Railroad Co.	1 Fisher	251, 522
Goodyear <i>v.</i> Rubber Co.	3 Blatch.	272, 535
Goodyear <i>v.</i> Rubber Co.	1 Cliff.	233
Goodyear <i>v.</i> Vulcanite Co.	2 Fisher	45
Goodyear Dental Vulcanite Co. <i>v.</i> Davis	3 Bann. & Ard.	488
Goodyear Dental Vulcanite Co. <i>v.</i> Folsom	5 Bann. & Ard.	553
Goodyear Shoe Machinery Co. <i>v.</i> Dancel	119 F. R.	270
Goodyear Shoe Machinery Co. <i>v.</i> Jackson	112 F. R.	263
Goodyear Shoe Mach. Co. <i>v.</i> Spauld- ing	101 F. R.	323
Gordon <i>v.</i> Anthony	16 Blatch.	335
Gordon <i>v.</i> Harvester Works	23 F. R.	346
Gordon <i>v.</i> Warder	150 U. S.	310
Gorham <i>v.</i> White	14 Wallace	322
Goshen Sweeper Co. <i>v.</i> Bissell Sweeper Co.	72 F. R.	305
Goss <i>v.</i> Cameron	14 F. R.	3
Goss Printing-Press Co. <i>v.</i> Scott..	103 F. R.	17, 61
Goss Printing-Press Co. <i>v.</i> Scott..	108 F. R.	35, 76
Gottfried <i>v.</i> Brewing Co.	5 Bann. & Ard.	406
Gottfried <i>v.</i> Brewing Co.	13 F. R.	465
Gottfried <i>v.</i> Brewing Co.	22 F. R.	438
Gottfried <i>v.</i> Miller	104 U. S.	239
Gottfried <i>v.</i> Moerlein	14 F. R.	465
Gould <i>v.</i> Sessions	67 F. R.	555, 556
Gould <i>v.</i> Spicer	15 F. R.	219, 419

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Gould Coupler Co. v. Pratt.....	70 F. R.	311, 312
Graham v. Crawford Mfg. Co.	11 F. R.	169
Graham v. Earl	82 F. R.	190, 341, 342, 362
Graham v. Johnston	21 F. R.	82
Graham v. Mfg. Co.	11 F. R.	64, 87, 166, 452
Graham v. Mfg. Co.	24 F. R.	434, 435
Graham v. Mason	5 Fisher	312
Graham v. Mason	1 Holmes	561, 566
Graham v. McCormick	5 Bann. & Ard....	64, 87, 132, 169
Graham v. McCormick	11 F. R.	166
Graham v. Teter	25 F. R.	117
Gramme Electrical Co. v. Electric Co.	17 F. R.	150
Grant v. Raymond	6 Peters....	92, 134, 165, 199, 207 212, 222, 231, 371, 419
Grant v. Walter	148 U. S.	161
Graver v. Faurot	162 U. S.	430, 514
Gray v. Halkyard	28 F. R.	497
Gray v. James	1 Peters' Circuit Court Reports.	93 361, 407
Gray v. Railroad Co.	1 Woolworth	553, 554
Green v. Austin	22 O. G.	341
Green v. Barney	19 F. R.	469
Green v. Biddle	8 Wheaton	139
Green v. Bogue	158 U. S.	464
Green v. City of Lynn	55 F. R.	383, 488, 491
Green v. City of Lynn	81 F. R.	356, 424
Green v. French	4 Bann. & Ard..	469, 536, 537, 538
Green v. French	11 F. R.	69
Green v. Gardner	22 O. G.	342
Greene v. Bishop	1 Cliff.	582, 583
Greene v. Buckley	120 F. R.	349, 350
Greenleaf v. Mfg. Co.	17 Blatch.	438
Greenwood v. Bracher	1 F. R.	529
Grier v. Baynes	46 F. R.	272
Grier v. Baynes	49 F. R.	257
Grier v. Wilt	120 U. S.	380
Griffen v. Swenson	15 App. D. C.	127
Griffith v. Segar	29 F. R.	355
Griffith v. Shaw	89 F. R.	383
Grimes v. Allen	102 F. R.	36
Groth v. Postal Supply Co.	61 F. R.	180
Grover & Baker Sewing Mach. Co. v. Williams	2 Fisher.....	519, 525, 526, 527
Guaranty Trust Co. v. Green Cove Railroad	139 U. S.	108, 246, 495
Guidet v. Brooklyn	105 U. S.	27
Guidet v. Palmer	10 Blatch.	540
Guille v. Swan	19 Johnson (N. Y.).....	343
Gunn v. Savage	30 F. R.	173
Guyon v. Serrell	1 Blatch.	445

H.

Haarmann v. Lueders	109 F. R.	455
Haffeke v. Clark	46 F. R.	2, 159
Haffeke v. Clark	50 F. R.	271

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Hailes v. Albany Stove Co.	123 U. S.	186, 187, 188, 191, 193 215
Hailes v. Van Wormer	20 Wallace	30
Haines v. McLaughlin	135 U. S.	418
Haines v. Peck	26 F. R.	212
Hake v. Brown	37 F. R.	197
Hake v. Brown	44 F. R.	504
Hale & Kilbourn Mfg. Co. v. Hart- ford Mattress Co.	36 F. R.	42
Hall v. Macneale	107 U. S.	38, 88
Hall v. Stern	20 F. R.	442
Hall v. Wiles	2 Blatch.	192, 444
Hall Signal Co. v. Union Switch & Signal Co.	115 F. R.	406
Halstead v. Grinnan	152 U. S.	468
Hamilton v. Kingsbury	15 Blatch.	262, 270
Hamilton v. Kingsbury	17 Blatch.	259, 265
Hamilton v. Rollins	3 Bann. & Ard.	240
Hamilton v. Simons	5 Bissell	557
Hammacher v. Wilson	26 F. R.	268
Hammacher v. Wilson	32 F. R.	583
Hammerschlag v. Garrett	10 F. R.	297
Hammerschlag Mfg. Co. v. Bancroft.	32 F. R.	490
Hammerschlag Mfg. Co. v. Spalding.	35 F. R.	490
Hammond v. Hunt	4 Bann. & Ard.	338
Hammond v. Organ Co.	92 U. S.	272
Hammond Buckle Co. v. Goodyear Rubber Co.	49 F. R.	531
Hammond Buckle Co. v. Goodyear Rubber Co.	58 F. R.	44
Hammond's Appeal	2 O. G.	114
Hancock Inspirator Co. v. Jenks.	21 F. R.	101, 105, 161
Hanger v. Abbott	6 Wallace	354
Hanifen v. Armitage	117 F. R.	23
Hanifen v. E. H. Godshalk Co.	78 F. R.	66, 405, 503
Hanifen v. E. H. Godshalk Co.	84 F. R.	54
Hanifen v. Lupton	95 F. R.	268
Hanifen v. Price	96 F. R.	66
Hanifen v. Price	102 F. R.	490
Hanks Dental Assn. v. International Tooth Crown Co.	122 F. R.	381
Hanlon v. Primrose	56 F. R.	471
Hans v. Louisiana	134 U. S.	341
Hapgood v. Hewitt	119 U. S.	233, 270
Hapgood v. Rosenstock	23 F. R.	250
Harding v. Handy	11 Wheaton	581, 583
Hardwick v. Masland	71 F. R.	394
Harmon v. Bird	22 Wendell (N. Y.)	238
Harmon v. Struthers	43 F. R.	85, 315, 316
Harmon v. Struthers	48 F. R.	381
Harper v. Butler	2 Peters	337
Harper & Reynolds Co. v. Wilgus.	56 F. R.	390
Harris v. Allen	15 F. R.	309
Harris v. Stern and Lotz	105 O. G.	125
Harrison v. Morton	83 Md.	235, 236, 250
Hart & Hegeman Mfg. Co. v. Anchor Electric Co.	92 F. R.	206

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Hartell <i>v.</i> Tilghman	99 U. S.	329
Hartshorn <i>v.</i> Barrel Co.	119 U. S.	173, 211, 212
Hartshorn <i>v.</i> Day	19 Howard	240
Hartshorn <i>v.</i> Roller Co.	18 F. R.	211
Harwood <i>v.</i> Mfg. Co.	3 Fisher	312
Hascall <i>v.</i> Whitman	19 Me.	143
Haselden <i>v.</i> Ogden	3 Fisher	444
Haslem <i>v.</i> Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.	71 O. G.	22
Hatch <i>v.</i> Mollitt	15 F. R.	3, 25
Hatch Storage Battery Co. <i>v.</i> Elec- tric Storage Battery Co.	100 F. R.	529
Hatfield <i>v.</i> Smith	44 F. R.	258
Hathaway <i>v.</i> Roach	2 Woodbury & Minot..	425, 426, 427
Hat Pouncing Machine Co. <i>v.</i> Hed- den	148 U. S.	35, 44
Hat-Sweat Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Porter.....	46 F. R.	266
Hat-Sweat Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Sewing Ma- chine Co.	32 F. R.	534
Hat-Sweat Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Waring	46 F. R.	266
Hausknecht <i>v.</i> Claypool	1 Black.....	354, 390, 430
Havana Press Drill Co. <i>v.</i> Ashurst..	148 Ill.	328
Havemeyer <i>v.</i> Randall	21 F. R.	219, 403
Hawes <i>v.</i> Antisdel	2 Bann. & Ard.	69
Hayden <i>v.</i> Oriental Mills	15 F. R.	354
Hayden <i>v.</i> Oriental Mills	22 F. R.	381
Hayes <i>v.</i> Bickelhaupt	23 F. R.	356, 391
Hayes <i>v.</i> Dayton	8 F. R.	356
Hayes <i>v.</i> Leton	5 F. R.	527
Hayward <i>v.</i> Andrews	12 F. R.	240
Hayward <i>v.</i> Andrews	106 U. S.	259, 335, 467
Hazelip <i>v.</i> Richardson	10 O. G.	114
Head <i>v.</i> Porter	48 F. R.	333
Head <i>v.</i> Porter	70 F. R.	483
Heald <i>v.</i> Rice	104 U. S.	38
Heap <i>v.</i> Borchers	108 F. R.	466
Heath <i>v.</i> Hildreth	1 McArthur's Patent Cases.	18, 64 130
Heaton Button-Fastener Co. <i>v.</i> Mac- Donald	57 F. R.	560
Heaton-Peninsular Button-Fastener Co. <i>v.</i> Eureka Specialty Co.....	77 F. R.	142, 144, 262, 345
Heaton-Peninsular Button-Fastener Co. <i>v.</i> Schlochtmeyer	69 F. R.	455
Hebert <i>v.</i> Joly	5 Louisiana	457
Heckers <i>v.</i> Fowler	2 Wallace..	388, 389, 422, 423, 429
Helm <i>v.</i> First National Bank	43 Ind.	143
Henderson <i>v.</i> Stove Co.	2 Bann. & Ard.	174
Hendrie <i>v.</i> Sayles	98 U. S.	155, 235, 243, 250
Hendy <i>v.</i> Iron Works	127 U. S.	32, 40
Henry <i>v.</i> Stove Co.	2 Bann. & Ard.	335
Henry <i>v.</i> Stove Co.....	5 Bann. & Ard.	87, 110
Henry <i>v.</i> Tool Co.	3 Bann. & Ard.	151
Henry <i>v.</i> United States	22 Court of Claims	371
Henzel <i>v.</i> California Electrical Works	51 F. R.	530

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

lxiii

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Herbert <i>v.</i> Butler	97 U. S.	430
Herring <i>v.</i> Gage	3 Bann. & Ard.	561, 562
Herring <i>v.</i> Nelson	3 Bann. & Ard.	217
Heulings <i>v.</i> Reid	58 F. R.	49
Hewett <i>v.</i> Swift	3 Allen (Mass.)	352
Hiatt <i>v.</i> Twomey	1 Devereaux & Battle's Equity Cas. (N. C.)	247
Hicks <i>v.</i> Kelsey	18 Wallace	25
Highy <i>v.</i> Rubber Co.	18 F. R.	555
Hill <i>v.</i> Biddle	27 F. R.	193
Hill <i>v.</i> Dunklee	1 McArthur's Patent Cases ...	66
Hill <i>v.</i> Hodge	12 App. D. C.	100, 128
Hill <i>v.</i> Smith	32 F. R.	506
Hill <i>v.</i> Thuermer	13 Indiana	238
Hill <i>v.</i> Whitcomb	1 Holmes	259
Hill <i>v.</i> Wooster	132 U. S.	17, 119
Hillborn <i>v.</i> Hale & Kilburn Mfg. Co.	69 F. R.	43, 164, 183
Himely <i>v.</i> Rose	5 Cranch	512
Hipp <i>v.</i> Babin	19 Howard	512
Hisey <i>v.</i> Peters	71 O. G.	123, 128, 129
Hitchcock <i>v.</i> Tremaine	9 Blatch.	501
Hitchcock <i>v.</i> Tremaine	4 Fisher	174
Hitchcock <i>v.</i> Tremaine	5 Fisher	502
Hobbie <i>v.</i> Jennison	149 U. S.	252
Hobbie <i>v.</i> Smith	27 F. R.	69, 434, 441
Hobbs <i>v.</i> Beach	180 U. S.	122, 150, 200
Hockholzer <i>v.</i> Eager	2 Sawyer	536
Hodge <i>v.</i> Railroad Co.	6 Blatch.	233, 521, 535, 539
Hodge <i>v.</i> North Missouri Railroad Co.	1 Dillon	255
Hodge <i>v.</i> Railroad Cos.	4 Fisher	336
Hoe <i>v.</i> Boston Daily Advertiser ...	14 F. R.	540
Hoe <i>v.</i> Kahler	12 F. R.	105
Hoe <i>v.</i> Knap	27 F. R.	162, 540
Hoe <i>v.</i> Scott	87 F. R.	577
Hoeltge <i>v.</i> Hoeller	2 Bond	280
Hoff <i>v.</i> Iron Clad Mfg. Co.	139 U. S.	25
Hoffheins <i>v.</i> Brandt	3 Fisher	220
Hogg <i>v.</i> Emerson	11 Howard	166, 173, 420
Hogg <i>v.</i> Gimbel	94 F. R.	447
Hohorst <i>v.</i> Howard	37 F. R.	465
Holbrook <i>v.</i> Small	3 Bann. & Ard.	446
Holden <i>v.</i> Curtis	2 New Hampshire	238, 244
Hollida <i>v.</i> Hunt	70 Ill.	143
Holiday <i>v.</i> Mattheson	24 F. R.	262
Holliday <i>v.</i> Pickhardt	12 F. R.	528
Holliday <i>v.</i> Pickhardt	29 F. R.	181, 279
Hollister <i>v.</i> Benedict Mfg. Co.	113 U. S.	17, 18, 22, 44
Holloway <i>v.</i> Dow	54 F. R.	101, 161, 390
Holmes <i>v.</i> Truman	67 F. R.	396, 418, 442
Holmes Alarm Tel. Co. <i>v.</i> Telephone Co.	42 F. R.	33, 150
Holmes, Booth & Haydens <i>v.</i> McGill.	108 F. R.	266
Holmes Protective Co. <i>v.</i> Alarm Co.	21 F. R.	152
Holmes Protective Co. <i>v.</i> Alarm Co.	31 F. R.	533
Horman Patent Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Railroad Co.	15 Blatch.	355

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Horn v. Detroit Co.	150 U. S.	464
Hoskin v. Fisher	125 U. S.	211, 215, 409
Hotchkiss v. Greenwood	11 Howard	25
Hotchkiss v. Greenwood	4 McLean	49
Hotchkiss v. Oliver	5 Denio (N. Y.)	376
Hotchkiss v. Wooden Ware Co.	53 F. R.	289, 290
Houston Ry. Co. v. Stern.	74 F. R.	436
Howard v. Hey	18 App. D. C.	116
Howard v. Mast	33 F. R.	556
Howard v. Stillwell & Bierce Mfg. Co.	139 U. S.	417
Howard v. St. Paul Plow-Works.	35 F. R.	69, 348, 349
Howe v. Morton	1 Fisher	530, 539, 541
Howe v. Russell	36 Maine	583
Howe v. Williams	2 Cliff.	298
Howe Machine Co. v. National Needle Co.	134 U. S.	40, 171, 173, 180
Howe Machine Co. v. Needle Co.	21 F. R.	42
Howes v. McNeal	3 Bann. & Ard.	81, 132
Howes v. McNeal	5 Bann. & Ard.	56
Hoyt v. Computing Scale Co.	96 F. R.	292
H. T. Slemmer's Appeal.	58 Penn.	49
Hubbell v. De Land.	14 F. R.	462
Hubbell v. United States	171 U. S.	381
Hubbell v. United States	179 U. S.	182, 307
Hubel v. Dick	28 F. R.	64, 311, 316
Hubel v. Tucker	24 F. R.	128
Huber v. Nelson Mfg. Co.	148 U. S.	152, 209
Huber v. Sanitary Depot	34 F. R.	338, 356
Hudson v. Draper.	4 Fisher	395
Huebel v. Barnard	90 O. G.	48
Hulett v. Long	15 App. D. C.	125, 374
Hulett v. Long	89 O. G.	128
Hull v. Commissioner of Patents.	7 O. G.	112, 119
Hulse v. Bonsack Mach. Co.	65 F. R.	249
Humphreys v. Douglass	10 Vermont	341
Hunnicutt v. Peyton	102 U. S.	433
Hunt v. Garsed	51 F. R.	39
Hunt Bros. Fruit Packing Co. v. Cassidy	53 F. R.	45, 70, 308, 390, 436, 440 470, 472
Hunter v. Stikeman	13 App. D. C.	124, 125
Huntington v. Heel Plate Co.	33 F. R.	543
Huntington Dry-Pulverizer Co. v. Alpha Portland Cement Co.	91 F. R.	540
Huntington Dry-Pulverizer Co. v. Newell Universal Mill Co.	109 F. R.	87
Huntington Dry Pulverizer Co. v. Virginia-Carolina Chemical Co.	121 F. R.	535
Huntington Dry Pulverizer Co. v. Whittaker Cement Co.	89 F. R.	306
Hupfield v. Automaton Piano Co.	66 F. R.	328, 340
Hurd v. Snow	35 F. R.	28
Hurlbut v. Schillinger	130 U. S.	191, 567
Hussey v. Whitely	2 Fisher	543

I.

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
<i>Ide v. Engine Co.</i>	31 F. R.	552
<i>Ide v. Trorlicht, Duncker & Renard Carpet Co.</i>	115 F. R.	167, 215, 316, 424
<i>Idealite Co. v. Protection Light Co.</i>	103 F. R.	209
<i>Illinois Central R. R. Co. v. Turrill.</i>	110 U. S.	569
<i>Illinois Steel Co. v. Kilmer Mfg. Co.</i>	70 F. R.	414
<i>Illingworth v. Atha</i>	42 F. R.	117, 118
<i>Imhaeuser v. Buerk</i>	101 U. S.	61, 308, 311
<i>Imperial Chemical Mfg. Co. v. Stein.</i>	69 F. R.	346
<i>Imperial Chemical Mfg. Co. v. Stein.</i>	77 F. R.	469
<i>India Rubber Comb Co. v. Phelps.</i>	4 Fisher	501
<i>Indiana Novelty Mfg. Co. v. Crocker Chair Co.</i>	103 F. R.	42, 177
<i>Indianapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co. v. Horst</i>	93 U. S.	432, 433
<i>Indurated Fibre Co. v. Grace</i>	52 F. R.	455, 472
<i>Ingalls v. Tice</i>	14 F. R.	338
<i>Ingersoll v. Holt</i>	104 F. R.	116, 118, 202
<i>Ingersoll v. Jewett</i>	16 Blatch.	382
<i>Ingersoll v. Musgrove</i>	3 Bann. & Ard.	442
<i>In re Barrett</i>	14 App. D. C.	115
<i>In re Beswick</i>	16 App. D. C.	116
<i>In re Chicago Sugar-Refining Co.</i>	87 F. R.	513
<i>In re Chincock</i>	21 D. C.	115
<i>In re Corbin and Martlett</i>	1 McArthur's Patent Cases	74
<i>In re Drawbaugh</i>	66 O. G.	115
<i>In re Drawbaugh</i>	67 O. G.	83
<i>In re Frasch</i>	20 App. D. C.	115, 116
<i>In re Gamewell Fire-Alarm Tel. Co.</i>	73 F. R.	503
<i>In re Haberman Mfg. Co.</i>	147 U. S.	547, 550
<i>In re Hebard</i>	1 McArthur's Patent Cases.	36, 309
<i>In re Hein</i>	166 U. S.	115
<i>In re Hemiup</i>	3 Paige (N. Y.)	582, 583
<i>In re Hoevler & McTighe</i>	21 D. C. Rep.	114
<i>In re Hohorst</i>	150 U. S.	280, 285, 328
<i>In re Keasbey & Mattison Co.</i>	160 U. S.	328
<i>In re Kemper</i>	1 McArthur's Patent Cases	2
<i>In re Lennon</i>	166 U. S.	546
<i>In re Maynard</i>	1 McArthur's Patent Cases	25
<i>In re Messenger</i>	12 App. D. C.	115
<i>In re Mond</i>	16 App. D. C.	30
<i>In re Mower</i>	15 App. D. C.	81
<i>In re Potts</i>	166 U. S.	507
<i>In re Schaeffer</i>	2 App. D. C.	55
<i>In re Seely</i>	1 McArthur's Patent Cases	18
<i>In re Snyder</i>	10 App. D. C.	17
<i>In re Swinburne</i>	19 App. D. C.	91
<i>Insurance Co. v. Eggleston</i>	96 U. S.	269
<i>Insurance Co. v. Lanier</i>	95 U. S.	436
<i>Insurance Co. v. Sea</i>	21 Wallace	421, 422
<i>Interior Construction Co. v. Gibney.</i>	160 U. S.	331
<i>International Pavement Co. v. Richardson</i>	75 F. R.	261

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
International Postal Supply Co. v. Bruce	114 F. R.	145, 333
International Terra Cotta Lumber Co. v. Maurer	44 F. R. .. 219, 390, 403, 455, 477	
International Tooth-Crown Co. v. Bennett	72 F. R.	393
International Tooth-Crown Co. v. Carmichael	44 F. R.	459, 460
International Tooth Crown Co. v. Gaylord	140 U. S.	84, 85, 88
International Tooth Crown Co. v. Hanks Dental Assn.	111 F. R.	418
International Tooth Crown Co. v. Richmond	30 F. R.	84, 132
Iowa Barb Steel Wire Co. v. Barbed Wire Co.	30 F. R.	557
Irwin v. McRoberts	4 Bann. & Ard.	540
Isaacs v. Cooper	4 Washington	527
Ives v. Hamilton	92 U. S.	317

J.

Jackson v. Allen	120 Mass.	267
Jackson v. Getz	16 App. D. C.	127
Jackson v. Nagle	47 F. R.	346
Jackson v. Vaughan	73 F. R.	252
Jackson v. Western Fireproofing Co.	112 F. R.	417
Jacob v. United States	1 Brockenbrough	292
Jacobs v. Baker	7 Wallace	13
Jacobs v. Hamilton County	4 Fisher	340
Jacobson v. Alpi	46 F. R.	533
James v. Campbell	104 U. S. 138, 145, 209,	408
Jaros Underwear Co. v. Fleece Un- derwear Co.	60 F. R.	259, 356
Jenkins v. Greenwald	1 Bond	563
Jenkins v. Greenwald	2 Fisher	531, 550
Jenkins v. Ruberg	39 F. R.	531
Jenkins v. Stetson	32 F. R.	206, 217
Jennings v. Dolan	29 F. R. 343, 344,	579
Jennings v. Kibbe	10 F. R.	394
Jennings v. Kibbe	24 F. R.	69
Jennings v. Rogers Silver Plate Co.	118 F. R.	580
Jennisons v. Leonard	21 Wallace	421
Jewett v. Atwood Suspender Co.	100 F. R. 144, 237,	254
J. J. Warner Co. v. Rosenblatt	80 F. R.	44, 390
J. L. Mott Iron Works v. Cassidy.	31 F. R.	25
J. L. Mott Iron Works v. Standard Mfg. Co.	53 F. R.	182
John Crossley & Sons v. Hogg	83 F. R.	53
John R. Williams Co. v. Miller, Du Brul & Peters Co.	107 F. R. 122, 128,	345
John R. Williams Co. v. Miller, Du- Brul & Peters Mfg. Co.	108 F. R.	150
John R. Williams Co. v. Miller, Du Brul & Peters Mfg. Co.	115 F. R.	150

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

lxvii

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Johnsen <i>v.</i> Fassman	1 Woods	81
Johnson <i>v.</i> Brooklyn Co.	37 F. R.	552
Johnson <i>v.</i> Johnston	60 F. R.	13
Johnson <i>v.</i> McCullough	4 Fisher	56, 228
Johnson <i>v.</i> Olsen	61 F. R.	181
Johnson <i>v.</i> Root	2 Cliff.	419, 420
Johnson <i>v.</i> Root	1 Fisher	395
Johnson <i>v.</i> Railroad Co.	33 F. R.	61
Johnson <i>v.</i> Railroad Co.	105 U. S.	211, 217
Johnson Co. <i>v.</i> Steel Co.	67 F. R.	24
Johnson Co. <i>v.</i> Toledo Traction Co.	119 F. R.	42
Johnson Signal Co. <i>v.</i> Union Signal Co.	59 F. R.	236
Johnson Signal Co. <i>v.</i> Union Switch & Signal Co.	55 F. R.	260
Johnson Street Rail. Co. <i>v.</i> North Branch Steel Co.	48 F. R.	495
Johnston <i>v.</i> Mining Co.	148 U. S.	469
Jolliffe <i>v.</i> Collins	21 Missouri	248
Jonathan Mills Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> White- hurst	56 F. R.	237
Jonathan Mills Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> White- hurst	60 F. R.	502
Jonathan Mills Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> White- hurst	72 F. R.	245
Jones <i>v.</i> Bank	5 How. (Miss.)	543
Jones <i>v.</i> Barker	11 F. R.	85, 179
Jones <i>v.</i> Berger	58 F. R.	240, 264, 480
Jones <i>v.</i> Buckell	104 U. S.	431
Jones <i>v.</i> Morehead	1 Wallace	511
Jones <i>v.</i> Reynolds	120 N. Y.	237
Jones <i>v.</i> Wetherell	1 McArthur's Patent Cases ...	130
Jones Co. <i>v.</i> Munger Co.	49 F. R.	312
Jordan <i>v.</i> Dayton	4 Ohio	144
Jordan <i>v.</i> Dobson	2 Abbott's U. S. Reports..	224, 225, 231, 548
Jordan <i>v.</i> Dobson	4 Fisher	217
Joslin <i>v.</i> Northern Pacific Ry. Co.	55 F. R.	315
Judson <i>v.</i> Bradford	3 Bann. & Ard.	436, 440
Judson <i>v.</i> Cook	11 Barbour (N. Y.)	342
Judson L. Thomson Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Hatheway	41 F. R.	531
Justi <i>v.</i> Clark	108 F. R.	209

K.

Kaaps <i>v.</i> Hartung	23 F. R.	39
Kearney <i>v.</i> Railroad Co.	27 F. R.	237
Kearney <i>v.</i> Railroad Co.	32 F. R.	64
Keasbey & Mattison Co. <i>v.</i> Philip Carey Mfg. Co.	110 F. R.	525
Keeler <i>v.</i> Folding Bed Co.	157 U. S.	252
Keep <i>v.</i> Fuller	42 F. R.	583
Keith <i>v.</i> Engineering Co.	136 Cal.	242
Keller <i>v.</i> Strauss	88 F. R.	456
Kelley <i>v.</i> Ypsilanti Dress-Stay Co.	44 F. R.	276, 458, 552

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Kelly <i>v.</i> Clow	89 F. R.	182
Kelly <i>v.</i> Fynn	16 App. D. C.	124
Kelly <i>v.</i> Springfield Ry. Co.	83 F. R.	425
Kendall <i>v.</i> Winsor	21 Howard	79, 80, 94, 142
Kendrick <i>v.</i> Emmons	2 Bann. & Ard.	159
Kendrick <i>v.</i> Emmons	3 Bann. & Ard.	309
Kennedy <i>v.</i> Hazelton	128 U. S.	46, 250
Kennedy <i>v.</i> Penn. Iron & Coal Co.	67 F. R.	539
Kennedy <i>v.</i> Solar Refining Co.	69 F. R.	297
Kenrick <i>v.</i> United States	1 Gallison	292
Keplinger <i>v.</i> De Young	10 Wheaton	343
Kerosene Lamp Heater Co. <i>v.</i> Fisher.	5 Bann. & Ard.	576
Kerosene Lamp Heater Co. <i>v.</i> Littell.	3 Bann. & Ard.	217
Ketchum Harvester Co. <i>v.</i> Johnson Harvester Co.	8 F. R.	443
Keyes <i>v.</i> Eureka Mining Co.	158 U. S.	273
Keyes <i>v.</i> Grant	118 U. S.	417
Keyes <i>v.</i> Mining Co.	158 U. S.	411, 466
Keyes <i>v.</i> Refining Co.	31 F. R.	528, 534, 536
Keyes <i>v.</i> Refining Co.	43 F. R.	439
Keystone Bridge Co. <i>v.</i> Iron Co.	95 U. S.	172, 179
Keystone Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Adams	151 U. S.	40, 44, 560, 566
Kidd <i>v.</i> Horry	28 F. R.	459
Kidd <i>v.</i> Ransom	35 F. R.	489
Kilbourne <i>v.</i> Bingham Co.	47 F. R.	25
Kilburn <i>v.</i> Holmes	121 F. R.	258
Kilmer Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Griswold	67 F. R.	499
Kimberly <i>v.</i> Arms	129 U. S.	582
King <i>v.</i> Anderson	90 F. R.	26
King <i>v.</i> Gallun	109 U. S.	40
Kinnear & Gager Co. <i>v.</i> Capital Sheet-Metal Co.	81 F. R.	62, 69
Kinner <i>v.</i> Shepard	107 F. R.	442
Kinsman <i>v.</i> Parkhurst	18 Howard	511
Kirby <i>v.</i> Mfg. Co.	10 Blatch	217
Kirby Bung Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> White.	1 McCrary	530, 539, 540
Kirk <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Patents.	37 O. G.	117, 118, 133
Kirk <i>v.</i> Du Bois	28 F. R.	465, 483
Kirk <i>v.</i> Du Bois	33 F. R.	128
Kisinger-Ison Co. <i>v.</i> Bradford Belt- ing Co.	97 F. R.	400
Kisinger-Ison Co. <i>v.</i> Bradford Belt- ing Co.	123 F. R.	507, 508, 565
Kittle <i>v.</i> De Graff	30 F. R.	465
Kittle <i>v.</i> Hall	29 F. R.	469
Kittle <i>v.</i> Hall	30 F. R.	193
Kittle <i>v.</i> Rogers	33 F. R.	465
Klein <i>v.</i> City of Seattle	77 F. R.	17
Klein <i>v.</i> Russell	19 Wall. ..	76, 178, 179, 216, 417
Knapp <i>v.</i> Morss	150 U. S.	102, 173, 315
Knapp <i>v.</i> Shaw	15 F. R.	496
Knickerbocker Co. <i>v.</i> Rogers.	61 F. R.	62, 70, 159
Knight <i>v.</i> Railroad Co.	Taney's Circuit Court Decisions.	210 216
Knox <i>v.</i> Loweree	1 Bann. & Ard.	81
Knox <i>v.</i> Quicksilver Mining Co.	6 Sawyer	306, 562, 577
Koalatype Co. <i>v.</i> Hoke	30 F. R.	240

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

Ixix

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Kokomo Fence Mach. Co. v. Kitselman	189 U. S.	175, 314
Korn v. Wiebusch	33 F. R.	463, 480
Kraus v. Fitzpatrick	34 F. R.	60
Krementz v. Cottle Co.	148 U. S.	23, 44
Krick v. Jansen	52 F. R.	471
Kruttschnitt v. Simmons	118 F. R.	322
Kuisheedt Mfg. Co. v. Naday	103 F. R.	39

L.

La Baw v. Hawkins	2 Bann. & Ard.	434, 439, 565, 567
Ladd v. Cameron	25 F. R.	533
Lake Shore R. R. Co. v. Car Brake Shoe Co.	110 U. S.	171
Lalanc & Grosjean Mfg. Co. v. Haberman Mfg. Co.	53 F. R.	298
Lalanc & Grosjean Mfg. Co. v. Haberman Mfg. Co.	55 F. R.	158
Lalanc & Grosjean Mfg. Co. v. Haberman Mfg. Co.	87 F. R.	395
Lalanc & Grosjean Mfg. Co. v. Haberman Mfg. Co.	93 F. R.	257, 413
Lalanc & Grosjean Mfg. Co. v. Moshheim	48 F. R.	471
Lalanc & Grosjean Mfg. Co. v. National Enameling Co.	108 F. R.	257
Lamb Knit Goods Co. v. Lamb Glove & Mitten Co.	120 F. R.	17, 510
Lamson Cash Railway Co. v. Kepingling	45 F. R.	179
Lamson Consolidated Store Service Co. v. Hillman	123 F. R.	163, 316
Lamson Consolidated Store Service Co. v. Siegel-Cooper Co.	106 F. R.	471
Lane v. Levi	104 O. G.	319, 528
Lane v. Welds	99 F. R.	381
Lane & Bodley Co. v. Locke	150 U. S.	272, 275, 469
Lanyon Zinc Co. v. Brown	115 F. R.	392
Lapham Dodge Co. v. Severin	40 F. R.	183
La Rue v. Electric Co.	31 F. R.	76
Lawther v. Hamilton	64 F. R.	560, 569
Lawther v. Hamilton	124 U. S.	36
Lay v. Indianapolis Brush & Broom Mfg. Co.	120 F. R.	133
Leach v. Chandler	18 F. R.	279
Leake v. Gilchrist	2 Devereaux (N. C.)	337
Leatherbee v. Brown	69 F. R.	480
Lee v. Blandy	2 Fisher	392
Lee v. Upson & Hart Co.	42 F. R.	25
Lee v. Upson & Hart Co.	43 F. R.	70
L. E. Waterman Co. v. Parker Pen Co.	100 F. R.	330, 331
L. E. Waterman Co. v. Parker Pen Co.	107 F. R.	509
Leffingwell v. Warren	2 Black.	354

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Leggett <i>v.</i> Avery	101 U. S.	79, 408
Leggett <i>v.</i> Standard Oil Co.....	149 U. S.	22, 211
Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. <i>v.</i> Kearney	158 U. S.	102, 173
Lehnbeuter <i>v.</i> Holthaus	105 U. S.	76
Lenox <i>v.</i> Roberts	2 Wheaton	335
Leonard <i>v.</i> Lovell	29 F. R.	63
Le Page Co. <i>v.</i> Russia Cement Co... 51	F. R.	365
Le Roy <i>v.</i> Tatham	14 Howard	161
Lettelier <i>v.</i> Mann	91 F. R.	41
Levy <i>v.</i> Dattlebaum	63 F. R.	241, 242
Levy <i>v.</i> Harris	124 F. R.	307
Lewis <i>v.</i> Johns	34 California	343
Lewiston Falls Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Franklin Co.	54 Maine	518
Lexington & Ohio Railroad Co. <i>v.</i> Applegate	8 Dana (Ken.)	546
Liddle <i>v.</i> Cory	7 Blatch.	555, 556
Lightner <i>v.</i> Railroad Co.	1 Lowell	271
Ligowski Clay-Pigeon Co. <i>v.</i> Clay-Bird Co.	34 F. R. ..	132, 133, 167, 308, 424, 470
Lilliendahl <i>v.</i> Detweller	18 F. R.	355
Lincoln <i>v.</i> Power	151 U. S.	419
Lindemeyer <i>v.</i> Hoffman	18 App. D. C.	125
Lindsay <i>v.</i> Stein	10 F. R.	133
Little <i>v.</i> Downing	37 New Hampshire	410
Littlefield <i>v.</i> Perry	21 Wallace	214, 237, 248, 251, 338, 339, 452
Livingston <i>v.</i> Jones	1 Fisher	395
Livingston <i>v.</i> Woodworth	15 Howard	560
Lloyd <i>v.</i> Antisdel	95 O. G.	47
Locke <i>v.</i> Boch	17 App. D. C.	124
Locke <i>v.</i> Lane Co.	35 F. R.	406
Lockwood <i>v.</i> Cleveland	6 F. R.	280
Locomotive Truck Co. <i>v.</i> Railroad Co.	2 F. R.	446, 451, 562, 572
Locomotive Truck Co. <i>v.</i> Railway Co.	10 Blatch.	356
Loercher <i>v.</i> Crandall	11 F. R.	309
Loew Filter Co. <i>v.</i> German-American Filter Co.	107 F. R.	345
Loewer <i>v.</i> Ford	55 F. R.	43
Long <i>v.</i> Pope Mfg. Co.	75 F. R.	316
Loom Co. <i>v.</i> Higgins	105 U. S. ..	23, 64, 157, 184, 376, 407
Loomis <i>v.</i> Hauser	99 O. G.	127
Loomis <i>v.</i> Loomis	26 Vermont	244
Loomis-Manning Filter Co. <i>v.</i> Manhattan Filter Co.	117 F. R.	349, 350
Lord <i>v.</i> Machine Co.	24 F. R.	467
Loring <i>v.</i> Booth	52 F. R.	536
Louden Mach. Co. <i>v.</i> Montgomery Ward & Co.	96 F. R.	356
Lovell <i>v.</i> Davis	101 U. S.	431
Lovell <i>v.</i> Johnson	82 F. R.	492
Lovell Mfg Co. <i>v.</i> Cary.....	147 U. S.	40

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

lxxi

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Low v. Stove Co.	36 F. R.	39
Lowell Mfg. Co. v. Hartford Carpet Co.	2 Fisher	552
Lowell Mfg. Co. v. Hogg	70 F. R.	479, 503
Lowell Mfg. Co. v. Whittall	71 F. R.	424, 447
Lowry v. Cowles Aluminum Co.	56 F. R.	241, 463, 478
Lyell v. Miller	6 McLean	425
Lyman Ventilating & Refrigerator Co. v. Lalor	1 Bann. & Ard.	55
Lyons v. Drucker	106 F. R.	471

M.

Mabie v. Haskell	2 Cliff.	44, 299, 308
Macbeth v. Braddock Glass Co.	54 F. R.	557
Macbeth v. Gillinder	54 F. R.	183, 322, 489, 557
Macbeth v. Lippencott Glass Co.	54 F. R.	531
Machesney v. Brown	29 F. R.	239
Machine Co. v. Murphy	97 U. S.	309
Mack v. Levy	49 F. R.	556
Mack v. Levy	59 F. R.	556
Mack v. Levy	60 F. R.	382
Mack v. Optical Mfg. Co.	52 F. R.	43
Mackay v. Jackman	12 F. R.	3
Mackaye v. Mallory	12 F. R.	240
Maddock v. Coxon	45 F. R.	168, 170
Magic Ruffle Co. v. Douglas	2 Fisher	74, 442
Magin v. Karle	150 U. S.	17
Magowan v. Belting Co.	141 U. S.	22, 44
Mahn v. Harwood	3 Bann. & Ard.	39
Mahn v. Harwood	112 U. S.	209, 210, 211
Mahon v. McGuire Mfg. Co.	51 F. R.	24, 37
Maitland v. Gibson	79 F. R.	254
Maitland v. Graham	96 F. R.	489
Mallory Mfg. Co. v. Hickok	20 F. R.	530
Malthby v. Bobo	14 Blatch.	341
Mann's Car Co. v. Monarch Car Co.	34 F. R.	42, 424
Manufacturing Co. v. Cowing.	105 U. S.	565, 567
Manufacturing Co. v. Ladd	102 U. S.	218
Many v. Jagger	1 Blatch.	372
Many v. Sizer	1 Fisher	68, 395, 530
Marchand v. Emken	26 F. R.	42
Marchand v. Emken	132 U. S.	40
Market St. Ry. Co. v. Rowley.	155 U. S.	417
Marks' Chair Co. v. Wilson	43 F. R.	424
Marsh v. Commissioner	3 Bissell	82
Marsh v. Dodge	4 Hun (N. Y.)	266
Marsh v. Harris Mfg. Co.	63 Wis.	266
Marsh v. Nichols	128 U. S.	138, 562
Marsh v. Nichols	140 U. S.	328
Marsh v. Seymour	97 U. S.	207, 451
Marsh v. Stove Co.	51 F. R.	396
Marston v. Sweet	66 N. Y.	266
Martin & Hill Cash Carrier Co. v. Martin	67 F. R.	383
Marvel v. Decker	13 App. D. C.	127

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Marvel Co. v. Pearl.....	114 F. R.	15
Marvin v. Gotshall	36 F. R.	45
Maryland Homing Co. v. Dorr.....	46 F. R.	159
Mason v. Graham	23 Wallace	312, 566
Mason v. Hepburn	13 App. D. C.....	125, 126
Mason v. Railroad Co.	52 Maine	583
Masseth v. Johnston	59 F. R.	446
Masseth v. Larkin	111 F. R.	174
Masseth v. Palm	51 F. R.	399
Masseth v. Reiber	59 F. R.	142
Massie's Heirs v. Graham's Adm'rs.	3 McLean	507
Mast, Foos & Co. v. Dempster Mill Mfg. Co.	82 F. R.	70, 78, 79
Mast, Foos & Co. v. Stover Mfg. Co.	177 U. S.	24, 41, 45, 490, 548
Mast, Foos & Co. v. Windmill & Pump Co.	68 F. R.	496
Matheson v. Campbell	69 F. R.	159
Matheson v. Campbell	77 F. R.	61
Matheson v. Campbell	78 F. R.	159, 181, 319, 320
Mathews v. Machine Co.....	105 U. S.	211
Matthews v. Flower	25 F. R.	204, 408
Matthews v. Mfg. Co.	18 Blatch.	356
Matthews v. Schoneberger	4 F. R.	171
Matthews v. Skates	1 Fisher	320, 323
Matthews v. Spangenberg	14 F. R.	197, 438
Matthews v. Spangenberg	19 F. R.	495
Matthews & Willard Mfg. Co. v. American Lamp & Brass Co.	103 F. R.	60
Matthews & Willard Mfg. Co. v. National Brass & Iron Works.	71 F. R.	393
Maurer v. Dickerson	113 F. R.	163
Maxwell v. Kennedy	8 Howard	469, 477
May v. Chaffee	2 Dillon	242, 257, 262
May v. County of Buchanan	29 F. R.	341
May v. County of Cass	30 F. R.	341
May v. County of Juneau	30 F. R.	240, 340
May v. County of Logan	30 F. R.	335, 337, 340, 354
May v. County of Mercer	30 F. R.	340, 347, 348, 359
May v. County of Ralls	31 F. R.	340
May v. County of Saginaw	32 F. R.	240
May v. Juneau County.....	137 U. S.	373, 417
May v. Le Claire	11 Wallace	246
Maynard v. Pawling	5 Bann. & Ard.....	345
Mayor of New York v. American Cable Ry. Co.	60 F. R.	392
McArthur v. Supply Co.....	19 F. R.	212, 218
McBerty v. Cook	16 App. D. C.....	128
McBride v. Kingman	97 F. R.	313
McBride v. Plow Co.	44 F. R.	168, 170
McBurney v. Goodyear	11 Cushing (Mass.).....	219
McCarty v. Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.	160 U. S.	173, 180
McClain v. Ortmyer	33 F. R.	35
McClain v. Ortmyer.....	141 U. S. . 19, 35, 44, 161, 169, 173, 178, 181, 307	
McCluny v. Silliman	3 Peters	354
McClure v. Jeffrey	8 Indiana	248

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

lxxiii

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
McClurg v. Kingsland	1 Howard	4, 139, 183
McComb v. Brodie	1 Woods	167, 300, 434, 436
McComb v. Ernest	1 Woods	73, 299, 526
McCormick v. Cleal	12 App. D. C.	126
McCormick v. Jerome	3 Blatch.	546, 554
McCormick v. Seymour	2 Blatch.	94, 405
McCormick v. Seymour	3 Blatch.	446
McCormick v. Talcott	20 Howard	175, 314
McCormick Harvesting Mach. Co. v. Aultman	69 F. R. ...	102, 160, 173, 308, 312 315
McCormick Mach. Co. v. Aultman ..	169 U. S.	138, 213, 284, 285
McCormick Mach. Co. v. Minneapolis Harvester Works	42 F. R.	66, 126
McCoy v. Nelson	121 U. S.	468
McCreary v. Pennsylvania Canal Co.	141 U. S.	569
McCulloch v. Association	45 F. R.	254, 255
McCulloch v. Maryland	4 Wheaton	185, 384
McDonald v. Miller	84 F. R.	466
McDonald v. Whitney	24 F. R.	69
McDonald v. Whitney	39 F. R.	506
McDowell v. Kurtz	77 F. R.	394, 526, 553
McEwan Bros. Co. v. McEwan	91 F. R.	178
McFarland v. Spencer	23 F. R.	24
McKay v. Jackman	16 Reporter	546
McKay v. Smith	39 F. R.	267
McKay v. Wooster	2 Sawyer	262
McKay & Copeland Mach. Co. v. Clafin	58 F. R.	171, 397
McKeever v. United States	14 Court of Claims	137
McKeever v. United States	23 O. G.	273
McKenna v. Fisk	1 Howard	360
McKernan v. Hite	6 Indiana	244
McKnight v. McNiece	64 F. R.	343
McMahon v. Tyng	14 Allen (Mass.)	401
McMichael & Wildman Mfg. Co. v. Ruth	123 F. R.	504
McMickin v. Perin	18 Howard	579
McMillan v. Conrad	16 F. R.	539
McMillin v. Rees	5 Bann. & Ard.	63, 64
McMurray v. Mallory	111 U. S.	192
McNeely v. Williams	96 F. R.	446
McNeil v. Holbrook	12 Peters	354
McNish v. Everson	5 Bann. & Ard.	58
McSherry Mfg. Co. v. Dowagiac Mfg. Co.	101 F. R.	317
McWilliams v. Webb	32 Iowa	244
McWilliams Mfg. Co. v. Blundell ..	11 F. R.	541
Meers v. Kelly	31 F. R.	17
Menasha Wood Split Pulley Co. v. Dodge	85 F. R.	531
Merchant v. Lewis	1 Bond	423
Mergenthaler v. Scudder	11 App. D. C.	125
Mergenthaler Co. v. Press Pub. Co.	57 F. R.	73, 316
Mergenthaler Co. v. Ridder	65 F. R.	349
Mergenthaler Co. v. Seymour	66 O. G.	117
Merriam v. Drake	5 Fisher	310

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Merriam <i>v.</i> Smith	11 F. R.	335
Merrill <i>v.</i> Yeomans	94 U. S.	142, 179
Merrimack Mattress Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Schlesinger	124 F. R.	471
Merrow <i>v.</i> Shoemaker	59 F. R.	66, 312
Mershon <i>v.</i> Furnace Co.	24 F. R.	466
Metallic Extraction Co. <i>v.</i> Brown..	104 F. R.	306, 499
Metallic Extraction Co. <i>v.</i> Brown..	110 F. R.	173, 424
Mevs <i>v.</i> Conover	125 U. S.	213, 570
Mewes' Appeal	2 O. G.	114
Meyer <i>v.</i> Bailey	2 Bann. & Ard.	220
Meyer <i>v.</i> Pritchard	1 Bann. & Ard.	42
Meyer <i>v.</i> Rothe	13 App. D. C.	416, 417
Meyers <i>v.</i> Sternheim	97 F. R.	432
Meyrowitz Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Eccleston ..	98 F. R.	469
Michaels <i>v.</i> Roessler	34 F. R.	159
Michigan Central Railroad Co. <i>v.</i> Car-Heating Co.	67 F. R.	122, 374, 474
Michigan Stove Co. <i>v.</i> Fuller-War- ren Co.	81 F. R.	479
Middletown Tool Co. <i>v.</i> Judd	3 Fisher	220
Miehle <i>v.</i> Read	18 App. D. C.	124
Miehle <i>v.</i> Read	96 O. G.	127
Millard <i>v.</i> Clase	108 F. R.	487, 499
Miller <i>v.</i> Brass Co.	104 U. S.	206, 207, 209, 377
Miller <i>v.</i> Eagle Co.	151 U. S. ...	100, 167, 168, 311, 313, 315
Miller <i>v.</i> Foree	116 U. S.	40
Miller <i>v.</i> Last Co.	105 F. R.	300
Miller <i>v.</i> McIntyre	6 Peters	481
Miller-Magee Co. <i>v.</i> Carpenter	34 F. R.	326
Millett <i>v.</i> Duell	96 O. G.	53
Milligan <i>v.</i> Mfg. Co.	21 F. R.	247
Milligan & Higgins Glue Co. <i>v.</i> Upton	1 Bann. & Ard.	218
Millner <i>v.</i> Schofield	4 Hughes	345
Millner <i>v.</i> Voss	4 Hughes	34
Minneapolis Harvester Works <i>v.</i> Machine Co.	28 F. R.	523
Minturn <i>v.</i> Seymour	4 Johnson's Chancery (N. Y.)..	543
Missouri <i>v.</i> Bell Telephone Co.	24 American Law Register ...	143
Missouri Lamp & Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Stempel	75 F. R.	383
Mitchell <i>v.</i> Hawley	16 Wallace.....	233, 259, 263
M'Millin <i>v.</i> Barclay	5 Fisher	133
M'Millin <i>v.</i> Rees	5 Bann. & Ard.....	166, 168, 170
Moat <i>v.</i> Holbein	2 Edwards' Chancery (N. Y.)..	545
Moffitt <i>v.</i> Garr	1 Black	213
Moline Plow Co. <i>v.</i> Parlin & Oren- dorff Co.	84 F. R.	70
Monroe <i>v.</i> McGreer	81 F. R.	170
Montrose <i>v.</i> Mabie	30 F. R.	271
Mooly <i>v.</i> Fiske	2 Mason	298
Moore <i>v.</i> Bare	11 Iowa	244
Moore <i>v.</i> Marsh	7 Wallace.....	240, 251, 331, 337
Moore <i>v.</i> National Boiler Co.	84 F. R.	266
Moore Mfg. & Foundry Co. <i>v.</i> Cronk Hanger Co.	69 F. R.	238

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

LXXV

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Morey <i>v.</i> Lockwood	8 Wallace	60, 207, 317
Morgan <i>v.</i> Daniells	153 U. S.	129
Morgan Envelope Co. <i>v.</i> Albany Paper Co.	40 F. R.	37
Morgan Envelope Co. <i>v.</i> Albany Paper Co.	152 U. S. ..	27, 180, 181, 262, 263
Morley Machine Co. <i>v.</i> Lancaster...	129 U. S.	175, 313, 314
Morris <i>v.</i> Barrett	1 Bond	299
Morris <i>v.</i> Kempshall Mfg. Co.	20 F. R.	168, 281
Morris <i>v.</i> Mfg. Co.	3 Fisher	534, 540, 541
Morris <i>v.</i> McMillin	112 U. S.	17, 22
Morris <i>v.</i> Shelbourne	4 Fisher	540
Morss <i>v.</i> Knapp	35 F. R.	551
Morss <i>v.</i> Knapp	37 F. R.	331, 556
Morton <i>v.</i> Infirmary	5 Blatch.	3, 373
Morton Trust Co. <i>v.</i> American Car & Foundry Co.	121 F. R.	455
Moulton <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Pat- ents	61 O. G.	3
Mowry <i>v.</i> Railroad Co.	5 Fisher	529
Mowry <i>v.</i> Whitney	14 Wallace...	5, 232, 284, 296, 570
Mueller <i>v.</i> Mueller	95 F. R.	273
Muller <i>v.</i> Lodge & Davis Mach. Tool Co.	77 F. R.	172, 173
Mumma <i>v.</i> Potomac Co.	8 Peters	350, 355, 549
Mundy <i>v.</i> Mfg. Co.	34 F. R.	554, 556
Municipal Signal Co. <i>v.</i> Gamewell Fire Alarm Tel. Co.	77 F. R.	503
Munson <i>v.</i> New York	11 F. R.	502
Munson <i>v.</i> New York	19 F. R.	551
Munson <i>v.</i> New York City	124 U. S.	17
Murdock <i>v.</i> Finney	21 Missouri	244
Murphy <i>v.</i> Trenton Rubber Co.	45 F. R.	28, 312
Musgrave & Nye <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Patents	78 O. G.	28
Myers <i>v.</i> Cunningham	44 F. R.	328, 360
Myers <i>v.</i> Dunbar	1 Bann. & Ard.	510
Myers <i>v.</i> Frame	8 Blatch.	197
Myers <i>v.</i> Sternheim	97 F. R.	397

N.

Nathan Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Craig	47 F. R.	361
Nathan Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Craig	49 F. R.	168, 278
National Automatic Mach. Co. <i>v.</i> Automatic Weighing Mach. Co.	105 F. R.	499
National Box & Paper Co. <i>v.</i> Ameri- can Paper Box Co.	48 F. R.	489
National Cable Ry. Co. <i>v.</i> Sioux City Cable Ry. Co.	42 F. R.	540
National Car Brake Shoe Co. <i>v.</i> Mfg. Co.	19 F. R.	323, 394, 438, 443
National Cash Register Co. <i>v.</i> American Cash Register Co.	53 F. R.	31, 163, 312, 313, 316
National Cash Register Co. <i>v.</i> Boston Cash Recorder Co.	41 F. R.	552

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
National Cash-Register Co. v. Lamson Store-Service Co.	60 F. R.	65, 281
National Cash-Register Co. v. Leland	77 F. R.	416
National Cash-Register Co. v. Leland	94 F. R.	313, 350, 416
National Cash-Register Co. v. Navy Cash-Register Co.	99 F. R.	392, 408, 540
National Chemical & Fertilizer Co. v. Swift & Co.	100 F. R.	376
National Co. v. Belcher	68 F. R.	22
National Co. v. Belcher	71 F. R.	22
National Conduit Co. v. Connecti- cut Pipe Mfg. Co.	73 F. R.	383
National Device Co. v. Lloyd	40 F. R.	74
National Folding Box & Paper Co. v. American Paper Pail & Box Co.	55 F. R.	292
National Folding-Box & Paper Co. v. Brown & Bailey Co.	98 F. R.	531
National Folding-Box & Paper Co. v. Dayton Paper Novelty Co.	95 F. R.	382, 564
National Folding-Box & Paper Co. v. Dayton Paper-Novelty Co.	97 F. R.	575
National Folding Box & Paper Co. v. Robertson	104 F. R.	548, 552
National Folding Box & Paper Co. v. Stecher Lithographic Co.	77 F. R.	493
National Harrow Co. v. Quick	74 F. R.	62
National Harrow Co. v. Westcott ..	84 F. R.	39, 44
National Heeling-Mach. Co. v. Abbott	70 F. R.	237, 245, 249
National Hollow Brake-Beam Co. v. Interchangeable Brake-Beam Co.	106 F. R.	18, 43, 63, 70, 102, 167 172, 177, 315, 316
National Machine Co. v. Brown ...	36 F. R.	64, 424
National Machine Co. v. Hedden. ...	29 F. R.	533
National Machine Co. v. Thom ...	25 F. R.	161
National Mach. Co. v. Wheeler & Wilson Mfg. Co.	72 F. R.	169
National Mechanical Directory Co. v. Polk	121 F. R.	348
National Meter Co. v. Thomson Meter Co.	106 F. R.	99, 159, 492
National Newsboard Co. v. Elk- hart Egg Case Co.	123 F. R.	29
National Phonograph Co. v. Fletcher	117 F. R.	263
National Pump Cylinder Co. v. Gun- nison	17 F. R.	219
National Roofing Co. v. Garwood ..	35 F. R.	25
National Rubber Co. v. Rubber Shoe Co.	41 F. R.	267
National Spring Co. v. Mfg. Co. ...	12 Blatch.	207
National Tooth Crown Co. v. Mac- donald	117 F. R.	25

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

lxxvii

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
National Typographic Co. v. New York Typograph Co.	46 F. R.	182, 315, 524, 525
Neale v. Neals	9 Wallace	400
Neale v. Walker	1 Cranch's Circuit Court Reports	384
Nebraska v. Nebraska Telephone Co.	24 American Law Register ...	143
Neidich v. Fosbenner	108 F. R.	471
Neilson v. Bradshaw	16 App. D. C.	123, 124
Nellis v. Mfg. Co.	13 F. R.	355
Nellis v. McLanahan	6 Fisher	356
Nelson v. McMann	4 Bann. & Ard.	338
Nesmith v. Calvert	1 Woodbury & Minot	248
New v. Warren	22 O. G.	3, 212
New American File Co. v. Nicholson File Co.	8 F. R.	152, 229
New Departure Bell Co. v. Bevin Mfg. Co.	64 F. R.	43, 167, 315, 461
New Departure Bell Co. v. Bevin Bros. Mfg. Co.	73 F. R.	24, 68
New Departure Bell Co. v. Hardware Co.	62 F. R.	279
New Departure Bell Co. v. Hardware Co.	69 F. R.	414
Newgold v. American Electrical Novelty & Mfg. Co.	108 F. R.	49
Newell v. West	13 Blatch.	256
New Home Sewing Machine Co. v. Singer Mfg. Co.	68 F. R.	170
Newton v. Buck	72 F. R.	144, 254
Newton v. Buck	77 F. R.	242, 253
Newton v. McGuire	97 F. R.	305
Newton Mfg. Co. v. Wilgus	90 F. R.	382
Newton v. Woodward	16 App. D. C.	128
New York v. Ransom	23 Howard	435, 443
New York Air-Brake Co. v. Westinghouse Air-Brake Co.	69 F. R.	531
New York & Baltimore Coffee Polishing Co. v. New York Coffee Polishing Co.	9 F. R.	285, 458
New York Belting Co. v. Gutta Percha Mfg. Co.	56 F. R.	529
New York Belting Co. v. New Jersey Car-Spring Co.	47 F. R.	334, 465
New York Belting Co. v. New Jersey Car-Spring Co.	48 F. R.	60
New York Belting Co. v. New Jersey Car-Spring Co.	53 F. R.	322
New York Belting Co. v. New Jersey Car-Spring Co.	137 U. S.	471
New York Belting Co. v. Rubber Co.	30 F. R.	471
New York Belting Co. v. Rubber Co.	32 F. R.	506
New York Filter Co. v. Filter Co.	62 F. R.	501
New York Filter Co. v. Jackson ...	91 F. R.	345
New York Filter Co. v. Niagara Falls Water Works Co.	77 F. R.	538

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
New York Filter Co. v. Schwarzwald	58 F. R.	276, 298
New York Filter Mfg. Co. v. Chemical Bldg. Co.	93 F. R.	531, 550
New York Filter Mfg. Co. v. Loomis-Manning Filter Co.	91 F. R.	537
New York Filtration Co. v. City of Sullivan	111 F. R.	338
New York Grape Sugar Co. v. American Grape Sugar Co.	10 F. R.	522, 528, 539
New York Grape Sugar Co. v. American Grape Sugar Co.	42 F. R.	561
New York Grape Sugar Co. v. Buffalo Grape Sugar Co.	24 F. R.	469
New York Packing Co. v. Magowan	27 F. R.	548
New York Paper Bag Machine Co. v. Union Paper Bag Machine Co.	32 F. R.	243, 250
New York Pharmaceutical Association v. Tilden	14 F. R.	369
New York Sugar Co. v. Sugar Co.	20 F. R.	461
New York Sugar Co. v. Sugar Co.	35 F. R.	502
Ney v. Ney Mfg. Co.	69 F. R.	414
Ney Mfg. Co. v. Drill Co.	56 F. R.	524, 537
Nichols v. Newall	1 Fisher	290
Nicholson Pavement Co. v. Jenkins	14 Wallace	235
Nims v. Johnson	7 California	410
Noonan v. Chester Park Athletic Club Co.	99 F. R.	383
Northwestern Fire Extinguisher Co. v. Philadelphia Fire Extinguisher Co.	1 Bann. & Ard.	55, 58, 154, 156, 220, 255, 336
Northwestern Horse Nail Co. v. Horse Nail Co.	28 F. R.	306
Norton v. Automatic Can Co.	45 F. R.	550
Norton v. Automatic Can Co.	57 F. R.	324, 469
Norton v. Automatic Can Co.	59 F. R.	557
Norton v. Automatic Can Co.	61 F. R.	540
Norton v. California Can Co.	45 F. R.	309, 312
Norton v. Jensen	81 F. R.	382
Norton v. Jensen	49 F. R.	300, 313, 395
Norton v. San Jose Fruit-Packing Co.	79 F. R.	382
Nourse v. Allen	3 Fisher	355
Noyes v. Willard	1 Woods	464
Nutter v. Mossberg	118 F. R.	503

O.

O'Brien v. Gallagher	25 Conn.	104
Ockington v. Law	66 Maine	235
Odell v. Stout	22 F. R.	56, 197, 209, 217
Odiome v. Winkley	2 Gallison	398
Office Specialty Co. v. Fenton Metallic Mfg. Co.	174 U. S.	32

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

lxxix

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Office Specialty Co. v. Globe Co.	65 F. R.	194
Office Specialty Co. v. Winternight Mfg. Co.	67 F. R.	489
Ohio v. Bell Telephone Co.	36 Ohio State Reports	143
Olin v. Timken	155 U. S.	36, 44, 70, 209
Olds v. Brown	41 F. R.	78, 171
Oliphant v. Salem Flouring Mills Co.	5 Sawyer	289
Oliver v. Chemical Works.	109 U. S.	271
Oliver v. Felbel	20 App. D. C.	124, 127
Oliver v. Piatt	3 Howard	246
Onderdonk v. Fanning	5 Bann. & Ard.	555
Oregon Imp. Co. v. Excelsior Coal Co.	132 U. S.	378
O'Reilly v. Morse.	15 Howard.	3, 5, 48, 57, 98, 161 165, 188, 192, 193, 194 216, 299, 308, 312, 316 373, 376, 407, 513
Orr v. Littlefield	1 Woodbury & Minot.	519, 522, 525 541
Osborn v. Judd	29 F. R.	17
Osborne v. Glazier	31 F. R.	69
Ostergren v. Tripler.	17 App. D. C.	126
Otley v. Watkins	36 F. R.	307, 319
Otis Mfg. Co. v. Crane Mfg. Co.	27 F. R.	338
Overman Wheel Co. v. Elliott Cycle Co.	49 F. R.	361
Overweight Elevator Co. v. Henry Vogt Mach. Co.	102 F. R.	30
Overweight Elevator Co. v. Improved Order of Red Men.	94 F. R.	394
Overweight Elevator Co. v. Standard Elevator Co.	96 F. R.	466

P.

Pacific Bank v. Robinson	57 California	253
Pacific Cable Ry. Co. v. Butte City Ry. Co.	52 F. R.	281, 282
Pacific Cable Ry. Co. v. Butte City Ry. Co.	55 F. R.	69, 85, 171, 316
Pacific Cable Ry. Co. v. Butte City Ry. Co.	58 F. R.	63, 171, 310, 376
Pacific Contracting Co. v. Bingham.	62 F. R.	36
Pacific Contracting Co. v. Union Paving Co.	80 F. R.	330
Pacific Iron Works v. Newhall.	34 Connecticut	267
Pacific Steam Whaling Co. v. Alaska Packers' Assn.	100 F. R.	538, 547
Packard v. Lacing-Stud Co.	70 F. R.	163
Packet Co. v. Sickles	19 Wallace	373, 435
Page v. Buckley	67 F. R.	380
Page v. Ferry	1 Fisher	99, 305
Page v. Telegraph Co.	18 Blatch.	502, 533
Page Fence Co. v. Land.	49 F. R.	171
Paillard v. Bruno	29 F. R.	152

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
<i>Paine v. Snowden</i>	46 F. R.	60
<i>Paine v. Trask</i>	56 F. R.	392
<i>Pairpoint Mfg. Co. v. Eldridge Co.</i> ..	71 F. R.	410
<i>Palmer v. Corning</i>	156 U. S.	22
<i>Palmer v. Gatling Gun Co.</i>	8 F. R.	174
<i>Palmer v. John E. Brown Mfg. Co.</i> ..	84 F. R.	42
<i>Palmer v. John E. Brown Mfg. Co.</i> ..	92 F. R.	169
<i>Palmer v. Landphere</i>	99 F. R.	342
<i>Palmer v. Mills</i>	57 F. R.	522, 539
<i>Palmer Pneumatic Tire Co. v. Lo-</i> <i>zier</i>	69 F. R.	282
<i>Palmer Pneumatic Tire Co. v. Lo-</i> <i>zier</i>	90 F. R.	280
<i>Paper-Bag Cases</i>	105 U. S.	233, 262, 338, 428
<i>Paper Stock Co. v. Disinfecting Co.</i> ..	147 Mass.	272
<i>Parham v. Machine Co.</i>	4 Fisher	69, 174
<i>Parker v. Bigler</i>	1 Fisher	393, 425
<i>Parker v. Brant</i>	1 Fisher	454, 518, 520, 533
<i>Parker v. Dickinson</i>	38 F. R.	44
<i>Parker v. Ferguson</i>	1 Blatch.	67
<i>Parker v. Hall</i>	2 Fisher	354
<i>Parker v. Hatfield</i>	4 McLean	487, 498
<i>Parker v. Hawk</i>	2 Fisher	354
<i>Parker v. Haworth</i>	4 McLean	323, 392
<i>Parker v. Hulme</i>	1 Fisher	35, 324, 444
<i>Parker v. Sears</i>	1 Fisher	548
<i>Parker v. Stiles</i>	5 McLean	193, 194
<i>Parker v. The Judges</i>	12 Wheaton	554
<i>Parker & Whipple Co. v. Yale Clock</i> <i>Co.</i>	123 U. S.	167, 205, 215, 218
<i>Parkhurst v. Kinsman</i>	1 Blatch.	544
<i>Parkhurst v. Kinsman</i>	2 Blatch.	482
<i>Parks v. Booth</i>	102 U. S.	61, 101, 134, 425, 428, 513
<i>Parlin & Orendorff Co. v. Moline</i> <i>Plow Co.</i>	89 F. R.	70
<i>Parrott v. Wikoff</i>	1 Louisiana An'l	241
<i>Parsons v. Seelye</i>	100 F. R.	307, 471
<i>Patent Clothing Co. v. Glover.</i>	141 U. S.	41, 513
<i>Pattee Plow Co. v. Kingman & Co.</i> ..	129 U. S.	17, 215
<i>Patterson v. Duff</i>	20 F. R.	24
<i>Patterson v. Kentucky</i>	97 U. S.	144
<i>Patterson v. Stapler</i> ..	7 F. R.	452
<i>Paul Boynton Co. v. ...</i> <i>Chute</i> <i>Co.</i>	87 F. R.	171
<i>Paynes v. Coles</i>	1 Munford (Va.)	382, 496
<i>Pearce v. Mulford</i> ..	102 U. S.	17
<i>Pearce v. Rice</i>	142 U. S.	464
<i>Peard v. Johnson</i> ...	23 F. R.	370
<i>Pearl v. Ocean Mills.</i>	2 Bann. & Ard.	217
<i>Peck v. Bacon</i>	18 Connecticut	244
<i>Peck v. Collins</i>	103 U. S.	213
<i>Peck v. Frame</i>	9 Blatch.	445
<i>Peck v. Frame</i>	5 Fisher	192, 194
<i>Pelouze Scale & Mfg. Co. v. Ameri-</i> <i>can Cutlery Co.</i>	102 F. R.	15
<i>Pelton v. Waters</i>	1 Bann. & Ard.	62
<i>Pelzer v. Meyberg</i>	97 F. R.	204

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

lxxxi

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Penfield <i>v.</i> Chambers Bros. Co.....	92 F. R.	316
Pennington <i>v.</i> Gibson	16 Howard	415
Pennington <i>v.</i> Hunt	20 F. R.	382
Pennington <i>v.</i> King	7 F. R.	64
Pennock <i>v.</i> Dialogue	2 Peters.....	78, 80, 89, 432
Pennsylvania Drill Co. <i>v.</i> Simpson..	29 F. R.	56
Pennsylvania Drill Co. <i>v.</i> Simpson..	39 F. R.	556
Pennsylvania Railroad Co. <i>v.</i> Truck Co.	110 U. S.	40
Pentlarge <i>v.</i> Beeston	14 Blatch.	523, 528
Pentlarge <i>v.</i> Beeston	1 F. R.	557
Pentlarge <i>v.</i> Kirby	19 F. R.	290, 292
Pentlarge <i>v.</i> New York Bushing Co.	20 F. R.	168
People <i>v.</i> Sturtevant	5 Selden (N. Y.).....	545
Peoria Target Co. <i>v.</i> Cleveland Tar- get Co.	47 F. R.	209
Peoria Target Co. <i>v.</i> Cleveland Tar- get Co.	58 F. R.	209
Perkins Electric Switch Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Gibbs Electric Mfg. Co.....	87 F. R.	21
Perrigo <i>v.</i> Spaulding	13 Blatch.	275
Perry <i>v.</i> Cornell	1 McArthur's Patent Cases....	64
Perry <i>v.</i> Corning	7 Blatch.	247
Perry <i>v.</i> Foundry Co.	12 F. R.	36
Perry <i>v.</i> Starrett	3 Bann. & Ard.....	60, 322
Peters <i>v.</i> Active Mfg. Co.....	129 U. S.....	27, 41, 177
Peters <i>v.</i> Hanson	129 U. S.	41, 177
Peters <i>v.</i> Union Biscuit Co.....	120 F. R.	70
Peterson <i>v.</i> Chemical Bank	32 N. Y.	337
Petrie <i>v.</i> De Schweinitz.....	19 App. D. C.....	125
Pfanschmidt <i>v.</i> Mercantile Co.....	32 F. R.	502
Phelps <i>v.</i> Classen	1 Woolworth	241
Phelps <i>v.</i> Mayer	15 Howard	433
Philadelphia & Reading Railroad Co. <i>v.</i> Derby	14 Howard	342
Philadelphia & Trenton Railroad Co. <i>v.</i> Stimpson	14 Peters	66, 209, 431
Philadelphia Creamery Supply Co. <i>v.</i> Davis & Rankin Bldg. & Mfg. Co.	77 F. R.	270
Philadelphia Creamery Supply Co. <i>v.</i> Davis & Rankin Bldg. & Mfg. Co.	79 F. R.	298
Philadelphia Trust Co. <i>v.</i> Edison Electric Light Co.....	65 F. R.	276, 533
Philip <i>v.</i> Nock	17 Wallace.....	435, 436, 446
Phillips <i>v.</i> Comstock.....	4 McLean	373
Phillips <i>v.</i> Detroit	3 Bann. & Ard.....	546, 555, 557
Phillips <i>v.</i> Detroit	111 U. S.	32, 399
Phillips <i>v.</i> Page	24 Howard	26, 372
Phoenix Caster Co. <i>v.</i> Spiegel.....	133 U. S.	182
Piaget Novelty Co. <i>v.</i> Headley.....	108 F. R.	240
Piaget Novelty Co. <i>v.</i> Headley.....	123 F. R.	566, 567
Pickering <i>v.</i> McCullough	104 U. S.	30, 59
Picquet <i>v.</i> Swan	3 Mason	336
Pierce <i>v.</i> West's Executors	1 Peters' Circuit Court Reports.	482
Pierpont Boiler Co. <i>v.</i> Penn. Iron & Coal Co.	75 F. R.	238

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Pike v. Potter	3 Fisher	160
Piper v. Brown	1 Holmes.....	560, 575, 579, 583
Pirkl v. Smith	42 F. R.	448
Pitts v. Hall	2 Blatch.	94, 406, 475
Pitts v. Hall	3 Blatch.	243
Pitts v. Jameson	15 Barbour (N. Y. Supreme Court)	252
Pitts v. Wemple	1 E. sell	142, 171, 323
Pitts v. Wemple	2 Fisher	67, 299
Pitts v. Whitman	2 Story	244, 298
Pittsburg Meter Co. v. Pittsburg Supply Co.	109 F. R.	310, 311
Pittsburgh Reduction Co. v. Cowles Aluminum Co.	55 F. R.	62, 70, 79, 160
Pittsburgh Reduction Co. v. Cowles Aluminum Co.	64 F. R.	503
Pittsburgh Reduction Co. v. Cowles Aluminum Co.	121 F. R.	501, 502
Pittsburgh Wire Co. v. Roberts....	71 F. R.	495
Planing-Machine Co. v. Keith.....	101 U. S. ...	27, 79, 80, 82, 132, 372, 472
Planter's Compress Co. v. Moore & Sons' Co.	106 F. R.	522
Platt v. Fire Extinguisher Mfg. Co.	59 F. R.	237, 268
Plimpton v. Winslow	14 F. R.	87
Pohl v. Anchor Brewing Co.....	134 U. S.	151
Pohl v. Heyman	58 F. R.	151
Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.	158 U. S.	185
Pomace Holder Co. v. Ferguson....	119 U. S.	22
Pontiac Boot Co. v. Merino Shoe Co.	31 F. R.	248
Pope Mfg. Co. v. Clark.....	46 F. R.	236, 339
Pope Mfg. Co. v. Gormully Mfg. Co.	34 F. R.	316
Pope Mfg. Co. v. Gormully Mfg. Co.	144 U. S....	22, 64, 76, 236, 251, 259, 315
Pope Mfg. Co. v. Johnson	40 F. R.	537
Pope Mfg. Co. v. Owsley.....	27 F. R.	266, 267
Poppenhusen v. Comb Co.	2 Fisher	73
Poppenhusen v. Falke	5 Blatch.	45
Poppenhusen v. Falke	2 Fisher	523, 534
Porter Needle Co. v. Needle Co....	17 F. R.	261
Porter Needle Co. v. Needle Co....	22 F. R.	440
Post v. Hardware Co.....	26 F. R.	25
Postal Tel. Cable Co. v. Netter....	102 F. R.	337
Potter v. Braunsdorf	7 Blatch.	229, 230
Potter v. Crowell	3 Fisher.....	341, 531, 549, 550
Potter v. Dixon	5 Blatch.	282
Potter v. Dixon	2 Fisher	123
Potter v. Fuller	2 Fisher	523, 538
Potter v. Holland	4 Blatch.	220, 221, 338
Potter v. Holland	1 Fisher	538
Potter v. Mack	3 Fisher	548, 550
Potter v. Muller	1 Bond	557
Potter v. Stewart	18 Blatch.	216, 312
Potter v. Whitney	1 Lowell	195
Potts v. Creager	155 U. S....	23, 26, 42, 43, 44, 167
Powder Co. v. Powder Works	98 U. S.	216, 477

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

lxxxiii

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Powell v. Leicester Mills Co.	103 F. R.	299
Power v. Semmes	1 Cranch's C. C. Reports.....	427
Pratt v. Paris Gas Light & Coke Co.	168 U. S.	328
Pratt v. Sencenbaugh	64 F. R.	70
Pratt v. Wilcox Mfg. Co.	64 F. R.	265
Pratt v. Wright	65 F. R.	490
Preston v. Manard	116 U. S.	28
Prevost v. Gratz	1 Peters' C. C. Reports	502
Priestly v. Montague	47 F. R.	49
Prieth v. Campbell Printing-Press Co.	80 F. R.	544
Prime v. Mfg. Co.	16 Blatch.	244, 245
Proctor v. Brill	16 F. R.	194
Prouty v. Ruggles	16 Peters	103, 169, 307, 413
Puetz v. Bransford	31 F. R.	235
Pullman v. Railroad Co.	5 F. R.	529
Pullman Palace Car Co. v. Wagner Palace Car Co.	44 F. R.	524, 533
Purnell v. Daniel	8 Iredell's Equity Reports (N. C.)	519
Putnam v. Yerrington	2 Bann. & Ard.	216

R.

Railroad Co. v. Dubois	12 Wallace	161, 284
Railroad Co. v. Durant	95 U. S.	249
Railroad Co. v. Mellon	104 U. S.	170, 173, 180
Railroad Co. v. Howard	7 Wallace	350, 355
Railroad Co. v. Smith	21 Wallace	431
Railroad Co. v. Trimble	10 Wallace	236, 240, 241
Railway Co. v. Sayles	97 U. S. ..	73, 122, 175, 308, 314, 374, 413
Railway Register Mfg. Co. v. Rail- road Co.	23 F. R.	200
Railway Register Mfg. Co. v. Rail- road Co.	26 F. R.	500
Railway Register Mfg. Co. v. Rail- road Co.	30 F. R.	309
Ralya v. Atkins	157 Ind.	241
Ransom v. New York	1 Fisher	49, 62, 94, 134
Ransome v. Hyatt	69 F. R.	414
Rapid Store Service Ry. Co. v. Tay- lor	43 F. R.	43, 101, 160, 161, 316
Rapp v. Kelling	41 F. R.	236, 339
Raymond v. Woven Hose Co.	39 F. R.	525
Read v. Bowman	2 Wallace	241
Read v. Miller	2 Bissell	371
Read Holliday & Sons v. Schulze- Berge	78 F. R.	312
Reay v. Raynor	19 F. R.	3, 465, 548
Reckendorfer v. Faber	92 U. S.	30, 166, 399
Red Jacket Mfg. Co. v. Davis.....	82 F. R.	344
Redway v. Ohio Stove Co.	38 F. R.	17, 60, 322
Reece Button-Hole Mach. Co. v. Globe Button-Hole Mach. Co.	61 F. R.	171, 309, 316

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Reed <i>v.</i> Chase	25 F. R.	308
Reed <i>v.</i> Cutter	1 Story	66, 126, 194, 196
Reedy <i>v.</i> Scott	23 Wallace	482
Reeves <i>v.</i> Keystone Bridge Co.	2 Bann. & Ard.	501, 502
Regan Vapor Engine Co. <i>v.</i> Pacific Gas Engine Co.	47 F. R.	246
Regent Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Penn. Electrical & Mfg. Co.	121 F. R.	342
Regina Music Box Co. <i>v.</i> Otto	114 F. R.	441, 442
Reichenbach <i>v.</i> Kelley	17 App. D. C.	124
Rein <i>v.</i> Clayton	37 F. R.	153
Reiter <i>v.</i> Jones	35 F. R.	45
Reliance Novelty Co. <i>v.</i> Dworzek ..	80 F. R.	74
Reminder Lock Co. <i>v.</i> Adler	71 F. R.	315
Reutgen <i>v.</i> Kanowrs	1 Washington	344
Reynes <i>v.</i> Dumont	130 U. S.	467
Reynolds <i>v.</i> Standard Paint Co.	68 F. R.	170
Rhodes <i>v.</i> Lincoln Press Drill Co.	64 F. R.	183
Rice <i>v.</i> Boss	46 F. R.	258, 259
Rich <i>v.</i> Lippincott	2 Fisher	66, 319
Rich <i>v.</i> Ricketts	7 Blatch.	354
Richards <i>v.</i> Chase Elevator Co.	158 U. S.	32, 470
Richards <i>v.</i> Chase Elevator Co.	159 U. S.	36
Richards <i>v.</i> West	2 Green's Chancery (N. Y.)	545
Richardson <i>v.</i> Hicks	1 McArthur's Patent Cases ...	404
Richardson <i>v.</i> Osborne & Co.	82 F. R.	469
Richmond <i>v.</i> Atwood	52 F. R.	498, 499, 504
Rickard <i>v.</i> Du Bon.	103 F. R.	74
Riddick <i>v.</i> Moore	65 N. C.	337
Riddle <i>v.</i> Mandeville	5 Cranch	335
Rifle & Cartridge Co. <i>v.</i> Arms Co.	118 U. S.	78, 79, 80, 82
Ring Refrigerator Co. <i>v.</i> St. Louis Ice Mfg. Co.	67 F. R.	344, 346
Ripley <i>v.</i> Elson Glass Co.	49 F. R.	448, 568
Risdon Iron & Locomotive Works <i>v.</i> Medart	158 U. S.	17, 25, 470
Risdon Iron & Locomotive Works <i>v.</i> Trent	92 F. R.	317, 343
Ritter <i>v.</i> Serrell	2 Blatch.	252
Robbins <i>v.</i> Illinois Watch Co.	78 F. R.	564
Robbins <i>v.</i> Illinois Watch Co.	81 F. R.	428, 566
Roberts <i>v.</i> Buck	1 Holmes	472
Roberts <i>v.</i> Harnden	2 Cliff.	312, 323
Roberts <i>v.</i> Nail Co.	53 F. R.	101, 161
Roberts <i>v.</i> Roter	5 Fisher	298
Roberts <i>v.</i> Ryer	91 U. S.	41, 167, 172
Roberts <i>v.</i> Schayler	12 Blatch.	419
Roberts <i>v.</i> Walley	14 F. R.	393
Robinson <i>v.</i> Randolph	4 Bann. & Ard.	533, 544
Rochester Coach Lacc Co. <i>v.</i> Schaefer	46 F. R.	70
Rocker Spring Co. <i>v.</i> Thomas	68 F. R.	122
Rodebaugh <i>v.</i> Jackson	37 F. R.	39
Roe <i>v.</i> Hanson	19 App. D. C.	125
Roemer <i>v.</i> Bernheim	132 U. S.	503, 511
Roemer <i>v.</i> Neumann	23 F. R.	356

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

LXXXV

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Roemer v. Neumann	26 F. R.	381
Roemer v. Peddie	27 F. R.	168, 170
Roemer v. Peddie	132 U. S.	182
Roemer v. Simon	20 F. R.	305
Roemer v. Simon	31 F. R.	442
Roemer v. Simon	91 U. S.	503
Roemer v. Simon	95 U. S.	472, 473
Rogers v. Abbot	4 Washington	457, 519
Rogers v. Fitch	81 F. R.	71
Rogers Typograph Co. v. Mergen- thaler Co.	64 F. R.	316
Roller Mill Patent	156 U. S.	309
Roosevelt v. Electric Co.	20 F. R.	261
Roosevelt v. Telegraph Co.	33 F. R.	310
Root v. Railway Co.	105 U. S.	339, 451, 465, 562
Root v. Sontag	47 F. R.	471
Root v. Third Avenue Railroad Co.	146 U. S.	84
Rose v. Hirsh	71 F. R.	42
Rose v. Hirsh	94 F. R.	441, 442
Rose v. Hurley	39 Indiana	248
Rosenwasser v. Spieth	129 U. S.	53
Ross v. Ft. Wayne	58 F. R.	361
Ross v. Ft. Wayne	63 F. R.	465, 483
Ross v. Fuller & Warren Co.	105 F. R.	267
Ross v. Prentiss	4 McLean	506, 507
Ross-Moyer Mfg. Co. v. Randall	104 F. R.	173
Rousseau v. Brown	104 O. G.	131
Rowe v. Blanchard	18 Wisconsin	72, 404
Rowe v. Blodgett & Clapp Co.	112 F. R.	15
Rowell v. Lindsay	113 U. S.	169, 307, 309
Royal Metal Mfg. Co. v. Art Metal Works	121 F. R.	322
Royer v. Belting Co.	40 F. R.	39
Royer v. Belting Co.	135 U. S.	417
Royer v. Coupe	29 F. R.	49, 109, 305, 323
Royer v. Coupe	38 F. R.	39
Royer v. Coupe	146 U. S.	182, 297
Royer v. Mfg. Co.	20 F. R.	42, 413
Royer v. Roth	132 U. S.	32
R. Thomas & Sons Co. v. Electric Porcelain & Mfg. Co.	111 F. R.	129
Rubber Co. v. Goodyear	9 Wallace.	103, 162, 178, 207, 209, 217, 219, 232, 270, 271, 336, 473, 508, 560, 562, 563, 564, 565, 568, 570
Rubber Harness Trimming Co. v. Rubber Comb Co.	35 F. R.	42, 489
Rubber-Tire Wheel Co. v. Davie	100 F. R.	361, 362
Rubens v. Wheatfield	93 F. R.	548
Rude v. Westcott	130 U. S.	436, 438, 452
Ruggles v. Eddy	10 Blatch.	230
Ruggles v. Eddy	11 Blatch.	503
Rumford Chemical Works v. Hecker.	2 Bann. & Ard.	345, 381, 548
Rumford Chemical Works v. Vice.	14 Blatch.	531, 537, 538, 550
Russell v. Barney	6 McLean	415
Russell v. Dodge	93 U. S.	217
Russell v. Hyde	39 F. R.	531

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Russell v. Kern	58 F. R.	236, 251
Russell v. Kern	64 F. R.	378, 477
Russell v. Kern	69 F. R.	466
Russell v. Kern	72 O. G.	170
Russell v. Newark Machine Co. ...	55 F. R.	289, 290
Russell v. Place	9 Blatch.	420, 445
Russell v. Place	5 Fisher	444
Russell v. Place	94 U. S.	163
Russell v. Winchester Repeating Arms Co.	97 F. R.	356, 455
Ryan v. Gould	32 F. R.	506
Ryan v. Hard	145 U. S.	22, 25
Ryan v. Lee	10 F. R.	253
Ryan v. Newark Spring Mattress Co.	96 F. R.	168, 169

S.

Sackett v. Smith	42 F. R.	181
Salt Lake City v. Hollister	118 U. S.	347
Sanford v. Messer	1 Holmes	259, 338
San Francisco Bridge Co. v. Keat- ing	68 F. R.	33, 417
Sargent v. Burgess	129 U. S.	310
Sargent v. Covert	152 U. S.	22
Sargent v. Larned	2 Curtis	266
Sargent v. Lock Co.	114 U. S.	169, 173, 307
Sargent v. Mfg. Co.	17 Blatch.	442
Sargent v. Seagrave	2 Curtis	524, 526
Sarven v. Hall	9 Blatch.	309
Saunders v. Allen	60 F. R.	53
Sauvinet v. Poupono	14 Louisiana	457
Sawyer Spindle Co. v. Eureka Spindle Co.	33 F. R.	214
Sawyer Spindle Co. v. Morrison Co.	52 F. R.	305
Sawyer Spindle Co. v. Taylor	56 F. R.	523, 533
Saxe v. Hammond	1 Holmes	345
Saxton v. Aultman	15 Ohio State	244
Sayles v. Dubuque & Sioux City Railroad	5 Dillon	228, 229, 249
Sayles v. Oregon Central Railroad Co.	4 Bann. & Ard.	384
Sayles v. Railroad Co.	2 Fisher	82
Sayles v. Railway Co.	4 Fisher	59, 68
Sayles v. The Lake Shore & Michi- gan Southern Railway Co. ...	Manuscript	355
Sayre v. Scott	55 F. R.	563
Schillinger v. Brewing Co.	24 O. G.	219
Schillinger v. Cranford	37 O. G.	309
Schillinger v. Gunther	2 Bann. & Ard.	556, 558
Schillinger v. Gunther	17 Blatch.	192, 196
Schillinger v. United States	155 U. S.	332
Schlicht & Field Co. v. Sewing Ma- chine Co.	36 F. R.	49, 406
Schmid v. Mfg. Co.	37 F. R.	42, 424
Schmitt v. Nelson Valve Co.	121 F. R.	237

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

lxxxvii

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Schneider v. Bassett	13 F. R.	522, 527
Schneider v. Poutney	21 F. R.	344
Schneider v. Thill	5 Bann. & Ard.	160
Schoerken v. Swift & Courtney & Beecher Co.	7 F. R.	401
Schott v. Benson	1 Blatch.	427
Schreiber v. Sharpless	17 F. R.	291
Schreiber & Sons Co. v. Grim.....	65 F. R.	177, 470
Schreiber & Sons Co. v. Grimm ...	72 F. R.	42
Schultz Belting Co. v. Belting Co..	40 F. R.	62
Schultze v. Holtz	82 F. R.	74, 492
Schupphaus v. Stevens	17 App. D. C.	128
Schuyler Electric Co. v. Electric Supply Co.	66 F. R.	315
Schwarzwalder v. Detroit	77 F. R.	390
Schwarzwalder v. Filter Co.	66 F. R.	190, 196, 295
Scott v. Watson	46 Maine	341
Screw Co. v. Sloan	1 McArthur's Patent Cases	18
Seabury v. Am Ende	152 U. S.	158, 441, 565
Seabury v. Johnson	76 F. R.	309
Seal v. Beach	113 F. R.	268
Searle v. Hill	73 Iowa	237
Searls v. Bouton	12 F. R.	270
Searls v. Merriam	22 O. G.	38
Searls v. Railroad Co.	2 Woods	553
Sears v. United States	1 Gallison	292
Sedgwick v. Cleveland	7 Paige (N. Y.)	482
Seeley v. Brush Electric Co.	44 F. R.	309
Seibert Oil Cup Co. v. Beggs.....	32 F. R.	334
Seibert Oil Cup Co. v. Lubricator Co.	34 F. R.	258, 268, 273, 469
Seibert Oil Cup Co. v. Powell Co..	35 F. R.	150
Selden v. Gas Burner Co.	19 Blatch.	153
Selden v. Gas Burner Co.	9 F. R.	209, 214, 220
Sessions v. Gould	49 F. R.	522, 529
Sessions v. Gould	60 F. R.	489
Sessions v. Gould	63 F. R.	556
Sessions v. Romadka	145 U. S. ...	44, 186, 189, 196, 254, 315, 569, 572, 574
Severy Process Co. v. Harper & Bros.	113 F. R.	323
Sewell v. Jones	91 U. S.	160, 181
Sewing Machine Co. v. Frame	24 F. R.	24, 206
Seymour v. Marsh	6 Fisher	404
Seymour v. McCormick	16 Howard	435, 444
Seymour v. McCormick	19 Howard	193, 194, 402
Seymour v. Osborne	11 Wallace... 54, 73, 105, 138, 142, 162, 165, 171, 209, 216, 307, 355, 409, 472	
Shannon v. Bruner	33 F. R.	563
Sharer v. McHenry	19 App. D. C.	124
Sharp v. Reissner	9 F. R.	480
Sharp v. Riessner	119 U. S.	169, 307
Sharpless v. Moseley & Stoddard Mfg. Co.	75 F. R.	264, 338
Shaw v. Boylan	16 Indiana	351
Shaw v. Cooper	7 Peters	93
Shaw v. Lead Co.	11 F. R.	73, 212, 335

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Shaw Stocking Co. v. Pearson.....	48 F. R.	183
Shaw Valve Co. v. New Bedford...	19 F. R.	255
Sheffield Ry. Co. v. Gordon.....	151 U. S.	580, 581
Shelly v. Brannan	4 Fisher	541
Shenfield v. Mfg. Co.	27 F. R.	42
Shenfield v. Nashawannuck Mfg. Co.	137 U. S.	22
Shepard v. Carrigan	116 U. S.	169, 181, 307
Sherman v. Champlain Transporta- tion Co.	31 Vt.	246
Shickle, Harrison & Howard Iron Co. v. St. Louis Car-Coupler Co.	77 F. R.	263
Shields v. Barrow	17 Howard	461
Shirley v. Sanderson	8 F. R.	69
Shoemaker v. Merrow	61 F. R.	306
Shoup v. Henrici	2 Bann. & Ard.....	58
Shute v. Morley Co.....	64 F. R.	499
Shuter v. Davis	16 F. R.	45
Siekles v. Borden	3 Blatch.	310, 312
Siekles v. Borden	4 Blatch.	546, 557
Siekles v. Mitchell	3 Blatch.	522, 538
Siekles v. Tileston	4 Blatch.	538
Siemens v. Sellers	123 U. S.	52, 152
Silsby v. Foote	1 Blatch.	497
Silsby v. Foote	14 Howard..	162, 195, 307, 371, 397
Silsby v. Foote	20 Howard	408, 510
Simmonds v. Morrison	44 F. R.	70
Simmons v. Standard Oil Co.....	62 F. R.	71
Simonds Rolling-Mach. Co. v. Ha- thorn Mfg. Co.	93 F. R.	70
Simplex Railway Appliance Co. v. Wands	115 F. R.	175, 278, 281
Simpson v. Davis	12 F. R.	60
Simpson v. Davis	22 F. R.	451, 563
Sinclair v. Backus	5 Bann. & Ard.....	86
Singer v. Braunsdorf	7 Blatch.	64, 122
Singer v. Walmsley	1 Fisher.....	159, 193, 194, 299
Singer Mfg. Co. v. Brill.....	54 F. R.	307, 390
Singer Mfg. Co. v. Cramer.....	109 F. R.	429
Singer Mfg. Co. v. Schenck	68 F. R.	70
Singer Mfg. Co. v. Wilson Mach. Co.	38 F. R.	465
Single Track Overhead Ry. Mfg. Co. v. Roden	98 F. R.	70
Sisson v. Gilbert	9 Blatch.	90
Sizer v. Many	16 Howard	427
Slack v. Walcott	3 Mason	485
Slawson v. Railroad Co.....	107 U. S.....	17, 33, 399, 470
Sloan Filter Co. v. El Paso Reduc- tion Co.	117 F. R.	505
Smead v. School District.....	44 F. R.	197
Smith v. Davis	34 F. R.	69
Smith v. Dental Vulcanite Co.....	93 U. S.....	26, 44, 80, 132, 171
Smith v. Downing	1 Fisher	299, 300
Smith v. Felt	50 Barbour (N. Y.)	343
Smith v. Halkyard	16 F. R.	523
Smith v. Halkyard	19 F. R.	555
Smith v. Macbeth	67 F. R.	170

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

lxxxix

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Smith v. Mercer	3 Penn. L. J. Reports.....	220
Smith v. Meriden Britannia Co.....	92 F. R.	522
Smith v. Merriam	6 F. R.	209
Smith v. Murray	27 F. R.	28
Smith v. Nichols	21 Wallace	36, 196
Smith v. Ridgely	103 F. R.	339, 383
Smith v. Saddle Co.....	148 U. S.....	15, 17, 41
Smith v. Selden	1 Blatch.	242
Smith v. Stewart	55 F. R.	48, 322, 447, 568
Smith v. United States	1 Gallison	292
Smith v. Vulcan Iron Works.....	165 U. S.	499
Smith v. Walton	51 F. R.	288
Smith v. Walton	56 F. R.	288
Smith & Davis Mfg. Co. v. Mellon.....	58 F. R.	88
Smith & Egge Mfg. Co. v. Bridgeport Chain Co.	46 F. R.	174
Smith & Griggs Mfg. Co. v. Sprague.....	123 U. S.	86, 110
Snow v. Railway Co.....	121 U. S.	307
Snyder v. Bunnell	29 F. R.	345
Snyder v. Fisher	78 O. G.	18
Societe Anonyme v. Allen	84 F. R.	522, 533
Societe Anonyme v. Allen.....	90 F. R.	547
Societe Anonyme v. General Elec- tric Co.	97 F. R.	150, 463
Societe Fabriques, etc., v. Franco- American Trading Co.....	82 F. R.	274
Solomons v. United States	21 Court of Claims	238
Solomons v. United States	22 Court of Claims	332
Solomons v. United States	137 U. S.	145, 236
Solvay Process Co. v. Michigan Alkali Co.	90 F. R.	42, 177
Sone v. Palmer	28 Missouri	244
Southard v. Russell	16 Howard	506, 508
Southern Pacific Co. v. Earl	82 F. R.	415, 547
Spaeth v. Barney	22 F. R.	363
Spalding v. Tucker	4 Fisher	427
Sparhawk v. Wills	5 Gray (Mass.)	583
Sparkman v. Higgins	1 Blatch.	48, 545
Spaulding v. Page	1 Sawyer	275
Spaulding v. Tucker	Deady	305
Specialty Mfg. Co. v. Fenton Mfg. Co.	174 U. S.	399
Spering's Appeal	71 Pennsylvania State	352
Sperry v. Ribbans	3 Bann. & Ard.	536
Spill v. Celluloid Mfg. Co.	21 F. R.	42, 500
Spill v. Celluloid Mfg. Co.....	28 F. R.	506
Sprague Electric Motor Co. v. Steel Motor Co.	105 F. R.	521
Sprague Electric Motor Co. v. Union Ry. Co.	84 F. R.	305
Sprague v. Mfg. Co.	12 F. R.	84
Spring v. Machine Co.	4 Bann. & Ard.	527, 537
Spring v. Sewing Machine Co.	13 F. R.	467
Sproull v. Pratt & Whitney Co.....	101 F. R.	266, 268
Sproull v. Pratt & Whitney Co.....	108 F. R.	513
S. S. White Dental Mfg. Co. v. Johnson	56 F. R.	530

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Stafford v. Hair-Cloth Co.	2 Cliff.	420
Stahl v. Ertel	62 F. R.	546, 554, 558
Stahl v. Williams	52 F. R.	182
Stahl v. Williams	64 F. R.	312
Stainthorp v. Humiston	2 Fisher	539, 541
Stainthorp v. Humiston	4 Fisher	56
Standard Button-Fastener Co. v. Ellis	159 Mass.	258
Standard Cartridge Co. v. Peters Cartridge Co.	77 F. R.	118, 120
Standard Caster & Wheel Co. v. Caster Socket Co.	113 F. R.	42
Standard Dental Mfg. Co. v. Na- tional Tooth Co.	95 F. R.	268, 323
Standard Elevator Co. v. Crane Elevator Co.	56 F. R.	522, 529
Standard Elevator Co. v. Crane Elevator Co.	76 F. R.	392
Standard Fireproofing Co. v. Toole..	122 F. R.	341
Standard Folding Bed Co. v. Osgood..	51 F. R.	315
Standard Folding Bed Co. v. Osgood..	58 F. R.	310
Standard Oil Co. v. Southern Pacific Co.	42 F. R.	471
Standard Oil Co. v. Southern Pacific Co.	48 F. R.	32
Standard Oil Co. v. Southern Pacific Co.	54 F. R.	346
Standard Paint Co. v. Bird	65 F. R.	172, 320
Standard Sewing Mach. Co. v. Les- lie	118 F. R.	323, 430, 512
Stapleton v. Kinney	18 App. D. C.	127
Starling v. Plow Works	32 F. R.	269
Starrett v. Arms & Tool Co.	96 F. R.	469
Star Salt Caster Co. v. Crossman..	4 Bann. & Ard.....	451
Steam Cutter Co. v. Sheldon	10 Blatch.	260, 261, 269
Steam Gauge & Lantern Co. v. Ken- nedy	41 F. R.	197
Steam Gauge & Lantern Co. v. Mfg. Co.	28 F. R.	311
Steam Gauge & Lantern Co. v. Mfg. Co.	29 F. R.	299
Steam Gauge & Lantern Co. v. Mey- rose	27 F. R.	383
Steam Gauge & Lantern Co. v. Mil- ler	11 F. R.	543
Steam Gauge & Lantern Co. v. Rog- ers	29 F. R.	315
Steam Gauge & Lantern Co. v. Wil- liams	50 F. R.	179
Steam Stone Cutter Co. v. Mfg. Co..	17 Blatch.	276, 561, 564
Steam Stone Cutter Co. v. Short- sleeves	16 Blatch.	259, 260
Stearns v. Beard	46 F. R.	60
Stearns v. Davis	1 McArthur's Patent Cases....	48
Stearns v. Phillips	43 F. R.	344
Stearns-Roger Mfg. Co. v. Brown..	114 F. R.	547
Stegner v. Blake	36 F. R.	167, 495

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

xi

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Steiger v. Heidelberger	4 F. R.	341
Stein v. Goddard	1 McAlister	334
Steiner Fire Extinguisher Co. v. Adrian	52 F. R.	42, 167, 177
Stephens v. Felt	2 Blatch.	443
Stephens v. Salisbury	1 McArthur's Patent Cases...	66
Stephenson v. Railroad Co.	14 F. R.	59
Stephenson v. Railroad Co.	114 U. S.	17, 32
Sterrick v. Pugsley	1 Central Law Journal	529
Stetson v. Herreshoff Mfg. Co....	113 F. R.	163
Stevens v. Cady	14 Howard	144, 261
Stevens v. Gladding	17 Howard	144, 261
Stevenson v. Magowan	31 F. R.	179
Stewart v. Tenk	32 F. R.	49
St. Germain v. Brunswick	135 U. S.	41, 177
Stiles v. Rice	29 F. R.	181
Still v. Reading	20 O. G.	340
Stillwell & Bierce Mfg. Co. v. The Cincinnati Gas. Light & Coke Co.	1 Bann. & Ard.	56
Stimpson v. Pond	2 Curtis	290, 292
Stimpson v. Railroad Co.	4 Howard	209, 222
Stimpson v. Railroads	1 Wallace, Jr.	419, 446
Stimpson v. Rogers	4 Blatch.	154, 452
Stimpson v. Woodman	10 Wallace	37
Stimpson Computing Scale Co. v. W. F. Stimpson Co.	104 F. R.	268, 269
Stirling Co. v. St. Louis Brewing Assn.	79 F. R.	132
Stirrat v. Excelsior Mfg. Co....	61 F. R.	175
Stitt v. Railroad Co.	22 F. R.	67, 68
St. Louis Stamping Co. v. Quinby..	4 Bann. & Ard.	159
Stohlmann v. Parker	53 F. R.	24
Stokes Bros. Mfg. Co. v. Heller....	56 F. R.	492
Stonemetz Mach. Co. v. Brown Mach. Co.	46 F. R.	279
Stonemetz Mach. Co. v. Brown Mach. Co.	57 F. R.	168, 278
Story v. Livingston	13 Peters	579
Stow v. Chicago	3 Bann. & Ard.	28, 35
Stow v. Chicago	104 U. S.	53
St. Paul Plow Works v. Starling..	140 U. S.	266, 268, 404, 421
Strait v. Harrow Co.	51 F. R.	458
Streat v. American Rubber Co....	115 F. R.	332
Streat v. White	35 F. R.	48
Strowbridge v. Lindsay	6 F. R.	557
Stuart v. Thorman	37 F. R.	533
Sturges v. Van Hagan	6 Fisher	283
Sturgis v. Knapp	33 Vermont	546
Stutz v. Armstrong	25 F. R.	276
Suffolk Co. v. Hayden	3 Wallace... 63, 64, 167, 169,	277, 434
Sugar Mfg. Co. v. Yaryan Mfg. Co..	43 F. R.	34, 394
Sugar Refinery Co. v. Mathiesson..	3 Cliff.	579
Sullivan v. Judah	4 Paige (N. Y.)	545
Sullivan v. Railroad Co.	94 U. S.	470

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Sun Printing & Publishing Assn. <i>v.</i>		
Edwards	121 F. R.	509
Superior Drill Co. <i>v.</i> Ney Mfg. Co.	98 F. R.	240
Sutro Bros. Braid Co. <i>v.</i> Schloss	44 F. R.	322
Sutter <i>v.</i> Robinson	119 U. S.	181
Suydam <i>v.</i> Day	2 Blatch.	251
Swain <i>v.</i> Holyoke Machine Co.	111 F. R.	86
Swift <i>v.</i> Jenks	29 F. R.	279
Swift <i>v.</i> Whisen	2 Bond	220
Sykes <i>v.</i> Manhattan Co.	6 Blatch.	541

T.

Taber <i>v.</i> Meriden Britannia Co.	106 F. R.	505
Tack Co. <i>v.</i> Mfg. Co.	109 U. S.	22, 32
Tannage Patent Co. <i>v.</i> Adams	77 F. R.	533
Tannage Patent Co. <i>v.</i> Donnallan.	93 F. R.	62
Tannage Patent Co. <i>v.</i> Zahn	66 F. R.	98, 157
Tannage Patent Co. <i>v.</i> Zahn	70 F. R.	43
Tatham <i>v.</i> Lowber	4 Blatch	276, 561
Tatum <i>v.</i> Gregory	51 F. R.	442
Taws <i>v.</i> Laughlins	70 F. R.	43, 311
Taylor <i>v.</i> Archer	8 Blatch.	186, 190
Taylor <i>v.</i> Porter	4 Hill (N. Y.)	138, 146
Taylor <i>v.</i> Sawyer Spindle Co.	75 F. R.	469
Taylor Burner Co. <i>v.</i> Diamond.	72 F. R.	62
Teese <i>v.</i> Huntingdon	23 Howard	371, 445, 446, 473
Telegraph Co. <i>v.</i> Telephone Co.	61 Vt.	143
Telephone Cases	126 U. S. ... 3, 7, 17, 43, 152,	162, 171
Temple Pump Co. <i>v.</i> Mfg. Co.	30 F. R.	171
Temple Pump Co. <i>v.</i> Mfg. Co.	31 F. R.	556
Tennessee <i>v.</i> Butler	71 Tenn.	143
Terhune <i>v.</i> Phillips	99 U. S.	25, 470
Terry Clock Co. <i>v.</i> New Haven Clock Co.	4 Bann. & Ard.	23
Tesla Electric Co. <i>v.</i> Scott	97 F. R.	168
Tesla Electric Co. <i>v.</i> Scott	101 F. R.	425, 426
Thatcher Heating Co. <i>v.</i> Burtis	121 U. S.	32
Thayer <i>v.</i> Hart	20 F. R.	69
Theberath <i>v.</i> Trimming Co.	15 F. R.	15, 88
The Baltimore	8 Wallace	425
The Barbed Wire Patent	143 U. S.	23
The Commander-in-Chief	1 Wallace	582, 583
The Corn-Planter Patent.	23 Wallace	22
The Fire Extinguisher Case.	21 F. R.	224
The Roller Mill Patent.	156 U. S.	175
The Santa Maria	10 Wheaton	512
The Telephone Cases	126 U. S.	316
The Three Friends	166 U. S.	515
The Tremolo Patent	23 Wallace	461, 568
Thomas <i>v.</i> Haavie's Heirs	10 Wheaton	506
Thomas <i>v.</i> Quintard	5 Duer (N. Y.)	247
Thomas <i>v.</i> Rocker Spring Co.	77 F. R.	182
Thomas & Sons Co. <i>v.</i> Electric Por- celian Co.	114 F. R.	556

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

xciii

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Thompson v. Boisselier	114 U. S.	17
Thompson v. Donnell Mfg. Co.	40 F. R.	167
Thompson v. Gildersleeve	34 F. R.	167
Thompson v. Utah	170 U. S.	389
Thompson v. Wooster	114 U. S.	206
Thomson v. Citizens' National Bank.	53 F. R.	138
Thomson v. Weston	19 App. D. C.	126
Thomson Electric Welding Co. v. Two Rivers Mfg. Co.	63 F. R.	524
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Bullock Electric Co.	101 F. R.	330
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Elmira Ry. Co.	69 F. R.	43
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Elmira Ry. Co.	71 F. R. .. 166, 167, 168, 170,	424
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Exeter Ry. Co.	110 F. R.	530
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Hoosick Ry. Co.	82 F. R.	168, 548
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. H. W. Johns Mfg. Co.	78 F. R.	263
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Jeffrey Mfg. Co.	101 F. R.	168
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Kelsey Electric Ry. Specialty Co.	72 F. R.	344
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Kelsey Ry. Specialty Co.	75 F. R.	263
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Lorain Steel Co.	110 F. R.	86
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Lorain Steel Co.	117 F. R.	25, 86
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Mahar	112 F. R.	489
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Nassau Electric R. Co.	98 F. R.	27
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Nassau Electric R. Co.	107 F. R.	2
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Nassau Electric Railroad Co.	112 F. R.	499
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Ohio Brass Co.	78 F. R.	522, 530
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Ohio Brass Co.	80 F. R.	168, 344, 547
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Rahway Electric Co.	95 F. R.	42, 177
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Union Ry. Co.	86 F. R.	168, 173
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Western Electric Co.	70 F. R.	42
Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Winchester Ave. Ry. Co.	71 F. R.	43, 493
Thrall v. Poole	89 F. R.	309
Tibbe Mfg. Co. v. Heineken	37 F. R.	528
Tiemann v. Kraatz	85 F. R.	17, 21, 36
Tilghman v. Mitchell	9 Blatch.	229, 231

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Tilghman v. Mitchell	4 Fisher	523, 541
Tilghman v. Proctor	102 U. S.	3, 7, 62, 160, 295
Tilghman v. Proctor	125 U. S.	435, 489, 560, 562 563, 572, 575, 582
Time Telegraph Co. v. Himmer	19 F. R.	394, 522
Timken v. Olin	37 F. R.	70, 500
Timken v. Olin	41 F. R.	435, 437, 446
Timolat v. Franklin Boiler Works Co.	122 F. R.	469
Timolat v. Philadelphia Pneumatic Tool Co.	123 F. R.	543
Tobey Furniture Co. v. Colby.....	35 F. R.	541
Toledo Reaper Co. v. Harvester Co.	24 F. R.	548
Tompkins v. Butterfield	25 F. R.	290
Tompkins v. Gage	5 Blatch.	164
Tomkinson v. Mfg. Co.	23 F. R.	322
Tonduer v. Chambers	37 F. R.	107, 310
Toohey v. Harding	4 Hughes	298
Topliff v. Topliff	122 U. S.	241
Topliff v. Topliff	145 U. S.	44, 62, 80, 102, 174 178, 207, 209, 211, 444, 579 580
Toppan v. Tiffany Car Co.....	39 F. R.	346
Tracy v. Torrey	2 Blatch.	541
Trader v. Messmore	1 Bann. & Ard.	181
Traver v. Brown	62 F. R.	393
Travers v. Beyer	26 F. R.	344
Travers v. Cordage Co.	64 F. R.	402
Travers v. Spreader Co.	35 F. R.	533
Trecothick v. Austin	4 Mason	337
Trent v. Risdon Iron & Locomotive Works	102 F. R.	347
Troy Iron & Nail Factory v. Corn- ing	14 Howard	260, 270
Troy Iron & Nail Factory v. Corn- ing	6 Blatch.	564, 577, 579
Troy Iron & Nail Factory v. Corn- ing	7 Blatch.	425
Troy Machinery Co. v. Bunnell....	27 F. R.	39
Truax v. Detweiler	46 F. R.	555
Truman v. Holmes	87 F. R.	450
Tubular Rivet & Stud Co. v. O'Brien.	93 F. R.	263, 345
Tuck v. Bramhill	6 Blatch.	162, 190, 193
Tucker v. Carpenter	1 Hempstead	545
Tucker v. Spalding	13 Wallace	41, 419
Tufts v. Tufts	3 Woodbury & Minot	501
Turnbull v. Plow Co.	6 Bissell	244, 246
Turrell v. Spaeth	3 Bann. & Ard.	217, 310
Turrill v. Illinois Central R. R. Co.	20 F. R.	569
Turrill v. Michigan Southern R. R. Co.	1 Wallace	68, 178, 418
Tuttle v. Claffin	62 F. R.	571
Tuttle v. Claffin	76 F. R.	479, 513, 574
Tuttle v. Matthews	28 F. R.	156, 276, 298, 459
Tyler v. Boston	7 Wallace	103, 159, 320, 397
Tyler v. Galloway	12 F. R.	192, 197
Tyler v. Hyde	2 Blatch.	283
Tyler v. Savage	143 U. S.	467

U.

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Underwood <i>v.</i> Gerber	149 U. S.	177
Union Bank <i>v.</i> Kerr	2 Maryland Chancery	518
Union Edge Setter Co. <i>v.</i> Keith....	31 F. R.	39
Union Edge Setter Co. <i>v.</i> Keith....	139 U. S.	32
Union Metallic Cartridge Co. <i>v.</i> United States Cartridge Co....	2 Bann. & Ard.	308
Union Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Lounsbury.....	42 Barbour (N. Y.)	269
Union Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Lounsbury.....	41 New York	233
Union Paper Bag Machine Co. <i>v.</i> Binney	5 Fisher	519, 533, 536, 540
Union Paper Bag Machine Co. <i>v.</i> Crane	1 Bann. & Ard.	128
Union Paper Bag Machine Co. <i>v.</i> Murphy	97 U. S.	312
Union Paper-Bag Machine Co. <i>v.</i> Newell	11 Blatch.	518
Union Paper Bag Machine Co. <i>v.</i> Waterbury	39 F. R.	197, 207, 212
Union Paper Collar Co. <i>v.</i> Leland..	1 Bann. & Ard.	39
Union Steam-Pump Co. <i>v.</i> Battle Creek Steam-Pump Co.....	104 F. R.	306, 316
Union Stone Co. <i>v.</i> Allen	14 F. R.	300
Union Sugar Refinery <i>v.</i> Matthies- sen	2 Fisher	403
Union Switch & Signal Co. <i>v.</i> John- son Signal Co.	61 F. R.	264
Union Switch & Signal Co. <i>v.</i> Phila- delphia & Reading Railroad Co.	68 F. R.	356
Union Switch & Signal Co. <i>v.</i> Phila- delphia & Reading Railroad Co.	69 F. R.	340, 346, 480
Union Trust Co. <i>v.</i> Walker Electric Co.	122 F. R.	452
United Nickel Co. <i>v.</i> Electrical Works	25 F. R.	261
United Nickel Co. <i>v.</i> Pendleton....	15 F. R.	312
United Nickel Co. <i>v.</i> Railroad Co....	36 F. R.	437, 438
United Nickel Co. <i>v.</i> Worthington..	13 F. R.	342, 350
United States <i>v.</i> Allen	101 O. G.	113
United States <i>v.</i> Bell Telephone Co.	128 U. S.	285
United States <i>v.</i> Bell Telephone Co.	159 U. S.	514
United States <i>v.</i> Bell Telephone Co.	167 U. S.	142, 144
United States <i>v.</i> Berdan Fire Arms Co.	156 U. S.	324, 332
United States <i>v.</i> Burns	12 Wallace	145, 332
United States <i>v.</i> Butterworth	3 Mackey	114
United States <i>v.</i> Colgate	21 F. R.	286
United States <i>v.</i> Colgate	32 F. R.	116
United States <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Patents	7 O. G.	123
United States <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Patents	22 O. G.	96
United States <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Patents	54 O. G.	112

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
United States <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Patents	104 O. G.	96
United States <i>v.</i> Delespine's Heirs	12 Peters	410
United States <i>v.</i> Duell	95 O. G.	113, 156
United States <i>v.</i> Duell	172 U. S.	128
United States <i>v.</i> Marble	2 Mackey	123
United States <i>v.</i> Morris	2 Bond	291
United States <i>v.</i> Palmer	128 U. S.	145, 273, 332
United States <i>v.</i> Samperyac	Hemstead's Circuit Court Reports	507
United States <i>v.</i> Weber	114 F. R.	554
United States Annunciator Co. <i>v.</i> Sanderson	3 Blatch.	395, 530, 540
United States Bung Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Independent Bung Co.	31 F. R.	44, 53
United States Credit System Co. <i>v.</i> Indemnity Co.	51 F. R.	471
United States Credit System Co. <i>v.</i> Indemnity Co.	53 F. R.	471
United States Electric Lighting Co. <i>v.</i> Consolidated Electric Light Co.	33 F. R.	473
United States Felting Co. <i>v.</i> Asbestos Felting Co.	4 F. R.	382
United States Glass Co. <i>v.</i> Atlas Glass Co.	88 F. R.	170
United States Mitis Co. <i>v.</i> Carnegie Steel Co.	89 F. R.	159, 411
United States Mitis Co. <i>v.</i> Detroit Steel & Spring Co.	122 F. R.	465, 469
United States Packing Co. <i>v.</i> Tripp	31 F. R.	382
United States Peg Wood Co. <i>v.</i> B. F. Sturtevant Co.	122 F. R.	68, 161
United States Playing-Card Co. <i>v.</i> Spalding	92 F. R.	546, 554
United States Playing-Card Co. <i>v.</i> Spalding	93 F. R.	555
United States Seeded Raisin Co. <i>v.</i> Phoenix Seeding Co.	124 F. R.	331
United States Stamping Co. <i>v.</i> King	4 Bann. & Ard.	534
United States Stamping Co. <i>v.</i> King	17 Blatch.	222
United States Stamping Co. <i>v.</i> Jewett	7 F. R.	235
Universal Winding Co. <i>v.</i> Willimantic Linen Co.	82 F. R.	57, 67, 68
Untermeyer <i>v.</i> Freund	37 F. R.	17
Untermeyer <i>v.</i> Freund	58 F. R.	57, 448, 562, 568
Upton Nut Co. <i>v.</i> H. Chapin Sons Co.	117 F. R.	47
Upton <i>v.</i> Wayland	36 F. R.	524
Urner <i>v.</i> Kayton	17 F. R.	575

V.

Vanbuskirk <i>v.</i> Hartford Fire Insurance Co.	14 Connecticut	244
Vance <i>v.</i> Campbell	1 Black	169, 307, 354, 390, 472

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

xcvii

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Vance <i>v.</i> Campbell	1 Fisher	73, 76
Van Hook <i>v.</i> Pendleton	1 Blatch.	469, 537
Vannini <i>v.</i> Paine	1 Har. (Del.)	144
Van Orden <i>v.</i> Nashville	67 F. R.	337
Van Ostrand <i>v.</i> Reed	1 Wendell (N. Y.)	248
Varick <i>v.</i> Briggs	6 Paige (N. Y.)	246
Vattier <i>v.</i> Hinde	7 Peters	461, 484
Vermilya <i>v.</i> Erie Railroad Co.	89 F. R.	535
Vermont Farm Machine Co. <i>v.</i> Marble	20 F. R.	118
Victor Talking Mach. Co. <i>v.</i> The Fair	123 F. R.	144, 262, 327, 328
Vinton <i>v.</i> Hamilton	104 U. S.	22
Vogler <i>v.</i> Semple	7 Bissell	312
Von Schmidt <i>v.</i> Bowers	80 F. R.	64, 81
Vose <i>v.</i> Singer	4 Allen (Mass.)	257
Vulcanite Paving Co. <i>v.</i> Pavement Co.	36 F. R.	436
Vulcanized Fiber Co. <i>v.</i> Taylor.	49 F. R.	25

W.

Wade <i>v.</i> Lawder	165 U. S.	328
Wade <i>v.</i> Metcalf	129 U. S.	145
Wagner Typewriter Co. <i>v.</i> Watkins.	84 F. R.	268
Waite <i>v.</i> Chair Co.	45 F. R.	465
Wales <i>v.</i> Waterbury Mfg. Co.	101 F. R.	513, 567
Walker <i>v.</i> Hawxhurst	5 Blatch.	289
Wall <i>v.</i> Leck	61 F. R.	471
Wall <i>v.</i> Leck	66 F. R.	2
Wallace <i>v.</i> Holmes	9 Blatch.	344
Wallace <i>v.</i> Noyes	13 F. R.	23
Ward <i>v.</i> County of Hartford.	12 Connecticut	340
Ward <i>v.</i> Plow Co.	14 F. R.	23
Waring Electric Co. <i>v.</i> Edison Elec- tric Light Co.	69 F. R.	150
Warren <i>v.</i> Keep	155 U. S.	511, 563
Warren Featherbone Co. <i>v.</i> Warner Bros. Co.	92 F. R.	473
Washburn <i>v.</i> Gould	3 Story ...	194, 221, 241, 252, 420
Washburn & Moen Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Barbed Wire Co.	33 F. R.	39
Washburn & Moen Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Barbed Wire Fence Co.	22 F. R.	536
Washburn & Moen Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Barbed Wire Fence Co.	42 F. R.	268, 270
Washburn & Moen Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Freeman Wire Co.	41 F. R.	270
Washburn & Moen Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Haish	4 Bann. & Ard.	203
Washburn & Moen Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Haish	4 F. R.	236, 251
Washburn & Moen Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Scutt Co.	22 F. R.	536

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Washing Machine Co. v. Earle.....	3 Wallace, Jr.	251
Washing-Machine Co. v. Tool Co....	20 Wallace	175
Waterbury Brass Co. v. Miller	9 Blatch.	298, 303
Waterbury Brass Co. v. New York Brass Co.	3 Fisher	395, 396, 419
Waterman v. Mackenzie	138 U. S. ..	236, 252, 253, 258, 334 337, 338, 465
Waterman v. Thomson	2 Fisher	58
Waterman v. Shipman	55 F. R. ..	253, 270, 271, 339, 400
Waterman v. Shipman	130 N. Y.	328
Water-Meter Co. v. Desper	101 U. S.	307
Watson v. Railway Co.	132 U. S.	17
Watson v. Stevens	47 F. R.	42
Watt v. Starke	101 U. S.	498
Wayne v. Winter	6 McLean	403
Weatherhead v. Coupe	147 U. S.	169, 307
Weber v. Virginia	103 U. S.	143
Webster v. New Brunswick Carpet Co.	1 Bann. & Ard.	81
Webster Loom Co. v. Higgins	4 Bann. & Ard.	69
Webster Loom Co. v. Higgins	39 F. R.	573
Webster Loom Co. v. Higgins	43 F. R.	571
Weddeburn v. Bliss	12 App. D. C.	111, 112
Weir v. Morden	125 U. S.	22
Welling v. Crane	14 F. R.	25
Welling v. La Bau	35 F. R.	445
Welling v. Trimming Co.	2 Bann. & Ard.	555
Wells v. Gill	6 Fisher	520, 534, 540
Welsbach Light Co. v. American In- candescent Lamp Co.	98 F. R.	66
Welsbach Light Co. v. Apollo Incan- descent Gaslight Co.	96 F. R.	152
Welsbach Light Co. v. Benedict & Burnham Mfg. Co.	82 F. R.	524
Welsbach Light Co. v. Cosmopolitan Gaslight Co.	100 F. R.	49, 406, 532
Welsbach Light Co. v. Cosmopolitan Light Co.	104 F. R.	49, 547
Welsbach Light Co. v. Freeman....	100 F. R.	343
Welsbach Light Co. v. Sunlight Lamp Co.	87 F. R.	308, 313, 315, 320
Werner v. King	96 U. S.	310
West v. Barnes	2 Dallas	429
West v. Rae	33 F. R.	471
West Publishing Co. v. Co-opera- tive Publishing Co.	53 F. R.	550
Westcott v. Rude	19 F. R.	437, 438, 440
Western Electric Co. v. Anthracite Telephone Co.	100 F. R.	491
Western Electric Co. v. Capital Tel. & Tel. Co.	86 F. R.	63, 305
Western Electric Co. v. Citizens' Telephone Co.	106 F. R.	151
Western Electric Co. v. La Rue ...	139 U. S.	76, 167, 305, 308
Western Electric Mfg. Co. v. Odell.	18 F. R.	17
Western Electric Co. v. Sperry Elec- tric Co.	58 F. R.	133, 473

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

xcix

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Western Electric Co. v. Home Telephone Co.	85 F. R.	46, 168, 349
Western Electric Co. v. Williams-Abbott Electric Co.	83 F. R.	455, 528
Western Electric Co. v. Williams-Abbott Electric Co.	108 F. R.	315, 499, 510
Western Telephone Construction Co. v. Stromberg	66 F. R.	383, 529
Western Union Telegraph Co. v. American Bell Telephone Co.	105 F. R.	498
Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Telegraph Co.	25 F. R.	535
Westervelt v. Library Bureau	118 F. R.	464
Westinghouse v. Air-Brake Co.	2 Bann. & Ard.	171
Westinghouse v. Air-Brake Co.	59 F. R.	24
Westinghouse v. Boyden Brake Co.	66 F. R.	183
Westinghouse v. Boyden Brake Co.	170 U. S.	171, 174, 299, 310, 313
Westinghouse v. Carpenter	43 F. R.	549, 552
Westinghouse v. Duncan	66 O. G.	128
Westinghouse v. Edison Electric Light Co.	63 F. R.	181
Westinghouse v. Gas Co.	43 F. R.	56
Westinghouse v. New York Air-Brake Co.	115 F. R.	566
Westinghouse Air-Brake Co. v. Burton Stock Car Co.	77 F. R.	540
Westinghouse Air-Brake Co. v. Carpenter	32 F. R.	539
Westinghouse Air-Brake Co. v. Chicago Brake & Mfg. Co.	85 F. R.	138, 141, 243, 245, 249, 250
Westinghouse Air-Brake Co. v. Christensen Engineering Co.	103 F. R.	438
Westinghouse Air-Brake Co. v. Christensen Engineering Co.	113 F. R.	491
Westinghouse Air-Brake Co. v. Christensen Engineering Co.	121 F. R.	532, 558
Westinghouse Air-Brake Co. v. Great Northern Ry. Co.	86 F. R.	538
Westinghouse Air-Brake Co. v. Great Northern Ry. Co.	88 F. R.	55
Westinghouse Air-Brake Co. v. New York Air-Brake Co.	111 F. R.	469, 470, 479
Westinghouse Air-Brake Co. v. New York Air-Brake Co.	112 F. R.	100, 323
Westinghouse Air-Brake Co. v. New York Air-Brake Co.	119 F. R.	300
Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. American Transformer Co.	121 F. R.	531
Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. Beacon Lamp Co.	95 F. R.	11, 60, 76
Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. Catskill Co.	94 F. R.	3
Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. Catskill Co.	121 F. R.	71

C

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. New England Granite Co.	103 F. R.	36
Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. Royal Weaving Co.	115 F. R.	533
Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. Saranac Lake Electric Light Co.	108 F. R.	51, 54, 71, 79, 86
Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. Stanley Electric Mfg. Co.	115 F. R.	208, 209
Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. Stanley Electric Mfg. Co.	116 F. R.	331
Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. Stanley Electric Mfg. Co.	117 F. R.	381
Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. Triumph Electric Co.	97 F. R.	15
Weston v. White	13 Blatch.	132
Weston Electrical Instrument Co. v. Stevens	119 F. R.	158
Wetherell v. Keith	27 F. R.	69
Wetherell v. Zinc Co.	6 Fisher	233, 241, 265
Wetherill v. Zinc Co.	1 Bann. & Ard.	554, 556, 562, 572
Wheaton v. Kendall	85 F. R.	71, 118
Wheeler v. McCormick	8 Blatch.	464
Wheeler v. McCormick	11 Blatch.	64, 169, 549
Wheeler v. Reaper Co.	10 Blatch.	73, 309
Whipple v. Hutchinson	4 Blatch.	546, 554, 557
Whipple v. Mfg. Co.	4 Fisher	395
Whipple v. Miner	15 F. R.	118
Whitcomb v. Coal Co.	47 F. R.	42, 212, 219, 391
White v. Dunbar	119 U. S.	173, 180, 211, 218
White v. Hunter	47 F. R.	522
White v. Lee	5 Bann. & Ard.	268
White v. Lee	14 F. R.	28, 266
White v. Rankin	144 U. S.	328, 330
White v. Surdam	41 F. R.	522
White v. Walbridge	46 F. R.	308, 531, 549
Whitely v. Fadner	73 F. R.	323
Whitely v. Swayne	4 Fisher	209
Whitford v. Clark County	119 U. S.	416
Whiting v. Graves	3 Bann. & Ard.	237, 257
Whiting v. The Bank of the United States	13 Peters	506
Whitney v. B. & A. R. Co.	50 F. R.	189
Whitney v. Burr	115 Ill.	237
Whitney v. Mowry	3 Fisher	510
Whitney v. Mowry	4 Fisher	76
Whitson v. Phonograph Co.	18 App. D. C.	262
Whittall v. Lowell Mfg. Co.	79 F. R.	104
Whittemore v. Cutter	1 Gallison	443, 446
Wickelman v. A. B. Dick Co.	88 F. R.	26, 62
Wicke v. Kleinknecht	1 Bann. & Ard.	263
Wickersham v. Singer	1 McArthur's Patent Cases ...	80
Wickersham's Case	4 O. G.	228
Wickes v. Lockwood	65 F. R.	70
Wicks v. Stevens	2 Bann. & Ard.	209
Wickshire v. Wire Fabric Co.	41 F. R.	499, 552

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

ci

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Wilbur <i>v.</i> Beecher	2 Blatch.	444
Wich <i>v.</i> Phelps	14 Neb.	143
Wilcox <i>v.</i> Jackson	13 Peters	545
Wilcox & Gibbs Sewing Mach. Co. <i>v.</i> Sherborne	123 F. R.	504
Wilcoxon <i>v.</i> Bowles	1 Louisiana An'l.	241
Wilder <i>v.</i> Kent	15 F. R.	262
Wilder <i>v.</i> McCormick	2 Blatch.	361, 362, 365, 366
Wilgus <i>v.</i> Van Sickle	99 F. R.	524
Wilkin <i>v.</i> Covell	46 F. R.	173
Wilkins <i>v.</i> Ellett	108 U. S.	336
Wilkins <i>v.</i> Jordan	3 Washington	543
Wilkins Shoe-Button Fastener Co. <i>v.</i> Webb	89 F. R.	166, 344, 356, 390
Williames <i>v.</i> Barnard	41 F. R.	305
Williames <i>v.</i> McNeely	64 F. R.	197
Williames <i>v.</i> McNeely	77 F. R.	423, 443
William Mann Co. <i>v.</i> Hoffmann	104 F. R.	313
Williams <i>v.</i> American String Wrap- per Co.	86 F. R.	45
Williams <i>v.</i> Boston & Albany Rail- road Co.	4 Bann. & Ard.	94
Williams <i>v.</i> Leonard	9 Blatch.	565
Williams <i>v.</i> McNeely	56 F. R.	531
Williams <i>v.</i> Rubber Shoe Co.	49 F. R.	181, 182
Williams <i>v.</i> Rubber Shoe Co.	54 F. R.	45
Williams <i>v.</i> Steam Gauge & Lan- tern Co.	47 F. R.	103
Williams <i>v.</i> Stolzenbach	23 F. R.	307
Williams Patent Crusher Co. <i>v.</i> St. Louis Pulverizer Co.	104 F. R.	160
Willimantic Linen Co. <i>v.</i> Clark Thread Co.	24 F. R.	501
Willimantic Thread Co. <i>v.</i> Clark Thread Co.	27 F. R.	440
Willis <i>v.</i> McCullen	29 F. R.	345
Willis <i>v.</i> Miller	121 F. R.	400
Wilson <i>v.</i> Barnum	8 Howard	514
Wilson <i>v.</i> Chickering	14 F. R.	338
Wilson <i>v.</i> Consolidated Store Ser- vice Co.	88 F. R.	528
Wilson <i>v.</i> Coon	18 Blatch.	157, 205, 206, 408
Wilson <i>v.</i> Fire Alarm Co.	151 Mass.	253
Wilson <i>v.</i> Fire Alarm Co.	52 O. G.	145
Wilson <i>v.</i> Janes	3 Blatch.	419
Wilson <i>v.</i> Keeley	43 O. G.	492
Wilson <i>v.</i> Mfg. Co.	12 F. R.	289
Wilson <i>v.</i> Rousseau	4 Howard.	214, 228, 229, 230, 233, 242, 252, 334
Wilson <i>v.</i> Sandford	10 Howard	328
Wilson <i>v.</i> School District	32 New Hampshire	341
Wilson <i>v.</i> Sherman	1 Blatch.	535
Wilson <i>v.</i> Simpson	9 Howard	233
Wilson <i>v.</i> Stolley	3 McLean	261
Wilson <i>v.</i> Stolley	4 McLean	260, 461
Wilson <i>v.</i> Turner	Taney's Circuit Court De- cisions	228, 229

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Wilton <i>v.</i> Railroad Co.	1 Brightly's Federal Digest ...	76
Winans <i>v.</i> Denmead	15 Howard	44, 178, 183, 303
Winans <i>v.</i> Railroad Co.	21 Howard	184
Winchester Arms Co. <i>v.</i> American Buckle Co.	54 F. R.	550
Winchester Arms Co. <i>v.</i> American Cartridge Co.	62 F. R.	566
Winfrey <i>v.</i> Gallatin	72 Mo. App.	240
Winkler <i>v.</i> Studebaker Mfg. Co.	105 F. R.	256
Winne <i>v.</i> Snow	19 F. R.	289, 291, 292
Wintermute <i>v.</i> Redington	1 Fisher	256
Wirt <i>v.</i> Brown	30 F. R.	556
Wirt <i>v.</i> Hicks	46 F. R.	454, 518, 549
Wiscott <i>v.</i> Agricultural Works	11 F. R.	257
Wise <i>v.</i> Allis	9 Wallace	372
Wise <i>v.</i> Railway Co.	33 F. R.	468
Wisner <i>v.</i> Grant	5 Bann. & Ard.	164
Wisner <i>v.</i> Grant	7 F. R.	219
Withington-Coolley Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Kin- ney	68 F. R.	275
Wolff <i>v.</i> Du Pont	122 F. R.	414
Wollensak <i>v.</i> Reiher	115 U. S.	211, 409, 477
Wollensak <i>v.</i> Sargent	32 F. R.	525, 528
Wollensak <i>v.</i> Sargent	41 F. R.	181
Wollensak <i>v.</i> Sargent	151 U. S.	40, 212
Wood <i>v.</i> Mill Co.	4 Fisher	69
Wood <i>v.</i> Railroad Co.	2 Bissell	233
Wood <i>v.</i> Underhill	5 Howard	159
Wood <i>v.</i> Wells	6 Fisher	269
Woodard <i>v.</i> Gas Stove Co.	68 F. R.	524, 535
Woodbridge <i>v.</i> Perkins	3 Day (Connecticut)	244
Woodmense & Hewitt Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Williams	68 F. R.	469, 470
Wood-Paper Patent	23 Wallace	217
Woodruff <i>v.</i> Barney	2 Fisher	427
Woodward <i>v.</i> Boston Lasting Mach. Co.	63 F. R.	513
Woodward <i>v.</i> Lasting Mach. Co. ..	60 F. R.	383
Woodworth <i>v.</i> Cook	2 Blatch.	242, 269
Woodworth <i>v.</i> Curtis	2 Woodbury & Minot	233, 261
Woodworth <i>v.</i> Edwards	3 Woodbury & Minot..	224, 346, 457, 521
Woodworth <i>v.</i> Hall	1 Woodbury & Minot	219
Woodworth <i>v.</i> Morrison	1 Holmes	319
Woodworth <i>v.</i> Rogers	3 Woodbury & Minot..	543, 544, 545, 556
Woodworth <i>v.</i> Stone	3 Story	220, 221
Woodworth <i>v.</i> Weed	1 Blatch.	269, 535
Woonsocket Rubber Co. <i>v.</i> Candee..	23 F. R.	28
Wooster <i>v.</i> Handy	21 F. R.	500
Wooster <i>v.</i> Handy	23 F. R.	425, 506
Wooster <i>v.</i> Machine Co.	4 Bann. & Ard.	538
Wooster <i>v.</i> Marks	17 Blatch.	343
Wooster <i>v.</i> Sidenberg	13 Blatch.	233
Wooster <i>v.</i> Simonson	16 F. R.	440
Wooster <i>v.</i> Simonson	20 F. R.	437
Wooster <i>v.</i> Taylor	14 Blatch.	563

TABLE OF CITED CASES.

ciii

Names of Cases.	Where Reported.	Pages in this book.
Worley <i>v.</i> Tobacco Co.	104 U. S.	84, 110
Worswick Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> Buffalo	20 F. R.	69
Wortendyke <i>v.</i> White	2 Bann. & Ard.	261, 536
Wright <i>v.</i> Bales	2 Black.	354, 390
Wright <i>v.</i> Postel	44 F. R.	80
Wright <i>v.</i> Randel	8 F. R.	243, 245
Wright <i>v.</i> Wilson	11 Richardson (S. C. Law Re- ports)	248
Wright <i>v.</i> Yuengling	155 U. S.	32, 169, 177, 307
Wright & Colton Wire-Cloth Co. <i>v.</i> Wire-Cloth Co.	67 F. R.	167
Writing Mach. Co. <i>v.</i> Book-Type- writer Co.	108 F. R.	313, 316
Writing Mach. Co. <i>v.</i> Elliott & Hatch Co.	106 F. R.	177
Wurts <i>v.</i> Harrington	10 App. D. C.	126
Wurts <i>v.</i> Harrington	79 O. G.	124, 127
Wyckoff <i>v.</i> Wagner Typewriter Co.	88 F. R.	468
Wyeth <i>v.</i> Stone	1 Story	93, 196, 298
Wyman <i>v.</i> Donnelly	104 O. G.	127

Y.

Yale & Greenleaf Mfg. Co. <i>v.</i> North. ⁵ Blatch.		550
Yale Lock Co. <i>v.</i> Berkshire Bank.	135 U. S.	79, 208, 209, 408
Yale Lock Co. <i>v.</i> Greenleaf	117 U. S.	22
Yale Lock Co. <i>v.</i> Sargent	117 U. S.	169, 192, 193, 194, 300, 307, 435, 436, 441
Yale Lock Co. <i>v.</i> National Bank.	17 F. R.	39
Yates <i>v.</i> Huson	8 App. D. C.	127, 375, 406
York & Cumberland Railroad Co. <i>v.</i> Myers	18 Howard	429
York & Maryland Line Railroad Co. <i>v.</i> Winans	17 Howard.	156, 340, 348, 353
Young <i>v.</i> Foerster	37 F. R.	263, 342
Young <i>v.</i> Lippman	9 Blatch.	520
Young <i>v.</i> Lippman	5 Fisher	543
Young <i>v.</i> Wolfe	120 F. R.	70, 396
Young Reversible Lock Nut Co. <i>v.</i> Young Lock Nut Co.	72 F. R.	330
Yuengling <i>v.</i> Johnson	1 Hughes	519, 521

Z.

Zane <i>v.</i> Peck	13 F. R.	436
Zane <i>v.</i> Soffe	5 Bann. & Ard.	417
Zinn <i>v.</i> Weiss	7 F. R.	300
Zinsser <i>v.</i> Krueger	45 F. R.	489
Zinsser <i>v.</i> Krueger	48 F. R.	42

TABLE OF CITED STATUTES.

Names of Statutes.	Sections of Statutes.	Pages in this book.
Patent Act of 1790	1.....	138, 223
Patent Act of 1793	1.....	89, 223
Patent Act of 1832; July 3...	2.....	224
“ “ “ “...	3.....	200, 203, 214
Patent Act of 1832; July 13...	1.....	92
Patent Act of 1836	6.....	82, 106, 109
“ “	7.....	82, 119
“ “	13.....	201, 203, 214
“ “	18.....	225, 226, 228, 230, 231, 232
“ “	21.....	224
Patent Act of 1837	5.....	202
“ “	6.....	227
“ “	7.....	186, 204
“ “	8.....	201
“ “	9.....	186, 204
Patent Act of 1839	7.....	83
Patent Act of 1842	3.....	15
Patent Act of 1848	1.....	227
Patent Act of 1861; March 2..	11.....	14
“ “ “ “..	16.....	225
Patent Act of 1870	33.....	202
“ “	41.....	120
“ “	46-52.....	202
“ “	53.....	203, 213, 214, 216
“ “	54.....	186
“ “	60.....	186
“ “	61.....	83
“ “	63.....	228, 230
“ “	63-67.....	227
“ “	66.....	231
“ “	67.....	232
“ “	71.....	14
Patent Act of 1871; March 3..	1.....	202
Revised Statutes	1.....	107
“	483.....	96
“	487.....	111, 112
“	490.....	401

TABLE OF CITED STATUTES.

Names of Statutes.	Sections of Statutes.	Pages in this book.
Revised Statutes	591	553
“	592	553
“	593	553
“	594	553
“	595	553
“	596	553
“	608	360
“	609	553
“	611	553
“	617	553
“	618	553
“	629	116, 285, 326, 450
“	649	388, 421
“	693	514
“	699	429
“	700	421, 429
“	701	513
“	711	327
“	716	519
“	718	521
“	719	553, 554
“	720	519
“	721	292, 384, 423, 484
“	723	542
“	823	425
“	824	425, 426
“	848	426
“	863	416, 576
“	864	416, 576
“	865	416, 576
“	866	458
“	892	110, 390, 401, 408
“	893	401
“	899	410
“	900	410
“	905	409
“	914	292, 359, 389, 423
“	917	519
“	945	458
“	973	424
“	983	425
“	1007	509
“	1012	509
“	1910	326

TABLE OF CITED STATUTES.

Names of Statutes.	Sections of Statutes.	Pages in this book.
Revised Statutes	1911.....	326
"	4883.....	155, 156, 362
"	4884.....	148, 156, 363
"	4885.....	108, 133, 153
"	4886.. 51, 56, 68, 72, 83, 112, 153,	361 362
"	4887.....	149
"	4888..... 96, 97, 120, 157, 161,	376
"	4889.....	96, 108
"	4890.....	96, 110
"	4891.....	96, 109
"	4892.....	96, 105, 106
"	4893.....	96, 112
"	4894.....	133
"	4895.....	96, 153, 155, 219
"	4896..... 96, 107, 154, 155,	255
"	4897.....	90
"	4898..... 237, 243, 411,	479
"	4899.....	145
"	4900..... 288, 410,	478
"	4901..... 288, 291,	292
"	4902.....	130
"	4903..... 113,	120
"	4904..... 123,	279
"	4903.....	124
"	4909.....	113
"	4910.....	113
"	4911.....	114
"	4912.....	115
"	4913.....	115
"	4914.....	116
"	4915..... 116,	118
"	4916.. 200, 203, 207, 213, 214, 215,	219 221, 369, 408, 476
"	4917..... 187, 195, 196, 363,	424
"	4918..... 129, 279,	280
"	4919.. 334, 359, 398, 423, 444, 445,	451
"	4920..... 370, 371, 372, 374, 375,	406 474
"	4921..... 450, 451,	517
"	4922.. 187, 194, 364, 377, 407, 424,	513
"	4923.....	51
"	4924..... 228,	230
"	4924-4928	227

Names of Statutes.	Sections of Statutes.	Pages in this book.
Revised Statutes	4927.....	231
“	4928.....	227, 232
“	4931.....	149
“	4933.....	96
“	4934.....	108
“	5053.....	254
“	5596.....	519
Patent Act of 1875	2.....	468, 487, 497
Patent Act of 1887	1.....	447, 568
Patent Act of 1888	1.....	362
Sherman Anti-trust Act of 1890,	1.....	142
Judiciary Act of 1891	5.....	509
“ “	6..	131, 293, 429, 430, 509, 514, 515
“ “	11.....	506, 509, 514
Amendments of 1900	7.....	499, 547
Judiciary Act of 1893	7.....	131, 429, 511, 514
“ “	8.....	429
“ “	9.....	114, 128
Jurisdiction Act of 1897	1.....	330
Patent Act of 1897	1.....	362
“ “	1, 3, 8.....	90
“ “	2.....	370
“ “	3, 8.....	91
“ “	4.....	133
“ “	5.....	239, 392
“ “	6.....	384
“ “	8.....	150
Patent Act of 1899		96, 153
Patent Act of April, 1902.....		155, 363
Patent Act of May, 1902.....		14
Patent Act of 1903	1.....	91, 126
“ “	2.....	105, 106
“ “	3.....	96, 107
“ “	4.....	130

THE PATENT LAWS.

CHAPTER I.

THE SUBJECTS OF PATENTS.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Constitutional and statutory foundation of the patent laws. | 12. Illustrated by the five cases when compared. |
| 2. Patent law meaning of the word "discovery." | 13. Illustrated by the five cases when contrasted. |
| 3. Patent law meaning of the word "art." | 14. Deduced from the five cases as compared and contrasted. |
| 7. Difference between a "process" and a "principle" inquired into. | 15. Illustrated by the eighth claim of Morse. |
| 8. Illustrated by the case of <i>McClurg v. Kingsland</i> . | 16. Machines, and improvements of machines. |
| 9. Illustrated by the case of <i>O'Reilly v. Morse</i> . | 17. Manufactures. |
| 10. Illustrated by the case of <i>Mowry v. Whitney</i> . | 18. Compositions of matter. |
| 11. Illustrated by the case of <i>Tilghman v. Proctor</i> . | 19. Distinction between machines, manufactures, and compositions of matter. |
| 11a. Illustrated by the Telephone Cases. | 20. Designs. |
| | 21. Design patents, under statutes earlier than 1873. |
| | 22. Ornament and utility. |

§ 1. CONGRESS has power to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to inventors the exclusive right to their respective discoveries.¹ This constitutional law is the foundation of all the patent laws of the United States. In accordance with the power it confers, and in pursuance of the object it mentions, Congress has, from time to time, enacted certain statutes. The principal enactment, in force at this writing, is Section 4886

¹ Constitution of the United States of America, Article I, Section 8.

of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended March 3, 1897. Subject to certain conditions and limitations, hereafter to be explained in this book, that section provides that any person who has invented or discovered any new and useful art, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor. Statute law, identical with this, has been in force in the United States ever since April 10, 1790; except that the conditions and limitations attending it have varied somewhat from time to time; and except that compositions of matter were not mentioned in the statute prior to that of February 21, 1793, though they were doubtless covered by the word "manufacture," which the earlier statute contained.

§ 2. The word "discovery" does not have, either in the Constitution or the statute, its broadest signification. It means invention in those documents, and in them it means nothing else.¹ The "discoveries" of inventors are inventions. The same man may invent a machine and may discover an island or a law of nature. For doing the first of these things the patent laws may reward him, because he is an inventor in doing it; but those laws cannot reward him for doing either of the others, because he is not an inventor in doing either.² The statute provides that patents may be granted for four classes of things. These are arts, machines, manufactures, and compositions of matter. None of these things can be originally made known by discovery, as our continent was. They are not found, but created. They are results of original thought. They are inventions. Laws of nature, on the other hand, can never be invented by man, though they may be discovered by him. When discovered, they may be utilized by means of an art, a machine, a manufacture, or a composition of matter. It is the invention of one or more of these, for the purpose of

¹ *In re Kemper*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 4, 1841; *Haffcke v. Clark*, 46 F. R. 772, 1891.

² *Wall v. Leck*, 66 F. R. 557, 1895; *Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Nassau Electric R. Co.*, 107 F. R. 280, 1901.

utilizing a law of nature, and not the discovery of that law, that may be rewarded with a patent.¹

§ 3. The word "art" also has a narrower meaning in the patent laws than it has in the dictionaries. In the dictionaries its significance is "the use of means to produce a result." In the patent laws it covers only a limited meaning of the word process. The generic definition of process is "an operation performed by rule to produce a result." Operations performed by rule may be classified as: 1, operations which consist partly or wholly in the employment of heat, light, electricity, magnetism, chemistry, pneumatics, hydraulics, or some other non-mechanical science; 2, operations which consist entirely of mechanical transactions, and which are only the peculiar functions of the respective machines which are constructed to perform them; 3, operations which consist entirely of mechanical transactions, but which may be performed by hand or by any of several different mechanisms or machines. It is settled that all processes which belong to the first class are subjects of patents;² and that all processes which belong to the second class are unpatentable in the United States.³ It was formerly debatable whether processes which belong to the third class are subjects of patents or not; but reason is now known to answer that question in the affirmative. A negative answer would deny patentability to the art of weaving, if the art of weav-

¹ *O'Reilly v. Morse*, 15 Howard, 112, 1853; *Morton v. Infirmity*, 5 Blatch. 116, 1862.

² *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U. S. 780, 1876; *Tilghman v. Proctor*, 102 U. S. 728, 1880; *Eames v. Andrews*, 122 U. S. 40, 1887; *Fermentation Co. v. Maus*, 122 U. S. 427, 1887; *Telephone Cases*, 126 U. S. 533, 1888; *Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. Catskill Co.*, 94 F. R. 868, 1899.

³ *Corning v. Burden*, 15 Howard, 267, 1853; *Busch v. Jones*, 184

U. S. 607, 1902; *Carnegie Steel Co. v. Cambria Iron Works*, 185 U. S. 425, 1902; *MacKay v. Jackman*, 12 F. R. 615, 1882; *New v. Warren*, 22 O. G. 587, 1882; *Brainard v. Cramme*, 12 F. R. 621, 1882; *Goss v. Cameron*, 14 F. R. 576, 1882; *Hatch v. Mossitt*, 15 F. R. 253, 1883; *Reay v. Raynor*, 19 F. R. 310, 1884; *Moulton v. Commissioner of Patents*, 61 O. G. 1480, 1892; *Bonsack Machine Co. v. Elliot*, 63 F. R. 837, 1894; *Gindorff v. Deering*, 81 F. R. 952, 1897.

ing were new; and any such denial would undeniably contravene both the letter and the spirit of the patent law.

§ 7. It was shown in Section 2 that the discovery of a law of nature is not patentable. That which was so denominated in that section is often spoken of as a "principle," and at other times as a "scientific principle," and again as a "scientific fact," and still again as a "law of nature." By whatever name it is called it is certain that the thing referred to is not a material substance. It is not to be apprehended by the sense of touch, but when discovered finds a lodgment in the mind as a mental conception only. So also, a process is not a substance which can be handled. It is seen only by noting its constituent acts as they are being performed. Principles and processes are therefore alike in that they are intangible, and being so, they have sometimes been mistaken for each other.

Whether a given patent is one for a process or one for a principle, is a question upon which its validity may wholly depend. It is therefore important to ascertain what rule governs the decisions of such questions; to ascertain precisely wherein consists the difference between a principle and a process. Any search for that distinction made during the first half of the nineteenth century was necessarily a speculative one, for lack of authoritative adjudged cases from which to reason. Now, however, when engaged in an investigation of the point, we have recourse to five very instructive Supreme Court decisions. The proper method of conducting the inquiry seems to be, to first set down the important relevant points of each of those cases, and then to ascertain what doctrine is consistent with them all. Such hypothetical rules as are found to be inconsistent with either of the cases may safely be rejected as not true rules; but if some one proposition is found to logically underlie all five decisions, it is safe to believe that the Supreme Court will never depart from it.

§ 8. In *McClurg v. Kingsland*¹ it appears that some method was long sought, by means of which rollers or cylin-

¹ *McClurg v. Kingsland*, 1 Howard, 202, 1843.

ders could be so cast that the metal, when introduced into the moulds, would be given a rotary motion, to the end of throwing the flog or dross into the centre instead of the circumference of the casting. The fact that rotary motion would so result was an understood law of nature, an understood operation of centrifugal force. The problem was to produce such a motion more conveniently and more uniformly than by stirring the liquid metal with a circular movement of an implement inserted therein. That problem was solved in 1834 by James Harley, a workman in a foundry in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania. He discovered that the rotary motion desired, could be imparted to melted metal by injecting that metal into a mould tangentially. A patent was granted to him in 1835, for "an improvement in the mode of casting chilled rollers and other metallic cylinders and cones." Litigation arose on the patent, and coming before the Supreme Court it was held to be a patent for a process.

§ 9. In *O'Reilly v. Morse*¹ it appears that Samuel F. B. Morse was not the discoverer of either of the laws of nature which he utilized in his telegraph. He did, however, invent a machine by means of which those laws could be made to carry information to a distant place. That machine was dependent for success on several laws of nature, and lacking any one of them it would have failed of its result. The chief of these was the electric current discovered by Gray. The one next in importance was that discovered by Ørsted and Arago, and known as electro-magnetism. The eighth claim of Morse's patent was construed, by the Supreme Court, to be a claim for the use of an electric current, for marking intelligible signs at any distance. The Supreme Court held that claim to be void.

§ 10. In *Mowry v. Whitney*,² the following matters are set forth. It had long been known that sudden cooling of very hot cast-iron makes it hard, but brittle. On the other hand, the slow cooling of very hot cast-iron was known to make it soft, but tough. This is annealing. Cast-iron car-

¹ *O'Reilly v. Morse*, 15 Howard, 112, 1853.

² *Mowry v. Whitney*, 14 Wallace, 620, 1871.

wheels require hardened peripheries and annealed hubs and plates, because the first have to endure friction and the last two have to endure strain. The early attempts to subject car-wheels to both hardening and annealing produced a weak and worthless article, resulting from the law of the expansion and contraction of metals. The peripheries of the wheels were hardened by chilling them, this chilling consisting in surrounding the moulds in which the wheels were cast with a circle of iron, and with only a thin film of sand between it and the peripheries of the wheels. This iron band, being a rapid conductor of heat, caused the peripheries of the wheels to suddenly cool, and thus be hardened, while the plates and hubs, being enclosed in a thick mass of sand, cooled very slowly, and were thus annealed. The sudden cooling of the rims of the wheels, however, materially contracted their circumference, and that contraction forced the still hot plates to contract their diameter. Afterward, when the plates came to cool down, they themselves contracted still more, and thus tended to break away from the rims, which, having entirely cooled some time before, had no more contracting to do. Wheels so made were therefore weak.

In this condition of affairs, Asa Whitney, of Philadelphia, discovered in 1848, that hardness once given to iron will not be destroyed or seriously impaired by the immediate reheating of the iron, and its subsequent very slow cooling; and he also conceived a process by means of which that law of nature could be utilized to obviate the evil explained in the last paragraph. That process consisted in taking the wheels from the moulds, very soon after their rims were chilled, and in putting them immediately into a chamber or furnace which had previously been heated about as hot as the then heat of the wheels, and in thereupon gradually raising the temperature of all parts of the interior of the chamber or furnace and its contents, to an equally high point, and finally in causing all parts of the wheels to cool with equal slowness. In accordance with the law of nature discovered by Whitney, it turned out that the third stage of this process did not destroy or seriously impair the hardness of the peripheries of the wheels

which were subjected to it. It did, however, cause the peripheries of the wheels to re-expand in circumference, and in so doing to stretch the still hot and ductile plates back to nearly the same diameter as that they had before the rims were contracted by the chill. The fourth stage of the process then served to contract all parts of the wheels harmoniously, and the result of the whole process was to remedy the evil at which it was aimed. Mr. Whitney obtained a patent for his invention, and the Supreme Court held it to be a patent for a process, and held it to be valid.

§ 11. The case of *Tilghman v. Proctor*¹ discloses the following facts: The celebrated French chemist, Chevreul, discovered in 1813 that fat is a regular chemical compound, consisting of glycerine and three kinds of fat acids. He also discovered that fat can be separated into those, its constituent elements, by causing them to severally unite with an atomic equivalent of water. In 1853 Richard A. Tilghman, a Philadelphia chemist, discovered that those elements of fat can be caused so to unite with an atomic equivalent of water, by mixing the fat with water, and by thereupon subjecting the mixture to a high degree of heat, and to such a degree of pressure as will prevent the conversion of the water into steam. In 1854 Mr. Tilghman obtained a patent, in the specification of which he announced his discovery, and described a suitable apparatus in which to utilize that discovery in connection with the discoveries of Chevreul, and claimed "the manufacturing of fat acids and glycerine from fatty bodies by the action of water at a high temperature and pressure." The Supreme Court held that patent to be a patent for a process and to be valid.

§ 11a. The Telephone Cases² set forth the following fundamental facts. It has been known for centuries, that articulate sounds can be reproduced at a distance from the place where they are originally uttered, by means of two thin diaphragms, made of metal or membrane, and attached at their centres to the respective ends of a tightly drawn cord or wire;

¹ *Tilghman v. Proctor*, 102 U. S. 707, 1880.

² *Telephone Cases*, 126 U. S. 531, 1888.

and that when a person speaks near and toward one of those diaphragms, the sound vibrations which are produced by his voice cause that diaphragm to vibrate correspondingly; and that those corresponding vibrations are transmitted along the cord or wire to the other diaphragm, and cause it also to vibrate correspondingly; and that the second diaphragm thus vibrating, causes corresponding vibrations in the air adjacent thereto; and that when those vibrations strike upon the drum of the ear of a listener, they cause him to hear what was spoken toward the first diaphragm. Instruments like this are called string telephones, and they utilize that law of nature which cause such diaphragms as those employed therein, to copy and to transmit the vibrations of air which occur adjacent thereto. It has been known ever since 1831, when it was discovered by Faraday, that when an armature is moved in front of an electro-magnet, which is being magnetized by an electric current passing through its coil, the motion modifies the current, and that those modifications correspond to the movements of the armature in duration, in direction, and in strength. And it has long been known that the electric current thus modified, will cause correspondingly modified movements in the armature of another electro-magnet, through the coil of which the electric current thus modified is also passing. At this stage of knowledge of the relevant laws of nature, Alexander Graham Bell invented his telephone. That invention consisted in mounting two such diaphragms as those of the string telephone, upon two armatures arranged, combined and movable as above described, and thus enabling one of those armatures to transmit, and the other one to receive, such minute and exceedingly variant vibrations as those caused in the air by the human voice; and it also consisted in the process of transmitting sounds, by causing electrical undulations, similar in form to the vibrations of the air caused by the sounds, to occur upon the conducting wire. Mr. Bell obtained a patent for that invention in 1876, and the Supreme Court held it to be a patent for a process, as well as for an apparatus, and held the process claim to be valid.

§ 12. The last five sections present five cases, covering five subject-matters of claim, four of which the Supreme Court held to be patentable processes, and one of which that tribunal held to be an unpatentable principle, or law of nature. To learn the controlling distinction between a claim for a process and a claim for a principle, it is therefore sufficient to ascertain precisely wherein consists the controlling difference between the eighth claim of Morse, on the one hand, and the claims of Harley, Whitney, Tilghman, and Bell on the other.

That difference does not consist in the fact that Harley, Whitney, Tilghman, and Bell each discovered one of the laws of nature which he utilized, while the laws which Morse utilized were discovered by others; because the Supreme Court did not rest its decision in the Morse case on the ground that he was not the discoverer of the electric current, but on the ground that, being a power in nature, it was not patentable to any person. Neither does that difference consist in anything outside of the use of laws of nature, because all five claims extended to accomplishing results by means of such law or laws, regardless of the particular apparatus used in the respective processes. The fact that tangential injection of melted metal into a cylindrical mould will give that metal a rotary motion; the fact that moderate reheating of a car wheel will not destroy its chill; the fact that very hot water will separate the elements of fat; the fact that mechanical motion may cause electrical undulations — every one of these is just as truly a law of nature, just as truly a “principle,” as is the fact of the electric current. Nor was the apparatus described by Harley, Whitney, Tilghman, and Bell, respectively, for the purpose of utilizing the first four of these laws, respectively, claimed as their sole respective inventions, any more than the particular telegraph described by Morse was made essential to his eighth claim.

§ 13. There is apparently but one radical distinction between the claims of the four patents of Harley, Whitney,

Tilghman, and Bell, on the one hand, and the eighth claim of Morse on the other. That distinction is as follows: Harley, Whitney, Tilghman, and Bell each produced a process which utilized several laws of nature, and each of them claimed the entire process he produced, including the use of all those laws, in the order and method described. Morse also made an invention which utilized several laws of nature, but instead of claiming his combined and methodical use of all those laws, his eighth claim was construed as confined to one of them alone. This difference, taken in connection with the fact that the Supreme Court sustained the patents of Harley, Whitney, Tilghman, and Bell, and overthrew the eighth claim of Morse, and taken in connection with the fact that no other relevant and important difference can be detected, points to the soundness of the doctrine stated in the next section, and illustrated in the section following that.

§ 14. A patent for a process is a patent for the described combined use of all the laws of nature utilized by that process. A patent for a principle is a patent for one only of the laws of nature used in a process. If a patent for a principle were granted and sustained, it would be much broader than a patent for a process, because it would cover all processes which aim at the same result, and which use the particular law of nature covered by the patent for a principle, no matter in what combination with other laws. A patent for a process, on the other hand, covers only its own method of using all of the laws of nature which it utilizes. To grant and sustain a patent for a principle, would induce an inventor to guess which of the laws of nature used in his process, will always be found indispensable, and guessing rightly, would enable him, by claiming that particular law, to suppress all subsequent processes using it, and thus to suppress all subsequent invention in the same field, until such time as his patent might expire. A patent for a process, on the contrary, leaves the field open to ingenious men to invent and to use other processes using part

of the laws used by the patented process, or using all of them in other combinations and methods.¹

§ 15. An illustration of the doctrines of the last section exists in the matter of the eighth claim of Morse, when considered in connection with other telegraphs than his. The subject of that claim was construed to be the use of electric current for marking signs at any distance. Electric current is one fact, and electro-magnetism is another. The first was discovered by Gray, in 1729, but the existence of the latter was not known until ninety years later. Morse used both in his telegraph, but his eighth claim was construed to cover the use of electric current with or without the other. But without electro-magnetism Morse's telegraph would not work. After Morse came Bain, who invented a telegraph which used electric current, but did not use electro-magnetism. Its recording apparatus operated electro-chemically, and not electro-magnetically like that of Morse. Bain's telegraph could work with a much feebler current than could that of Morse, and therefore the relay batteries of the latter were not needed by Bain. The two telegraphs had nothing in common except that both used electric current. If the eighth claim of Morse had been sustained as construed, it would have covered Bain's and every other electric telegraph, capable of marking signs at a distance. On the other hand, had that claim been so drawn as to cover the combined use of all the laws of nature utilized by the telegraph of Morse, when used as he used them, then it would have been a claim for a process, and not being obnoxious to either of the weighty objections which are set forth in the opinion of the Supreme Court, it would doubtless have been sustained by that tribunal. In that case, however, it would not have been infringed by the telegraph of Bain, nor by any other which, like his, dispensed with one or more of the laws of nature necessary to the process of Morse.

¹ Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. National Telephone Co. v. Beacon Lamp Co., 95 F. R. 464, 1899; American Bell Telephone Co. v. National Telephone Mfg. Co., 109 F. R. 996, 1901.

§ 16. Machines, and improvements of machines constitute the subjects of a majority of the American patents heretofore granted. A machine is a combination of heterogeneous mechanical parts, adapted to receive energy, and to apply it to the production of some energetic result or results. All the parts of a machine may be old, while the machine as a whole, and also the sub-combinations which are contained therein, are proper subjects of patents.¹ An improvement of a machine may consist of an addition thereto, or in a subtraction therefrom, or in substituting for one or more of its parts something different, or in so rearranging its parts as to make it work better than before. Whether or not a given improvement is a patentable one will always depend upon several considerations. In order to be so it must, first of all, be an invented improvement,² as distinguished from one otherwise produced. This point of law is explained at large in the next chapter. So also it is explained in the chapter on infringement, what improvements can be used, and what improvements cannot be used, without infringing the patents for the machines improved upon, if the latter are patented. It is enough to say in this chapter, that patents are not void merely because they cover processes or things which include old inventions,³ and that an improvement may or may not be an invention, and in either case may or may not be an infringement of a patent covering the machine improved.

§ 17. The word "manufacture" has a much narrower signification in the American patent laws than it has in those of England. In the latter it includes everything made by the hand of man, and also includes processes of manufacture. According to the former, processes are patentable because they are arts, while some of the things made by the hand of man are patentable as machines, and some others are patentable as compositions of matter, and some

¹ *Cantrell v. Wallick*, 117 U. S. 694, 1886.

² *Cochrane v. Waterman*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 53, 1844.

³ *Cantrell v. Wallick*, 117 U. S. 694, 1886.

others are patentable as designs. Whatever is made by the hand of man, and is neither of these, is a manufacture, in the sense in which that word is used in the American patent laws.¹ The term should be held to justify a patent for the invention of a new and useful human habitation, or a new and useful improvement of such a structure. This statement is ventured, notwithstanding the facetious *obiter dictum* of Justice GRIER in the jail case.²

§ 18. The phrase "composition of matter," as used in the statutes, covers all compositions of two or more substances. It includes, therefore, all composite articles, whether they be results of chemical union, or of mechanical mixture, or whether they be gases, fluids, powders or solids. To be a proper subject of a patent, a composition of matter must, like a process, a machine, or a manufacture, be able to endure the relevant tests of invention, novelty, and utility, which are stated in the next three chapters of this book.

§ 19. The distinction between a machine and a manufacture cannot be so stated that its application to every case would be clear and satisfactory to every mind. The same remark is true of the distinction between manufactures and compositions of matter. In most instances, however, when something is invented by the mind and constructed by the hand of man, its classification under some one of these heads is sufficiently obvious. If an inventor is certain that his invention belongs to one or another of the three classes of things, but is uncertain as to which, no evil need result from the doubt. No inventor needs to state or to know whether the thing he has produced is a machine, a manufacture, or a composition of matter, provided he knows that it is one or the other of these. A seventeen-year patent may be lawfully granted for a thing which falls under either designation, but it never becomes vitally important to determine to which one of the three classes a particular thing really belongs.

¹ Johnson v. Johnston, 60 F. R. 620, 1894.

² Jacobs v. Baker, 7 Wallace, 297, 1868.

§ 20. Designs are patentable under Section 4929 of the Revised Statutes; as amended May 9, 1902. That section provides that any person who has invented any new, original, and ornamental design for an article of manufacture may, subject to certain conditions and limitations stated in the statute, obtain a patent therefor.¹ The original Section 4929, provided that any person who, by his own industry, genius, efforts, and expense, had invented and produced any new and original design for a manufacture, bust, statue, alto-relievo, or bas-relief, any new and original design for the printing of woollen, silk, cotton, or other fabrics, any new and original impression, ornament, patent, print, or picture to be printed, painted, cast, or otherwise placed on or worked into any article of manufacture, or any new, useful, and original shape or configuration of any article of manufacture, might, subject to certain conditions and limitations stated in that statute, obtain a patent therefor. That original section was almost a literal transcript of Section 71 of the consolidated Patent Act of 1870,² except that in the latter the word "pattern" is found in the connection in which the word "patent" is printed in Section 4929. The change from "pattern" to "patent" was doubtless an error of the printers of the Revised Statutes. Those statutes were enacted as printed, and not as is the custom with shorter edicts, as engrossed in writing. The word "patent" is meaningless in that connection, and patterns, though not mentioned in the section, were doubtless covered by its other provisions.

§ 21. In like manner as Section 4929 of the Revised Statutes was enacted to take the place of Section 71 of the Patent Act of 1870, the latter was passed to take the place of Section 11 of the Patent Act of 1861.³ The act of 1870 differed from its predecessor mainly in conferring upon any person, the rights to design patents which the Act of 1861

¹ 32 Statutes at Large, Pt. 1, Ch. 783, p. 193.

² 16 Statutes at Large, Ch. 230, p. 209.

³ 12 Statutes at Large, Ch. 88, p. 248.

gave only to citizens and to aliens who, having resided one year in the United States, had taken an oath of intention to become citizens. Section 11 of the Act of 1861 was a modification of Section 3 of the Patent Act of 1842,¹ which latter was the first American statute authorizing patents for designs.

§ 22. The amended Section 4929 of the Revised Statutes, differs from the original section, in using the word "ornamental" to specify one characteristic which every design must have, and in omitting the word "useful," from its former place among the characteristics which some designs were required to have, by the original Section 4929. But the word "useful" in the original section, did not have the meaning of the word "utilitarian." The presence of utility in a design, did not impart patentability thereto; and the absence of utility therefrom, did not deprive it of that privilege.²

¹ 5 Statutes at Large, Ch. 263, p. 543.

² *Smith v. Whitman Saddle Co.*, 148 U. S. 678, 1893; *Theberath v. Trimming Co.*, 15 F. R. 250, 1883; *Westinghouse Electric Mfg. Co. v. Triumph Electric Co.*, 97 F. R.

102, 1899; *Pelouze Scale & Mfg. Co. v. American Cutlery Co.*, 102 F. R. 918, 1900; *Rowe v. Blodgett & Clapp Co.*, 112 F. R. 61, 1901; *Marsvel Co. v. Pearl*, 114 F. R. 946, 1902; *Eaton v. Lewis*, 115 F. R. 635, 1902.

CHAPTER II.

INVENTION.

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>23. Invention necessary to patentability.</p> <p>24. Many negative rules, but no affirmative rule, for determining the presence or absence of invention.</p> <p>25. Mere skill is not invention.</p> <p>26. Circumstances indicating difference between invention and skill.</p> <p>27. Excellence of workmanship is not invention.</p> <p>28. Substitution of materials is not invention.</p> <p>29. Exceptions to the last rule.</p> <p>30. Enlargement is not invention.</p> <p>31. Change of degree is not invention.</p> <p>31a. Exception to the last rule.</p> <p>32. Aggregation is not invention.</p> <p>33. Simultaneousness of action is not necessary to invention.</p> <p>34. Duplication is not generally invention.</p> <p>35. Omission is not generally invention.</p> <p>36. Substitution of equivalents is not generally invention.</p> <p>37. New combination without new mode of operation, is not invention.</p> | <p>38. Using old thing for new and analogous purpose is not invention.</p> <p>39. Cases to which the last rule does not apply.</p> <p>40. Doubts relevant to invention, when otherwise insoluble, are solved by ascertaining comparative utility.</p> <p>41. Form.</p> <p>41a. Proportion.</p> <p>42. Questions of invention are questions of fact.</p> <p>43. Questions of invention are investigated in the light of the state of the prior art.</p> <p>44. Joint and sole inventions.</p> <p>45. How made.</p> <p>46. How distinguished.</p> <p>47. Suggestions to an inventor.</p> <p>48. Information sought by an inventor.</p> <p>49. Mechanical skill not necessary to invention.</p> <p>50. Sole patent to one joint inventor is void.</p> <p>51. Joint patent to sole inventor and another is void.</p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

§ 23. It has been shown that the word "discovered," in Section 4886 of the Revised Statutes, has the meaning of the word "invented."¹ It follows that patents are grantable for things invented, and not for things otherwise pro-

¹ Section 2 of this book.

duced,¹ even where the production required ability of a high order.² Novelty and utility must indeed characterize the subject of a patent, but they alone are not enough to make anything patentable; for the statute provides that things to be patented must be invented things, as well as new and useful things.³ The courts have therefore declared that not all improvement is invention, and entitled to protection as such, but that to be thus entitled, a thing must be the product of some exercise of the inventive faculties.⁴ And the law stated in this section applies not only to processes, machines, manufactures, and compositions of matter, but also to designs.⁵ But a patent may be sustained for an invention which resided in a theory, without a reduction to actual practice, at the time the patent was granted, if that theory afterward proves to be correct,⁶ and also where the

¹ *In re Snyder*, 10 App. D. C. 144, 1897; *Lamb Knit Goods Co. v. Lamb Glove & Mitten Co.*, 120 F. R. 272, 1902.

² *Fowler v. City of New York*, 121 F. R. 749, 1903.

³ *Thompson v. Boisselier*, 114 U. S. 11, 1884; *Gardner v. Herz*, 118 U. S. 191, 1885; *Klein v. City of Seattle*, 77 F. R. 204, 1896; *Tiemann v. Kraatz*, 85 F. R. 459, 1898; *Goss Printing-Press Co. v. Scott*, 103 F. R. 657, 1900.

⁴ *Pearce v. Mulford*, 102 U. S. 112, 1880; *Atlantic Works v. Brady*, 107 U. S. 199, 1882; *Slawson v. Railroad Co.*, 107 U. S. 649, 1882; *Morris v. McMillin*, 112 U. S. 247, 1884; *Hollister v. Benedict Mfg. Co.*, 113 U. S. 59, 1885; *Stephenson v. Railroad Co.*, 114 U. S. 149, 1885; *Munson v. New York City*, 124 U. S. 601, 1888; *Pattee Plow Co. v. Kingman & Co.*, 129 U. S. 294, 1889; *Watson v. Railway Co.*, 132 U. S. 161, 1889;

Hill v. Wooster, 132 U. S. 700, 1890; *Burt v. Evory*, 133 U. S. 349, 1890; *Magin v. Karle*, 150 U. S. 391, 1893; *Risdon Locomotive Works v. Medart*, 158 U. S. 81, 1895.

⁵ *Smith v. Saddle Co.*, 148 U. S. 679, 1893; *Western Electric Mfg. Co. v. Odell*, 18 F. R. 322, 1883; *Osborn v. Judd*, 29 F. R. 96, 1886; *Meers v. Kelly*, 31 F. R. 153, 1887; *Untermeyer v. Freund*, 37 F. R. 343, 1889; *Redway v. Stove Co.*, 38 F. R. 583, 1889; *Dukes v. Bauerle*, 41 F. R. 783, 1890; *Foster v. Crossin*, 44 F. R. 63, 1890; *Eclipse Mfg. Co. v. Adkins*, 44 F. R. 282, 1890; *Cahoone Mfg. Co. v. Harness Co.*, 45 F. R. 585, 1891; *Anderson v. Saint*, 46 F. R. 760, 1891; *Eagle Pencil Co. v. American Pencil Co.*, 53 F. R. 388, 1892; *Cary Mfg. Co. v. Neal*, 98 F. R. 617, 1899.

⁶ *Telephone Cases*, 126 U. S. 535, 1888.

correctness of the theory is self-evident.¹ Not only the first and the last, but every intermediate step of advance, which rises to the dignity of invention, in a particular art, is entitled to the protection of a patent.² And invention may result from long consideration, or from a flash of thought.³

§ 24. The abstract rule stated in the last section is as certainly true as it is universally just, but its application to particular cases cannot be made without the guidance of more concrete propositions. In delivering an opinion of the Supreme Court, in January, 1885, Justice MATTHEWS used some language which may be thought to establish an affirmative rule by which to determine the presence or absence of invention in every case. Speaking of a simple device which the court held not to be an invention, he said that it "seems to us not to spring from that intuitive faculty of the mind put forth in search for new results or new methods, creating what had not before existed, or bringing to light what lay hidden from vision; but, on the other hand, to be the suggestion of that common experience which arose spontaneously, and by a necessity of human reasoning, in the minds of those who became acquainted with the circumstances with which they had to deal."⁴ This language may be thought to mean that whatever new and useful process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter, or design is produced by intuition is an invention, and that whatever such thing is produced by reason is not an invention. But such an interpretation of the language would not be right. Intuition may sometimes reach to a single brilliant result; but intuition can never conceive or correlate the mazes of movements and mechanisms which constitute a modern automatic machine. To enforce such a rule as that

¹ *Heath v. Hildreth*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 19, 1841; *Screw Co. v. Sloan*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 210, 1853; *In re Seely*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 249, 1853; *Chandler v. Ladd*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 493, 1857.

² *National Hollow Brake-Beam Co. v. Interchangeable Brake-Beam Co.*, 106 F. R. 698, 1901.

³ *Snyder v. Fisher*, 78 O. G. 486, 1897.

⁴ *Hollister v. Benedict Mfg. Co.*, 113 U. S. 72, 1885.

hypothetically implied in the language of Justice MATTHEWS would be to deny invention to those marvelous combinations of numerous metallic devices which compose American automatic machinery, and which work with such complexity and yet with such precision that they seem themselves to be endowed with reason. But fortunately the supposed interpretation of that language is evidently not the meaning of the court. The court does not deny invention to all the products of pure reason in the useful arts. It merely finds want of invention in those things which are conceived "spontaneously and by a necessity of human reasoning" in the minds of those who have their attention directed to the subject.

In a later case the Supreme Court, speaking by Justice BROWN of the meaning of the word "invention," said: "The truth is the word cannot be defined in such manner as to afford any substantial aid in determining whether a particular device involves an exercise of the inventive faculty or not. In a given case we may be able to say that there is present invention of a very high order. In another we can see that there is lacking that impalpable something which distinguishes invention from simple mechanical skill. Courts, adopting fixed principles as a guide, have by a process of exclusion determined that certain variations in old devices do or do not involve invention; but whether the variation relied upon in a particular case is anything more than ordinary mechanical skill is a question which cannot be answered by applying the test of any general definition."¹ Thus it has been settled by the Supreme Court that the ideal line which separates things invented from things otherwise produced can never be concisely defined; and that there is no affirmative rule by which to determine the presence or absence of invention in every case; and that such questions are to be determined by means of several negative rules which operate by a process of exclusion. Each of those rules applies to a large class of cases, and all of them are entirely authoritative and sufficiently clear. To

¹ *McClain v. Ortmyer*, 141 U. S. 427, 1891.

formulate those rules, and to state their qualifications and exceptions, and to classify and cite the adjudged cases from which those rules, qualifications, and exceptions are deducible, is the scope of several sections which immediately follow.

§ 25. It is not invention to produce a process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter or design which any skillful mechanic, electrician, chemist, or other expert would produce whenever required.

In holding a patent to be void the Supreme Court, speaking by Justice BRADLEY, delivered a paragraph of very instructive argument in support of the rule of this section: a paragraph so valuable as to call for its verbatim quotation in this text.

“The process of development in manufactures creates a constant demand for new appliances, which the skill of ordinary head workmen and engineers is generally adequate to devise, and which, indeed, are the natural and proper outgrowth of such development. Each step forward prepares the way for the next, and each is usually taken by spontaneous trials and attempts in a hundred different places. To grant to a single party a monopoly of every slight advance made, except where the exercise of invention somewhat above ordinary mechanical or engineering skill is distinctly shown, is unjust in principle and injurious in its consequences. The design of the patent laws is to reward those who make some substantial discovery or invention which adds to our knowledge and makes a step in advance in the useful arts. Such inventors are worthy of all favor. It is never the object of those laws to grant a monopoly for every trifling device, every shadow of a shade of an idea which would naturally and spontaneously occur to any skilled mechanic or operator in the ordinary progress of manufactures. Such an indiscriminate creation of exclusive privileges tends rather to obstruct than to stimulate invention. It creates a class of speculative schemers who make it their business to watch the advancing wave of improvement, and gather its foam in the form of patented

monopolies, which enable them to lay a heavy tax upon the industry of the country without contributing anything to the real advancement of the arts. It embarrasses the honest pursuit of business with fears and apprehensions of concealed liens and unknown liabilities to lawsuits and vexatious accountings for profits made in good faith."¹

This opinion of Justice BRADLEY is now a classic. Many federal judges, during twenty years, have administered it as law; and some have paraphrased it in sound and suggestive language of their own. For example, Judge PHILIPS has said that: "In this day of increasing demand for new and enlarged mechanical appliances, the first natural result is the production of a large class of skilled and experienced mechanics and artisans, and, second, a more studious and constant development in applied mechanics. And, as such advance plainly points out, to the attentive and assiduous workman, the natural, larger, practical adaptation of existing, known mechanical devices; to invest each one of these developments with the immunity of a monopolizing patent, would not only be a perversion of the term "invention," but would utterly extinguish the doctrine of mechanical equivalents."² And Judge COXE has said that a chemical patent is addressed to accomplished chemists; and "That which seems, to the ordinary layman, to involve the exercise of extraordinary mental power, is to these men nothing but the everyday work of laboratory routine."³ And Judge TOWNSEND has said that an electrical patent should be stripped of the dazzling halo which conventionally adorns appliances designed to deal with that mysterious agent, electricity; when a court is called on to decide the question of the presence or absence of invention, in an electrical patent.⁴

Nearly a hundred other cases, involving the rule of this section, have now been adjudicated and reported. The ques-

¹ Atlantic Works v. Brady, 107 U. S. 199, 1882.

² Tiemann v. Kraatz, 85 F. R. 439, 1898.

³ Badische Anilin & Soda Fabrik v. Kalle, 94 F. R. 173, 1899.

⁴ Perkins Electric Switch Mfg. Co. v. Gibbs Electric Mfg. Co., 87 F. R. 923, 1898.

tion whether a particular process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter or design, evinces invention, or only shows skill, may sometimes be decided by reasoning by analogy from some of those cases; and therefore those of them which were decided by the Supreme Court are cited on this page in a note.¹

The absence of invention may be established in some cases, by evidence that a considerable number of persons who were not inventors, acting independently of each other, and without receiving any information from the patentee or his patent, did in fact contrive the improvement claimed therein, not long after he produced it.² And where that does not happen to be the case, want of invention can be proved by teaching a mechanic or other person the whole or a part of the prior art, and by proving that, without exercising any invention, he promptly produced the patented improvement, without any knowledge on the subject except what he had thus learned.³ But it does not tend to prove want of invention, to show that a skillful mechanic who had seen the patented thing, can reconstruct some older thing so as to make it similar to that covered by the patent.⁴

¹The Corn-Planter Patent, 23 Wallace, 232, 1874; Vinton *v.* Hamilton, 104 U. S. 491, 1881; Tack Co. *v.* Mfg. Co., 109 U. S. 119, 1883; Morris *v.* McMillin, 112 U. S. 244, 1884; Hollister *v.* Benedict Mfg. Co., 113 U. S. 72, 1885; Yale Lock Co. *v.* Greenleaf, 117 U. S. 554, 1886; Pomace Holder Co. *v.* Ferguson, 119 U. S. 335, 1886; Weir *v.* Morden, 125 U. S. 98, 1888; Brown *v.* District of Columbia, 130 U. S. 87, 1889; Day *v.* Railroad Co., 132 U. S. 102, 1889; Butler *v.* Steckel, 137 U. S. 29, 1890; Shenfield *v.* Nashawanuck Mfg. Co., 137 U. S. 59, 1890; Consolidated Roller Mill Co. *v.* Walker, 138 U. S. 132, 1891; Cluett *v.* Claffin, 140 U. S. 180,

1891; Magowan *v.* Belting Co., 141 U. S. 343, 1891; Pope Mfg. Co. *v.* Gormully Mfg. Co., 144 U. S. 259, 1892; Ryan *v.* Hard, 145 U. S. 246, 1892; Duer *v.* Lock Co., 149 U. S. 222, 1893; Leggett *v.* Standard Oil Co., 149 U. S. 295, 1893; Sargent *v.* Covert, 152 U. S. 516, 1894; Palmer *v.* Corning, 156 U. S. 342, 1895.

²Bromley Bros. Carpet Co. *v.* Stewart, 51 F. R. 915, 1892; Haslem *v.* Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., 71 O. G. 1770, 1894.

³National Co. *v.* Belcher, 68 F. R. 668, 1895.

⁴Beach *v.* Box-Machine Co., 63 F. R. 601, 1894; National Co. *v.* Belcher, 71 F. R. 879, 1896.

§ 26. But if a particular result was long desired and sometimes sought, but never attained, want of invention cannot be predicated of a device or process which first reached that result, on the ground that the simplicity of the means is so marked that many believe they could readily have produced it if required.¹ That is the opinion of many relevant to some real inventions, because solved problems often seem easy to persons who could never have solved them, and true inventions sometimes seem obvious to persons who could never have produced them. This doctrine does not contradict that of the last section. It only teaches us that the fact upon which the doctrine of the last section is founded cannot be proved by subsequent opinion, when that opinion is inconsistent with prior attempts and failures.

In *The Loom Co. v. Higgins*,² Justice BRADLEY remarked that: "It may be laid down as a general rule, though perhaps not an invariable one, that if a new combination and arrangement of known elements produce a new and beneficial result, never attained before, it is evidence of invention." The exception to this rule, which Justice BRADLEY contemplated, doubtless refers to cases, the result wherein was never before attained only because it was never before desired. In the circuit court cases which support the doctrine of this section, the proviso that the thing or process which the patentee was the first to produce, had been previously sought for by others in vain, is never overlooked, but, on the contrary, is always treated as a material element in the proposition.³ So also, the statement of Justice BRADLEY would still have been correct, if it had omitted the words which it contains to designate novelty of result; for where a new organization of old elements produces a new

¹ *The Barbed Wire Patent*, 143 U. S. 283, 1892; *Gandy v. Belting Co.*, 143 U. S. 594, 1892; *Krementz v. Cottle Co.*, 148 U. S. 560, 1893; *Potts v. Creager*, 155 U. S. 609, 1895; *Du Bois v. Kirk*, 158 U. S. 63, 1895; *Hanifen v. Armitage*, 117 F. R. 849, 1902.

² *Loom Co. v. Higgins*, 105 U. S. 591, 1881.

³ *Terry Clock Co. v. New Haven Clock Co.*, 4 Bann. & Ard. 121, 1879; *Wallace v. Noyes*, 13 F. R. 180, 1882; *Ward v. Plow Co.*, 14 F. R. 696, 1883; *Davis v. Fredericks*, 19 F. R. 99, 1884; *Patter-*

mode of operation, and a beneficial result, there may be a patentable invention,¹ whether that result is new or is old.

A qualification of the rule of this section consists in the subordinate point, that where several improvements have mutually contributed to introduce an unused invention into public favor, and where it does not appear that either of those improvements alone would have produced that result: no presumption in favor of either of those improvements being an invention, arises out of the commercial success of the invention thus improved.² And another qualification resides in holding that the rule of the section does not apply where the prior attempts were unsuccessful because they were unskillful,³ or because those who made them, did not know and understand the prior art.⁴

§ 27. It is not invention to produce an article which differs from some older thing only in excellence of workmanship.⁵

The distinction between this rule, and the rule of Section 25, resides in the fact that mechanical skill is treated as ability to plan improvement; while excellence of workmanship is contemplated as ability to execute improvement already planned, but not well executed by him who planned it. This subject does not require an elaborate explanation; because it is evident that invention does not reside in taking an article so irregular or rough, that it never could have

son *v.* Duff, 20 F. R. 641, 1884; Brown Mfg. Co. *v.* Deere, 21 F. R. 713, 1884; McFarland *v.* Spencer, 23 F. R. 151, 1885; Celluloid Mfg. Co. *v.* Chrolithion Collar & Cuff Co., 23 F. R. 397, 1885; Sewing Machine Co. *v.* Frame, 24 F. R. 596, 1884; Asmus *v.* Alden, 27 F. R. 687, 1886; Adee *v.* Peck, 42 F. R. 499, 1890; American Cable Ry. Co. *v.* New York, 56 F. R. 150, 1893; Stohlmann *v.* Parker, 53 F. R. 925, 1893; Westinghouse *v.* Air-Brake Co., 59 F. R. 581, 1893; Electric Ry. Co. *v.* Jamaica R. R. Co., 61 F. R. 670, 1894.

¹ Dowagiac Mfg. Co. *v.* Minnesota Moline Plow Co., 118 F. R. 139, 1902.

² Corbin Lock Co. *v.* Eagle Lock Co., 37 F. R. 338, 1889.

³ Butler *v.* Steckel, 137 U. S. 29, 1890; American Feather Duster Co. *v.* Levy, 43 F. R. 383, 1890; Mahon *v.* McGuire Mfg. Co., 51 F. R. 684, 1892; Johnson Co. *v.* Steel Co., 67 F. R. 942, 1895.

⁴ Mast Foos & Co. *v.* Stover Mfg. Co., 177 U. S. 493, 1900; New Departure Bell Co. *v.* Bevin Bros. Mfg. Co., 73 F. R. 475, 1896.

⁵ Edison *v.* American Mutoscope Co., 114 F. R. 935, 1902.

found a sale in the market, and exercising upon that article such superiority of workmanship as to make it commercial.¹

§ 28. It is not invention to substitute superior for inferior materials, in making one or more or all of the parts of a machine or manufacture.

In most of the cases which embody this rule, the substitution of materials was both new and useful; and in some of those cases, the increase of utility due to the substitution, was decidedly high. But the courts held the respective improvements to be the result of judgment and skill in the selection and the adaptation of materials, and not the product of the inventive faculties of those who made them.²

There being no invention in substituting superior for inferior materials, there is certainly none in selecting from a number of materials recommended by a prior patentee, that one which is best adapted to the purpose in view;³ and none in substituting one well-known form of a particular material, for another well-known form of the same material.⁴

§ 29. Important exceptions have, however, been established to the general rule of the last section. If the substitution of materials involved a new mode of construction, or

¹ *Risdon Locomotive Works v. Medart*, 158 U. S. 81, 1895; *Buzzell v. Fifield*, 7 F. R. 467, 1881; *Hatch v. Moffitt*, 15 F. R. 252, 1883; *Lee v. Upson Hart Co.*, 42 F. R. 531, 1890.

² *Hotchkiss v. Greenwood*, 11 Howard, 248, 1850; *Hicks v. Kelsey*, 18 Wallace, 670, 1873; *Terhune v. Phillips*, 99 U. S. 593, 1878; *Gardner v. Herz*, 118 U. S. 192, 1885; *Brown v. District of Columbia*, 130 U. S. 87, 1889; *Florsheim v. Schilling*, 137 U. S. 76, 1890; *Hoff v. Iron Clad Mfg. Co.*, 139 U. S. 329, 1891; *Ryan v. Hard*, 145 U. S. 245, 1892; *In re Maynard*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 536, 1857; *Post v. Hardware Co.*, 26 F. R. 616, 1886;

Forschner v. Baumgarten, 26 F. R. 858, 1886; *J. L. Mott Iron Works v. Cassidy*, 31 F. R. 47, 1887; *National Roofing Co. v. Garwood*, 35 F. R. 658, 1888; *Kilbourne v. Bingham Co.*, 47 F. R. 57, 1891; *Vulcanized Fiber Co. v. Taylor*, 49 F. R. 744, 1891; *Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Lorain Steel Co.*, 117 F. R. 254, 1902; *National Tooth Crown Co. v. Macdonald*, 117 F. R. 617, 1902; *Drake Castle Pressed Steel Lug Co. v. Brownell & Co.*, 123 F. R. 87, 1903.

³ *Welling v. Crane*, 14 F. R. 571, 1882.

⁴ *Brush Electric Co. v. Julien Electric Co.*, 41 F. R. 693, 1890; *Brush Electric Co. v. Accumulator Co.*, 47 F. R. 50, 1891.

if it developed new properties and uses of the article made, it may amount to invention.¹ And substitution of materials may constitute invention, where it produces a new mode of operation, or results in a new function,² or in the first practical success in the art in which the substitution is made.³ So also, where the excellence of the material substituted could not be known beforehand, and where practice shows its superiority to consist not only in greater cheapness and greater durability, but also in more efficient action; the substitution of a superior for an inferior material amounts to invention.⁴

It may or may not be invention to substitute one material for another, as an agent in performing a process, or as an ingredient of a composition of matter. The question of invention in any such case, is to be decided by some other rule or rules, than that of the substitution of materials.

§ 30. It is not invention to so enlarge and strengthen a machine that it will operate on larger materials than before.⁵

In *Phillips v. Page*⁶ the patent covered the first circular saw-mill which was adapted to sawing logs. Its utility was great, and was unquestioned. Machines like it, except that they were much smaller in every part, had been used before, to saw lath and other slender articles out of small blocks of wood. The Supreme Court therefore held that Mr. Page did not invent a circular saw-mill, but merely constructed one, by copying on a larger scale the prior machine for sawing lath.

¹ *Smith v. Dental Vulcanite Co.*, 93 U. S. 496, 1876; *Fairbanks Wood Rim Co. v. Moore*, 78 F. R. 490, 1897; *Badische Anilin & Soda Fabrik v. Kalle*, 94 F. R. 164, 1899.

² *Potts v. Creager*, 155 U. S. 609, 1895; *Wickelman v. A. B. Dick Co.*, 88 F. R. 264, 1898.

³ *Edison Electric Light Co. v. U. S. Electric Lighting Co.*, 52 F. R. 308, 1892; *George Frost Co. v. Cohn*, 119 F. R. 505, 1902.

⁴ *Dalton v. Nelson*, 13 Blatch. 357, 1876; *Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. American Zylonite Co.*, 35 F. R. 301, 1888; *Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Crane Chemical Co.*, 36 F. R. 110, 1888; *King v. Anderson*, 90 F. R. 503, 1898.

⁵ *American Well Works v. F. C. Austin Mfg. Co.*, 98 F. R. 993, 1900.

⁶ *Phillips v. Page*, 24 Howard, 164, 1860.

In the case of the *Planing Machine Co. v. Keith*,¹ the patent covered the Woodbury planing machine, a machine which differed from the older Woodworth planing machine in one respect only. Woodworth used rollers to press the boards against the bed of the machine, whereas Woodbury used pressure bars for that purpose. The Supreme Court held the Woodbury patent to be void because Alfred Anson, of Norwich, Connecticut, had previously invented and constructed a machine for dressing window-sash, which had pressure bars like Woodbury, instead of pressure rollers like Woodworth. This decision was made notwithstanding the fact that the Anson machine was too small and too weak for general planing work upon boards and planks. And this rule has been applied, and is well illustrated, in several other Supreme Court cases.²

§ 31. It is not invention to change the size or degree of a thing, or of any feature or function of a machine or manufacture.³

In *Glue Co. v. Upton*⁴ the patent covered pulverized glue made from flake glue by grinding it in any suitable manner. It had several points of superiority over all former kinds of glue, but the Supreme Court held that, not being a product of invention, the patent covering it was void.

In *Guidet v. Brooklyn*⁵ the patent covered paving-stones of a certain shape and with rough sides. Paving-stones of the same shape, but with sides less rough, had been known before. To make the sides of the prior stones rougher was held by the Supreme Court to be a change in degree only, and therefore not patentable.

In *Estey v. Burdett*,⁶ one of the claims of the patent involved, depended upon concentrating certain valve openings

¹ *Planing Machine Co. v. Keith*, 101 U. S. 490, 1879.

² *Peters v. Active Mfg. Co.*, 129 U. S. 530, 1889; *Morgan Envelope Co. v. Albany Paper Co.*, 152 U. S. 430, 1894.

³ *Baldwin v. Kresl*, 76 F. R. 826, 1896; *Thomson-Houston Elec-*

tric Co. v. Nassau Electric R. Co., 98 F. R. 111, 1899.

⁴ *Glue Co. v. Upton*, 97 U. S. 6, 1877.

⁵ *Guidet v. Brooklyn*, 105 U. S. 552, 1881.

⁶ *Estey v. Burdett*, 109 U. S. 640, 1884.

into a smaller space than had theretofore been occupied by them. The Supreme Court held that there was no invention in that change.

In *Preston v. Manard*¹ the alleged invention consisted in making the reel of a fountain hose-carriage of larger diameter than were the reels of former hose-carriages, in order to allow the water to pass through the hose when partly wound upon the reel. The Supreme Court held that there resided no invention in that improvement.

In *French v. Carter*,² the patent claimed a roof for a vault, which consisted, like an earlier roof, of two gable-stones, and two sloping roof-stones, and one cap-stone; and which differed from the earlier roof in that its roof-stones were narrower, and its cap-stone was wider, than the corresponding stones of the earlier vault. The Supreme Court held that these differences of degree did not constitute invention.

In *American Road Machine Co. v. Pennock & Sharp Co.*,³ the patent claimed various combinations, in each of which a very heavy hand-wheel was the distinguishing element. The extra weight of the wheel gave it a useful momentum in the combination; but the Supreme Court held that it was not invention to increase the weight of a hand-wheel for that purpose.

Circuit Court cases which have been decided by skillful judges furnish still other illustrations of the rule of this section.⁴

It may or may not be invention to change the degree of heat, or other agent, used in a process;⁵ or to change the

¹ *Preston v. Manard*, 116 U. S. 663, 1886.

² *French v. Carter*, 137 U. S. 239, 1890.

³ *American Road Machine Co. v. Pennock & Sharp Co.*, 164 U. S. 26, 1896.

⁴ *Stow v. City of Chicago*, 3 Bann. & Ard. 91, 1877; *White v. Lee*, 14 F. R. 790, 1882; *Woonsocket Rubber Co. v. Candee*, 23

F. R. 797, 1885; *Smith v. Murray*, 27 F. R. 69, 1886; *Hurd v. Snow*, 35 F. R. 423, 1888; *Blumenthal v. Burrell*, 43 F. R. 669, 1890; *Murphy v. Trenton Rubber Co.*, 45 F. R. 571, 1891; *Caverly v. Deere*, 52 F. R. 763, 1892.

⁵ *Musgrave & Nye v. Commissioner of Patents*, 78 O. G. 2047, 1897; *De Lamar v. De Lamar Mining Co.*, 117 F. R. 240, 1902.

amount of an ingredient used in a composition of matter,¹ or to change the size of a feature of a design. The question of presence or absence of invention, in every such case, is to be decided by the application of some other rule or rules, than that of this section.

§ 31a. A meritorious exception, to the rule of the last section, is involved in the adjudicated validity of the Edison incandescent light patent.² The carbon filament which constitutes the only new part of the combination of the second claim of that patent, differs from the earlier carbon burners of Sawyer and Man, only in having a diameter of one-sixty-fourth of an inch or less, whereas the burners of Sawyer and Man had a diameter of one-thirty-second of an inch or more. But that reduction of one-half in diameter increased the resistance of the burner four-fold, and reduced its radiating surface two-fold, and thus increased eight-fold, its ratio of resistance to radiating surface. That eight-fold increase of proportion, enabled the resistance of the conductor of electricity from the generator to the burner, to be increased eight-fold, without any increase of percentage of loss of energy in that conductor, or decrease of percentage of development of heat in the burner; and thus enabled the area of the cross section of that conductor to be reduced eight-fold, and thus to be made with one-eighth of the amount of copper or other metal, which would be required if the reduction of diameter of the burner from one-thirty-second to one-sixty-fourth of an inch had not been made. And that great reduction in the size and cost of conductors, involved also a great difference in the composition of the electric energy employed in the system; that difference consisting in generating the necessary amount of electrical energy with comparatively high electromotive force, and comparatively low current, instead of contrarywise. For this reason, the use of carbon filaments, one-sixty-fourth of an inch in diameter or less, instead of

¹ National Newsboard Co. v. Elkhart Egg Case Co., 123 F. R. 432, 1903.

² Edison Electric Light Co. v. U. S. Electric Lighting Co., 52 F. R. 300, 1892.

carbon burners one-thirty-second of an inch in diameter or more, not only worked an enormous economy in conductors, but also necessitated a great change in generators, and did both according to a philosophy, which Edison was the first to know, and which is stated in this paragraph in its simplest form and aspect, and which lies at the foundation of the incandescent electric lighting of the world.

§ 32. Aggregation is not invention; either in processes,¹ machines,² or manufactures.³

In *Hailes v. Van Wormer*⁴ the patents passed upon, covered certain self-feeding coal stoves. These stoves were better than any which preceded them, because they contained more good things than were ever before assembled in that kind of heater. All of the things so assembled were old. The superiority of the patented stoves arose from the fact that sundry good features, theretofore scattered through several, were in them gathered into one such article of manufacture. The things so united did not, however, perform any joint function, but each did only what it had formerly done in former stoves. The Supreme Court held the whole to be a mere aggregation of devices, and not to be invention.

The case of *Reckendorfer v. Faber*⁵ was based upon patents for a new and useful article, of which many millions of specimens had been made and sold since those patents were granted. That article was a piece of soft rubber united to one end of a lead pencil. The Supreme Court called attention to the fact that there was no joint operation performed by the pencil and the rubber, and therefore held the patents to be void for want of invention.

In *Pickering v. McCullough*⁶ Justice MATTHEWS said: "In a patentable combination of old elements, all the con-

¹ *In re Mond*, 16 App. D. C. 354, 1900.

² *Overweight Counterbalance El. Co. v. Henry Vogt Mach. Co.*, 102 F. R. 961, 1900; *Brown H. & C. Mach. Co. v. King Bridge Co.*, 107 F. R. 504, 1901.

³ *Antidel v. Chicago Hotel Cabinet Co.*, 89 F. R. 312, 1898.

⁴ *Hailes v. Van Wormer*, 20 Wallace, 353, 1873.

⁵ *Reckendorfer v. Faber*, 92 U. S. 357, 1875.

⁶ *Pickering v. McCullough*, 104 U. S. 318, 1881.

stituents must so enter into it as that each qualifies every other; to draw an illustration from another branch of the law, they must be joint tenants of the domain of invention, seized each of every part, *per my et per tout*, and not mere tenants in common, with separate interests and estates. It must form either a new machine of a distinct character and function, or produce a result due to the joint and co-operating action of all the elements, and which is not the mere adding together of separate contributions."

The first of these sentences has been thought to imply a severer doctrine than the second, and some of the lower courts have inclined to ascribe to the opinion a milder signification than the first sentence standing alone may appear to warrant.

The Circuit Court of Appeals for the third circuit has said that: "If, instead of an extract, the whole opinion be read, in connection with the authorities which are cited in it, it may be readily perceived that the substance of the doctrine intended to be affirmed, is that a combination, to be patentable, must produce a new and useful result as the product of the combination, and not a mere aggregate of several results, each the complete result of one of the combined elements." And that: "If it were essential to a valid patent for any combination whatever, that the mode of operation of every element included in the combination should be changed by each of the others, it would have been impossible to sustain several combination patents which have in fact been upheld, as, indeed, it would be difficult to conceive of any mechanical combination which would be both possible and patentable."¹

And Judge McKENNA expressly declined, when strenuously urged by counsel so to do, to recognize as an established rule of law, that in all cases where the action of each of the combined devices remains its own individual action, there is no patentable combination.²

¹ National Cash Register Co. v. American Cash Register Co., 53 F. R. 371, 1892.

² Bowers v. Von Schmidt, 63 F. R. 582, 1894.

And while the language above quoted from *Pickering v. McCullough* has been often quoted since it was delivered, there is no case in which the severer doctrine of the first sentence of that language has been applied to defeat any patent or claim which could have endured the milder doctrine of the second of those sentences, or the milder doctrine held in the three last-mentioned cases. Indeed, the Supreme Court has shown its preference for the milder view, by substantially quoting the second sentence of Justice MATTHEWS,¹ while omitting the first sentence from all of its later decisions.

The law of this subject is well settled, and the dividing line between combinations and aggregations is well established. Every case must fall on one side or the other of that line, and no case can stand upon it. But the facts in particular cases, which will arise hereafter, will often make it difficult to determine upon which side of the line those cases respectively belong.² Such decisions may sometimes be made by direct analysis without extensive comparisons with precedents; but in other cases, reasoning by analogy from precedents may be helpful to just decisions, and therefore the Supreme Court cases, which have not been already mentioned, as relevant to the subject, are collected by name in a note.³

§ 33. The rule of the last section does not state nor imply that all the parts of a patentable combination must act at

¹ *Brinkerhoff v. Aloe*, 146 U. S. 516, 1892.

² *Standard Oil Co. v. Southern Pacific Railroad Co.*, 48 F. R. 110, 1891.

³ *Tack Co. v. Mfg. Co.*, 109 U. S. 120, 1883; *Bussey v. Mfg. Co.*, 110 U. S. 145, 1883; *Phillips v. Detroit*, 111 U. S. 607, 1883; *Stephenson v. Railroad Co.*, 114 U. S. 158, 1884; *Beecher Mfg. Co. v. Atwater Mfg. Co.*, 114 U. S. 523, 1884; *Thatcher Heating Co. v. Burtis*, 121 U. S. 293, 1886; *Hendy v.*

Iron Works, 127 U. S. 375, 1887; *Royer v. Roth*, 132 U. S. 201, 1889; *Fond Du Lac County v. May*, 137 U. S. 407, 1890; *Union Edge Setter Co. v. Keith*, 139 U. S. 539, 1891; *Adams v. Stamping Co.*, 141 U. S. 539, 1891; *Wright v. Yuengling*, 155 U. S. 53, 1894; *Richards v. Elevator Co.*, 158 U. S. 301, 1895; and 159 U. S. 486, 1895; *Office Specialty Mfg. Co. v. Fenton Metallic Mfg. Co.*, 174 U. S. 492, 1899.

the same time. The fact on that point is no criterion by means of which to distinguish invention from aggregation. Justice CURTIS, in a Circuit Court case,¹ stated the true doctrine on this subject, and stated it with marked lucidity, saying: "To make a valid claim for a combination, it is not necessary that the several elementary parts of the combination should act simultaneously. If those elementary parts are so arranged that the successive action of each contributes to produce some one practical result, which result, when attained, is the product of the simultaneous or successive action of all the elementary parts, viewed as one entire whole, a valid claim for thus combining those elementary parts may be made." And that view of the law has also been taken in more recent times.²

§ 34. It is not invention to duplicate one or more of the parts of a machine or a manufacture; unless the duplication causes a new mode of operation, or produces a new unitary result.

In *Dunbar v. Myers*³ the patent was based on a circular sawmill adapted to sawing lumber into thin sheets to be used for the backs of picture-frames and mirrors. It differed from former machines used for the same purpose, mainly in the fact that it had a plate on each side of the saw for the purpose of expanding the saw kerf and thus keeping the sawed parts away from the sides of the saw, whereas earlier machines had such a plate only on one side of the saw. The two plates of the patented machine differed from each other in diameter and in one or two other respects, but the function performed by each of them was substantially identical with that performed by the other. The Supreme Court therefore held the claim which covered the additional plate to be void for want of invention.

In *Slawson v. Grand Street R. R. Co.*⁴ the patented im-

¹ *Forbush v. Cook*, 2 Fisher, 669, 1857.

² *Holmes Alarm Tel. Co. v. Domestic Tel. Co.*, 42 F. R. 226, 1890; *San Francisco Bridge Co. v. Keating*, 68 F. R. 353, 1895.

³ *Dunbar v. Myers*, 94 U. S. 197, 1876.

⁴ *Slawson v. Grand Street R. R. Co.*, 107 U. S. 653, 1882.

provement consisted merely in putting an additional pane of glass in the fare-box of a street car, on the side next to the passengers, so that they could see into the box, as well as the driver, for whose use one pane of glass was already in the side of the box next to him. The Supreme Court said that the putting in of that additional pane of glass required no more invention than the putting of an additional window in a room opposite one already there.

*Millner v. Voss*¹ was decided by Judge BOND in Virginia. The patent involved, purported to cover an arrangement of furnaces and flues in a tobacco-curing house. It appeared to differ from prior arrangements only in the fact that each of the furnaces had two or more fire-places of different sizes on each side of a chimney, whereas former arrangements had but one. Judge BOND wittily said that, "Where one stove is found to be unequal to the heating of a room, to put another beside it, even though smaller, requires no invention." Mr. Millner's patent was therefore held to be void.

And the rule of this section has been applied in cases not so simple as those above mentioned;² and may be applied still more widely hereafter.

The first exception which belongs to the general rule of this section, is illustrated by the Parker water-wheel. Before the date of that invention, it was customary to place a single turbine, upon a vertical shaft, in such a way that the pressure of the water was partly exerted endwise of the shaft; and that pressure, in addition to the weight of the shaft, and of the wheel, had to be sustained by the bearing of the shaft. Parker placed two such wheels in a pair, face to face, on the same shaft, and the water entered between them, so that the downward pressure of the water upon one wheel was balanced by the upward pressure of the water upon the other wheel. In this case the duplication

¹ *Millner v. Voss*, 4 Hughes, 262, 1882.

² *Electrical Accumulator Co. v. Julien Electric Co.*, 38 F. R. 138,

1889; *Sugar Apparatus Co. v. Yaryan Mfg. Co.*, 43 F. R. 149, 1890.

of the wheel caused a new mode of operation; and the patent was held to be valid.¹

The second exception which belongs to the general rule of this section, is illustrated by the Goss printing-press. The distinguishing characteristic of that press, consists in mounting one prior "straight-run" web-perfecting printing-press, on top of another like press, so that the two printed webs can be brought flatwise together, without any edgewise movement of either. Thus a new unitary result was obtained; and the patent on the duplex press, was held to be valid.²

§ 35. It is not invention to omit one or more of the parts of a machine or manufacture, unless that omission causes a new mode of operation of the parts retained.

Stow v. Chicago,³ decided by Judge BLODGETT, is the case which perhaps most exactly corresponds with this rule. The patent in that case covered a wood pavement like that of Nicholson, except that it omitted the board foundation and also the board strips of that earlier pavement. Judge BLODGETT held that those omissions constituted no invention, saying: "A reconstruction of a machine, so that a less number of parts will perform all the functions of the greater, may be invention of a high order, but the omission of a part, with a corresponding omission of function, so that the retained parts do just what they did before in the combination, cannot be other than a mere matter of judgment, depending upon whether it is desirable to have the machine do all, or less, than it did before." These views were also reiterated and reinforced by the same judge many years after they were stated and applied by him in the leading case.⁴

And the Supreme Court, when the latter case reached that tribunal, affirmed Judge BLODGETT's decision;⁵ and has since rendered several decisions to the same effect.⁶

¹ *Parker v. Hulme*, 1 Fisher, 44, 1849.

² *Goss Printing-Press Co. v. Scott*, 108 F. R. 260, 1901.

³ *Stow v. Chicago*, 3 Bann. & Ard. 92, 1877.

⁴ *McClain v. Ortmyer*, 33 F. R. 287, 1888.

⁵ *McClain v. Ortmyer*, 141 U.S. 425, 1891.

⁶ *Hat Pouncing Machine Co. v. Hedden*, 148 U. S. 489, 1893. *Giles*

The exception which is stated in the general rule of this section was judicially applied, and is well illustrated, in a case decided by Judge NATHANIEL SHIPMAN, where invention was found to reside in so reorganizing a meat-mincing machine, as to dispense with some of its parts, and as to cause the parts retained to do the work of the original machine.¹

And the same exception is illustrated in a later case, in the Circuit Court of Appeals for the second circuit.² And in a case which involved a process patent, the Supreme Court has decided that invention resided in omitting one of the steps in an old process, where the resulting new process was the result of careful and long-continued experiment, and where its utility was decidedly greater than that of the old process.³ And Judge GILBERT has held that it is invention to omit, from a prior process, a step which those skilled in its performance considered essential, but which the inventor proved to be useless.⁴

§ 36. It is not invention to change a process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter, by substituting an equivalent for either of its parts; unless the new part, not only performs the function of the part for which it was substituted, but also performs another function, by another mode of operation.⁵

What is signified in the patent law by the word "equivalent" is explained in detail in the chapter on infringement. The subject is of double importance, because it relates some-

v. Heysinger, 150 U. S. 632, 1893; *Olin v. Timken*, 155 U. S. 148, 1894; *Richards v. Chase Elevator Co.*, 159 U. S. 477, 1895.

¹ *Enterprise Mfg. Co. v. Sargent*, 28 F. R. 187, 1886.

² *Consolidated Store Service Co. v. Siegel-Cooper Co.*, 107 F. R. 716, 1901.

³ *Lawther v. Hamilton*, 124 U. S. 1, 1887.

⁴ *Pacific Contracting Co. v. Bingham*, 62 F. R. 283, 1894.

⁵ *Smith v. Nichols*, 21 Wallace,

119, 1874; *Crouch v. Roemer*, 103 U. S. 797, 1880; *Cochrane v. Waterman*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 54, 1844; *In re Hebbard*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 550, 1857; *Perry v. Foundry Co.*, 12 F. R. 436, 1882; *Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Tower*, 26 F. R. 451, 1885; *Tiemann v. Kraatz*, 85 F. R. 440, 1898; *Grimes v. Allen*, 102 F. R. 615, 1900; *Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. New England Granite Co.*, 103 F. R. 967, 1900.

times to the validity and sometimes to the infringement of patents: A. B. may contrive and may patent a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, which differs from the prior patented invention of C. D. in one part only. If the courts decide that the new part inserted, is an equivalent of the old part omitted, then the contrivance of A. B. will be an infringement; and it will not be an invention, save in the exceptional case stated in the rule. If, on the other hand, the courts hold that the part inserted is not an equivalent of the old part omitted, then the machine of A. B. may be an invention, and it will not be an infringement of any claim covering the entire machine of C. D.

§ 37. It is not invention to combine old devices into a new machine or manufacture, without producing any new mode of operation.¹

This rule differs from that of Section 32 in not depending upon absence of joint mode of operation, but only upon antiquity of mode of operation. For this reason, while the invalidity of a patent, under the rule of Section 32, can be shown, where it exists, from the face of the patent; the invalidity of a patent under the rule of this section requires outside evidence for its establishment, and depends upon the state of the prior art for its applicability.² The meaning and scope of this rule, like all the primary rules of this chapter, require illustration and example for full comprehension; and such examples and illustrations are abundantly supplied by the adjudicated cases.

*Stimpson v. Woodman*³ involved a patent for a machine for pebbling leather. It gave the leather the pebbled surface by means of a roller, which had the counterpart of that surface engraved or sunk on its periphery. The same kind of roller had previously been used for the same purpose by hand, and the same kind of machine had been used for

¹ *Burt v. Evory*, 133 U. S. 349, 1890; *Florsheim v. Schilling*, 137 U. S. 77, 1890; *Morgan Envelope Co. v. Albany Paper Co.*, 40 F. R. 582, 1889; *Mahon v. McGuire Mfg. Co.*, 51 F. R. 684, 1892.

² *Brickill v. Hartford*, 57 F. R. 217, 1893.

³ *Stimpson v. Woodman*, 10 Wallace, 117, 1869.

compressing leather, except that the roller in it was smooth. The Supreme Court held that the change involved in putting the old figured hand roller in the place of the plain roller of the machine, involved no invention, and that the patent was void, if the facts were as stated.

*Heald v. Rice*¹ was based on a patent which covered a certain previously known straw-feeding attachment in combination with a certain previously known return-flue boiler, that straw-feeding attachment having been previously combined with a fire-box boiler. The utility of the return-flue boiler in that combination was much greater than that of the fire-box boiler, but the Supreme Court nevertheless held that there was no invention in the union of the former with the straw-feeding attachment.

*Hall v. Macneale*² shows the following state of facts. The patentee first made safe doors, the plates of which were held together by cored conical arbors, having screw threads cut on their exterior surfaces, and later he made other safe doors, the plates of which were held together by solid conical arbors which had no such screw threads as the cored conical arbors had, and he afterward obtained a patent for the combination of the plates of safe doors with solid conical arbors having such screw threads. The Supreme Court, speaking by Justice BLATCHFORD, said that "There was no invention in adding to the solid conical bolt the screw thread of the cored conical bolt."

Many Circuit Court cases also involve the doctrine of this section. In one such case³ Justice BLATCHFORD held a patent to be void for want of invention, which covered a combination of a whip socket having an annular recess in it, with a flexible elastic ring held in that recess by its own elasticity, and provided on its inner edge with non-contiguous projections, separated so that they could not be pressed into contact with each other by the insertion of the whip handle

¹ *Heald v. Rice*, 104 U. S. 754, 1881.

² *Hall v. Macneale*, 107 U. S. 90, 1882.

³ *Searls v. Merriam*, 22 O. G. 1040, 1882.

into the ring. That decision was based on the fact that a prior whip socket having an annular recess, had been combined with a plain rubber ring in that recess, and on the further fact that flexible elastic rings constructed like those of the patent had been combined with a whip socket which had no annular recess, but which clamped that ring between the upper end of that socket and a cap above it. Judge JOHN LOWELL likewise decided three similar cases. In one of them¹ he held it to be no invention to give paper collars the same kind of surface that had theretofore been impressed upon other articles of paper. In another² he decided that embossed lines on writing paper being old, and ogee lines on other paper being old, there was no invention in embossing ogee lines on writing paper to serve as guides to the eye of the writer. In a third case³ he held that soft base-balls having been covered with a double cover, and hard base-balls having been covered with a single cover, there was no invention in covering a hard base-ball with a double cover. And other still later cases illustrate the same doctrine.⁴

But while a new combination with an old mode of operation is not invention, an old combination with a new mode of operation may be an invention. The Supreme Court found that the Henry Adams corn sheller was an invention, and was patentable to him, although his father, Augustus Adams, had previously made corn shellers from which that of Henry differed only in reversing the direction of revolu-

¹ Union Paper Collar Co. v. Leland, 1 Bann. & Ard. 491, 1874.

² Cone v. Morgan Envelope Co., 4 Bann. & Ard. 109, 1879.

³ Mahn v. Harwood, 3 Bann. & Ard. 517, 1878.

⁴ Yale Lock Mfg. Co. v. National Bank, 17 F. R. 533, 1883; Kaaps v. Hartung, 23 F. R. 187, 1885; Troy Machinery Co. v. Bunnell, 27 F. R. 810, 1886; Union Edge Setter Co. v. Keith, 31 F. R. 46, 1887; Washburn & Moen Mfg. Co. v. Barbed Wire Co., 33 F. R. 273,

1888; Low v. Stove Co., 36 F. R. 903, 1888; Rodebaugh v. Jackson, 37 F. R. 886, 1889; Royer v. Coupe, 38 F. R. 115, 1889; Royer v. Belting Co., 40 F. R. 160, 1889; Gates Iron Works v. Fraser, 42 F. R. 49, 1890; Abbott Machine Co. v. Bonn, 51 F. R. 223, 1892; Hunt v. Garsed, 51 F. R. 678, 1892; Electric Ry. Co. v. Jamaica R. R. Co., 61 F. R. 655, 1894; National Harrow Co. v. Westcott, 84 F. R. 671, 1898; Kursheedt Mfg. Co. v. Naday, 103 F. R. 948, 1900.

tion of one of its parts. That part was the revolving beater, which Augustus Adams made to turn in the direction opposite to the desired motion of the ears of corn, expecting it to knock back any ear that might ride upon another, and thus tend to prevent choking the shelling devices. This mode of operation was not successful, and Henry Adams reversed the revolution of the beater so that its wings moved in the same direction as that of the ears of corn, and thus drove them forward into the shelling devices. The old combination, with that new mode of operation, was entirely successful, and the patent thereon was therefore held to be valid.¹

A new combination, with a new mode of operation, may be invention; even if all the parts thereof are old, and even if the function of the combination, is also old.² There are several cases which contain dicta contrary to this rule; but those dicta must have resulted from incomplete thinking. In each of many arts, many patents have been granted, on a corresponding number of new combinations of old parts, for performing precisely the same function. The earlier of those combinations may be useful; but not useful enough, because not rapid enough. To deny the quality of invention, to all the later, different, and far superior combinations for doing the same thing, would be unreasonable, and unjust, and plainly contrary to Section 4886 of the Revised Statutes.

§ 38. It is not invention to use an old process,³ machine,⁴

¹ *Keystone Mfg. Co. v. Adams*, 151 U. S. 142, 1894.

² *Deere & Co. v. Rock Island Plow Co.*, 84 F. R. 176, 1898.

³ *King v. Gallun*, 109 U. S. 99, 1883; *Miller v. Foree*, 116 U. S. 27, 1885; *Dreyfus v. Searle*, 124 U. S. 63, 1887; *Crescent Brewing Co. v. Gottfried*, 128 U. S. 169, 1888; *Marchand v. Emken*, 132 U. S. 195, 1889; *Lovell Mfg. Co. v. Cary*, 147 U. S. 637, 1893; *De Lamar v. De Lamar Mining Co.*, 110 F. R. 538, 1901; *Farrell v.*

Boston & M. Copper & Silver Mining Co., 121 F. R. 841, 1903.

⁴ *Pennsylvania Railroad Co. v. Truck Co.*, 110 U. S. 494, 1883; *Blake v. San Francisco*, 113 U. S. 679, 1884; *Hendy v. Iron Works*, 127 U. S. 375, 1888; *Aron v. Railway Co.*, 132 U. S. 84, 1889; *Howe Machine Co. v. Needle Co.*, 134 U. S. 397, 1890; *Fond Du Lac County v. May*, 137 U. S. 406, 1890; *Bussell Trimmer Co. v. Stevens*, 137 U. S. 433, 1890; *Wollensak v. Sargent*, 151 U. S. 227,

manufacture,¹ composition of matter,² or design,³ for a new and analogous purpose.

In *Tucker v. Spalding*⁴ the patent covered a combination of a circular disk with removable saw teeth. There was a prior combination of a circular disk with removable cutters for the purpose of cutting tongues and grooves. The Supreme Court held that if what the latter combination did, was in its nature the same as sawing, and if its structure and its action suggested to the mind of the ordinarily skillful mechanic this double use to which it could be adapted without material change, then the combination of the patent was but a double use of the older combination, and was therefore not an invention, and not patentable.

*Brown v. Piper*⁵ is a case in which the Supreme Court held that a patent for an apparatus for preserving fish and other articles in a close chamber by means of a freezing mixture having no contact with the atmosphere of the preserving chamber, covered nothing but a double use of the well-known ice-cream freezer.

In *Roberts v. Ryer*⁶ the same tribunal decided that to change the form and proportions of the compartments of a refrigerator, so as to utilize the descending instead of the ascending current of endlessly circulating air, was but a double use of that refrigerator.

More than forty other cases also embody the rule of this

1894; *Gates Iron Works v. Fraser*, 153 U. S. 347, 1894; *Mast Foss & Co. v. Stover Mfg. Co.*, 177 U. S. 485, 1900; *Lettelier v. Mann*, 91 F. R. 914, 1899; *American Well Works v. F. C. Austin Mfg. Co.*, 98 F. R. 994, 1900.

¹ *Peters v. Active Mfg. Co.*, 129 U. S. 530, 1889; *Peters v. Hanson*, 129 U. S. 541, 1889; *St. Germain v. Brunswick*, 135 U. S. 230, 1890; *Patent Clothing Co. v. Glover*, 141 U. S. 563, 1891; *Ansonia Co. v. Electrical Supply Co.*, 144 U. S. 18, 1892.

² *Browning v. Colorado Telephone Co.*, 61 F. R. 845, 1894.

³ *Smith v. Saddle Co.*, 148 U. S. 679, 1893; *Cahoone Barnet Mfg. Co. v. Rubber & Celluloid Harness Co.*, 45 F. R. 582, 1891; *Bevin Bros. Mfg. Co. v. Starr Bros. Bell Co.*, 114 F. R. 362, 1902.

⁴ *Tucker v. Spalding*, 13 Wallace, 543, 1871.

⁵ *Brown v. Piper*, 91 U. S. 37, 1875.

⁶ *Roberts v. Ryer*, 91 U. S. 157, 1875.

section, and apply it to particular new uses of old inventions.¹

§ 39. It may be invention, to use an old process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter, or design, for a new and non-analogous purpose.² The question whether a particular

¹ *Bean v. Smallwood*, 2 Story, 408, 1843; *Meyer v. Pritchard*, 1 Bann. & Ard. 261, 1874; *Adams v. Loft*, 4 Bann. & Ard. 496, 1879; *Royer v. Mfg. Co.*, 20 F. R. 853, 1884; *Howe Machine Co. v. Needle Co.*, 21 F. R. 630, 1884; *Spill v. Celluloid Mfg. Co.*, 21 F. R. 639, 1884; *Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Noyes*, 25 F. R. 319, 1885; *Aron v. Manhattan Ry. Co.*, 26 F. R. 317, 1886; *Marchand v. Emken*, 26 F. R. 629, 1886; *Shenfield v. Mfg. Co.*, 27 F. R. 808, 1886; *Gloucester Isinglass & Glue Co. v. Le Page*, 30 F. R. 370, 1887; *Ansonia Brass & Copper Co. v. Electrical Supply Co.*, 32 F. R. 81, 1887; *Acme Hay Harvesting Co. v. Martin*, 33 F. R. 249, 1888; *Mann's Car Co. v. Monarch Car Co.*, 34 F. R. 130, 1888; *Babcock & Wilcox Co. v. Pioneer Iron Works*, 34 F. R. 338, 1888; *Rubber Harness Trimming Co. v. Rubber Comb Co.*, 35 F. R. 498, 1888; *Hale & Kilbourn Mfg. Co. v. Hartford Mattress Co.*, 36 F. R. 762, 1888; *Schmid v. Mfg. Co.*, 37 F. R. 345, 1889; *Foster v. Crossin*, 44 F. R. 62, 1890; *American Road Machine Co. v. Pennock & Sharp Co.*, 45 F. R. 255, 1890; *Watson v. Stevens*, 47 F. R. 117, 1891; *Whitcomb v. Coal Co.*, 47 F. R. 660, 1891; *Zinsser v. Krueger*, 48 F. R. 298, 1891; *Buckingham v. Iron Co.*, 51 F. R. 236, 1892; *Steiner Extinguisher Co. v. Adrian*, 52 F. R. 733, 1892; *Steiner*

Extinguisher Co. v. Adrian, 59 F. R. 132, 1893; *Forgie v. Oil-Well Supply Co.*, 57 F. R. 747, 1893; *Consolidated Bunting Apparatus Co. v. Brewing Co.*, 60 F. R. 93, 1894; *Adams Electric Ry. Co. v. Lindell Ry. Co.*, 63 F. R. 990, 1894; *Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Western Electric Co.*, 70 F. R. 96, 1895; *Rose v. Hirsh*, 71 F. R. 881, 1896; *Schreiber & Sons Co. v. Grimm*, 72 F. R. 671, 1896; *Dunbar v. Eastern Elevating Co.*, 81 F. R. 201, 1897; *Palmer v. John E. Brown Mfg. Co.*, 84 F. R. 454, 1897; *Frederick R. Stearns Co. v. Russell*, 85 F. R. 230, 1898; *Capital Sheet Metal Co. v. Kinnear & Gager Co.*, 87 F. R. 333, 1898; *Edison Electric Light Co. v. E. G. Bernard Co.*, 88 F. R. 276, 1898; *Solvay Process Co. v. Michigan Alkali Co.*, 90 F. R. 818, 1898; *Briggs v. Duell*, 93 F. R. 974, 1899; *Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Rahway E. L. & P. Co.*, 95 F. R. 660, 1899; *Indiana Novelty Mfg. Co. v. Crocker Chair Co.*, 103 F. R. 496, 1900; *Standard Caster & Wheel Co. v. Caster Socket Co.*, 113 F. R. 162, 1901; *Johnson Co. v. Toledo Traction Co.*, 119 F. R. 892, 1903; *Antidel v. Bent*, 122 F. R. 811, 1903; *Bettendorf Patents Co. v. J. R. Little Metal Wheel Co.*, 123 F. R. 433, 1903.

² *Potts v. Creager*, 155 U. S. 608, 1895; *Cash Register Co. v.*

new use is analogous, or is non-analogous, to some old use of the same process or thing, is a question, the answer to which depends on the particular facts of the case in which it arises.¹ The decision of such a case can be reached by comparing the facts thereof, with the facts of some of the cases wherein the new uses were held to be analogous, and also with the facts of some of the cases, in which the new uses were held to be non-analogous, to the old uses of the same processes of things. The first of those classes of cases have already been cited,² and the second class are cited now.³ Where a new use of an old thing consists in combining it with other things in a new organization, invention may be present in the combination, though absent from the separate parts.⁴

§ 40. Want of invention, if it really exists in a particular process or thing, can nearly always be detected by one or another of the foregoing rules. When a case arises to which neither of them applies, and relevant to which the mind remains in uncertainty, that uncertainty may be removed

Cash Indicator Co., 156 U. S. 515, 1895.

¹ *Briggs v. Duell*, 93 F. R. 974, 1899.

² Section 38.

³ *Potts v. Creager*, 155 U. S. 608, 1895; *Cash Register Co. v. Cash Indicator Co.*, 156 U. S. 515, 1895; *Rapid Service Store Ry. Co. v. Taylor*, 43 F. R. 253, 1887; *Mack v. Optical Mfg. Co.*, 52 F. R. 821, 1892; *Brown Mfg. Co. v. Mast*, 53 F. R. 585, 1892; *Loewer v. Ford*, 55 F. R. 62, 1893; *New Departure Bell Co. v. Bevin Mfg. Co.*, 64 F. R. 863, 1894; *Collins v. Gleason*, 68 F. R. 915, 1895; *Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Elmira & Horseheads Ry. Co.*, 69 F. R. 264, 1895; *American Pneumatic Tool Co. v. Fisher*, 69 F. R. 332, 1895; *Hillborn v. Hale & Kilburn Mfg. Co.*, 69 F. R. 963, 1895; *Taws v.*

Laughlins & Co., 70 F. R. 107, 1895; *American Sulphite Pulp Co. v. Howland Falls Pulp Co.*, 70 F. R. 991, 1895; *Tannage Patent Co. v. Zahn*, 70 F. R. 1004, 1895; *Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Winchester Ave. Ry. Co.*, 71 F. R. 19, 1895; *Brownson v. Dodson-Fisher-Brockmann Co.*, 71 F. R. 517, 1895; *A. B. Dick Co. v. Wickelman*, 74 F. R. 709, 1895; *Consolidated Car Heating Co. v. American Electric Heating Corp.*, 82 F. R. 997, 1897; *Electric Smelting & Aluminum Co. v. Carborundum Co.*, 102 F. R. 631, 1900; *National Hollow Brake-Beam Co. v. Interchangeable Brake-Beam Co.*, 106 F. R. 702, 1901; *Diamond Drill & Machine Co. v. Kelly Bros.*, 120 F. R. 292, 1903.

⁴ *Telephone Cases*, 126 U. S. 572, 1887.

by means of the rule in *Smith v. The Dental Vulcanite Co.*¹ namely: When the other facts in the case leave the question of invention in doubt, the fact that a process or machine, or other subject of a patent, has gone into general use, and has displaced other processes or things which had previously been employed for analogous uses, is sufficient to turn the scale in favor of the existence of invention. But the fact that a machine or other article has been forced into extensive sale, by judicious advertising and business energy, does not prove the presence of invention in any case.²

§ 41. To change the form of a machine or manufacture is sometimes invention, and sometimes it is not invention. Where a change of form is within the domain of mere construction, it is not invention;³ but where it involves a change of mode of operation, or of function, or of result, it is invention, unless it is held to be otherwise in pursuance of some rule other than any that relates to form.⁴

¹*Smith v. Dental Vulcanite Co.*, 93 U. S. 495, 1876; *Hollister v. Benedict Mfg. Co.*, 113 U. S. 72, 1884; *Adams v. Stamping Co.*, 141 U. S. 542, 1891; *Magowan v. Belting Co.*, 141 U. S. 343, 1891; *Gandy v. Belting Co.*, 143 U. S. 594, 1892; *Barb Wire Patent*, 143 U. S. 284, 1892; *Sessions v. Romadka*, 145 U. S. 44, 1892; *Topliff v. Topliff*, 145 U. S. 164, 1892; *Hat Pouncing Machine Co. v. Hedden*, 148 U. S. 489, 1893; *Krementz v. Cottle Co.*, 148 U. S. 560, 1893; *Duer v. Lock Co.*, 149 U. S. 223, 1893; *Keystone Mfg. Co. v. Adams*, 151 U. S. 143, 1894; *Olin v. Timken*, 155 U. S. 155, 1894; *Potts v. Creager*, 155 U. S. 609, 1895.

²*McClain v. Ortmyer*, 141 U. S. 427, 1891; *Fox v. Perkins*, 52 F. R. 213, 1892; *Billings & Spen-*

cer Co. v. Van Wagoner & Williams Hardware Co., 98 F. R. 732, 1899.

³*J. J. Warner Co. v. Rosenblatt*, 80 F. R. 542, 1897; *National Harrow Co. v. Wescott*, 84 F. R. 670, 1898.

⁴*Winans v. Denmead*, 15 Howard, 341, 1853; *Davis v. Palmer*, 2 Brock, 310, 1827; *Mabie v. Haskell*, 2 Cliff. 510, 1865; *Aiken v. Dolan*, 3 Fisher, 204, 1867; *United States Bung Mfg. Co. v. Independent Bung Co.*, 31 F. R. 76, 1887; *Electrical Accumulator Co. v. Julien Electric Co.*, 38 F. R. 143, 1889; *Parker v. Dickinson*, 38 F. R. 413, 1889; *Hammond Buckle Co. v. Goodyear Rubber Co.*, 58 F. R. 413, 1893; *Goldie v. Iron Co.*, 64 F. R. 237, 1894; *Diamond State Iron Co. v. Goldie*, 84 F. R. 975, 1898.

§ 41a. To change the proportions of a machine or manufacture will seldom, or never amount to invention; but it may be invention to change the proportions of the ingredients of a chemical combination, or other composition of matter. For example, Charles Goodyear invented soft vulcanized rubber, consisting of crude India rubber and sulphur in the proportion of one part of sulphur to five parts of rubber, mixed and subjected to a high degree of heat; and afterward Nelson Goodyear invented hard vulcanized rubber, consisting of equal, or comparatively equal, parts of sulphur and crude rubber mixed and subjected to a high degree of heat. In this case, the change in proportion of the two materials resulted in two entirely distinct articles, having entirely distinct modes of operation and functions; and the later article was well held to be an invention.¹

§ 42. A question of invention is a question of fact and not of law;² though it is to be determined by means of the rules of law set forth in this chapter. In applying those rules, patents are not held void for want of invention except where invention is clearly absent.³ And invention is not clearly absent from the subject of a patent, unless that subject was logically deducible from the prior art.⁴

§ 43. Every inventor or constructor is presumed by the law to have borrowed from another, whatever he produces that was actually first invented and constructed or used by that other, in the United States;⁵ or was previously patented⁶ or described in a printed publication⁷ in any country, after having been invented by another. It follows that such of the

¹ Goodyear v. Vulcanite Co., 2 Fisher, 312, 1856.

² Poppenhusen v. Falke, 5 Blatch. 49, 1862; Shuter v. Davis, 16 F. R. 564, 1883.

³ Reiter v. Jones, 35 F. R. 421, 1888; Marvin v. Gotshall, 36 F. R. 908, 1888; Hunt Bros. Fruit Packing Co. v. Cassidy, 53 F. R. 260, 1892.

⁴ Williams v. American String Wrapper Co., 86 F. R. 641, 1898.

⁵ Mast. Foos & Co. v. Stover Mfg. Co., 177 U. S. 493, 1900; Crompton v. Knowles, 7 F. R. 203, 1881; Williams v. Rubber Shoe Co., 54 F. R. 499, 1893; Allen v. Steele, 64 F. R. 795, 1894.

⁶ Duer v. Lock Co., 149 U. S. 223, 1893.

⁷ French v. Carter, 137 U. S. 239, 1890.

foregoing rules as involve an inquiry into the state of the art to which the thing or process in controversy pertains, may involve an inquiry into the date and the character of inventions which were in fact unknown to the patentee, when he produced that thing or process. Where those prior inventions are proved by prior patents, those patents are the record evidence of those parts of the prior art which they present. The rights under the later patent are subject to what this record evidence actually shows. To change this record, by making theoretical modifications of these earlier patents, would be the same in principle, as to change by interpolation or modification, any other evidence between the parties.¹

§ 44. It was shown in Section 23 that patents are grantable for nothing but inventions. It is also the law that they can be granted only to those who invented the inventions they respectively cover, or to the assignees or legal representatives of those persons.² The subjects of assignments and devolutions of inventions and patents are explained in the chapter on title; but this is the proper place in which to treat the subjects of joint invention and sole invention.

§ 45. If A. B. notices the need of a new machine to perform a particular function, and thereupon conceives the plan of such a machine, and proceeds to embody that plan in a successful working structure, and does all this without assistance from any other person; then it is clear that he is a sole inventor of that machine. If, on the other hand, C. D. notices the need of a new machine to perform a particular function, and calls the attention of E. F. to the matter, and a successful invention is, after many conversations between the two, embodied in a working machine constructed by the hands of both, then it may be that C. D. is the sole inventor, or it may be that E. F. is the sole inventor, or it may be that both are joint inventors of the machine they produce.

¹ *Western Electric Co. v. Home Tel. Co.*, 85 F. R. 656, 1898.

672, 1888; *Eager v. United States*, 35 Court of Claims, 567, 1900.

² *Kennedy v. Hazelton*, 128 U. S.

§ 46. Every machine, before it can be used, must be constructed as well as invented. If one man does all the inventing and another does all the constructing, the first is the sole inventor. But where two or more persons exercised their inventive faculties in the mutual production of a new and useful process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter, or design, those persons are joint inventors thereof, regardless of whether one, or part, or all, or neither of those persons constructed or helped to construct the first specimen of that thing, or performed or helped to perform the first instance of that process.

§ 47. The case of the *Agawam Co. v. Jordan*¹ is not inconsistent with what is advanced at the close of the last section. The defendant in that case did not set up a joint invention by the patentee and another, but set up an alleged sole invention by that other of the thing patented. The most that it could get its witness to testify, however, was that he suggested to the patentee one of the parts of one of the combinations secured by the patent, but that the patentee himself contrived the devices by means of which that part was incorporated into that combination. The patentee did not claim the suggested part as his invention, but only claimed several new combinations of old devices, and among the number, a combination of several things, one of which was said to have been suggested by the defendant's witness. In that state of facts it was clear that the latter was neither sole nor joint inventor of anything covered by the patent, and accordingly the Supreme Court so decided.

And the case of *Forgie v. Oil Well Supply Co.*² is also consistent with the views of the last section. In that case Forgie wanted a machine by means of which to exert great power horizontally, and it occurred to him that a lifting jack might be somehow used for the purpose. With this view he called on Barrett, who was the inventor and manu-

¹ *Agawam Co. v. Jordan*, 7 Wallace, 583, 1868. See also *Lloyd v. Antisdel*, 95 O. G. 1646, 1901.

58 F. R. 871, 1893. See also *Upton Nut Co. v. H. Chapin Sons Co.*, 117 F. R. 320, 1902.

² *Forgie v. Oil Well Supply Co.*,

facturer of a particularly good lifting jack, and presented his case to him. Barrett thereupon caused his lifting jack to be reconstructed on a plan prescribed by himself, and thereafter made a number of the reconstructed tools for Forgie, who sold them to others who, like himself, wanted such a machine. They filled the vacant place by entirely successful operation, and became very popular. Thereupon Forgie applied for and obtained a patent on the reconstructed machine as his own invention; but the Circuit Court of Appeals for the third circuit held the patent to be void, because the machine had been produced by Barrett, and not by Forgie.

§ 48. In order to make an invention of importance, a considerable fund of general knowledge must be possessed by the inventor. Where that fund was acquired before he undertook his invention, it is easy to see that those who imparted it, are not thereby made joint inventors with him. Though not quite so obvious, it is equally certain that if, pending his experiments, an inventor seeks and secures one point of information from a scientist, and another from a machinist, and a third from a book, he is not, on account of having done the first two, any less a sole inventor than he is on account of having done the last.¹

§ 49. To constitute a man an inventor, it is not necessary for him to have skill enough to embody his invention in a working machine, or in a model, or even in a drawing. If a man furnishes all the ideas needed to produce the invention aimed at, he may avail himself of the mechanical skill of others, to practically embody or represent his contrivance, and still be the sole inventor thereof.² But it is not invention to conceive a result, and then employ another to produce that result.³

§ 50. Under the statute, only he or they who have invented a particular process or thing can lawfully receive a patent

¹ O'Reilly v. Morse, 15 Howard, 62, 1853.

² Sparkman v. Higgins, 1 Blatch. 209, 1846; Stearns v. Davis, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 696, 1859;

Smith v. Stewart, 55 F. R. 483, 1893; Huebel v. Barnard, 90 O. G. 751, 1899.

³ Streat v. White, 35 F. R. 426, 1888.

therefor, except in a case where the patentee is an assignee or legal representative of the true inventor or inventors. The patent must disclose the real inventor, and must be founded on his right as such. It follows that if one of two or more persons obtains a patent for a process or thing which was jointly invented by them all, that patent is not valid.¹ In such a case it is not true that the patentee invented the thing patented. He only helped to invent it. If he could have a valid patent for that thing or process, each of his co-inventors could do likewise, and each of several persons would possess the exclusive right to the same. As to each other, such a state of affairs among patentees would be impossible, and as to the public it would be intolerable.

§ 51. So also, if several persons obtained a joint patent for what was invented solely by one of them, that patent is void.² And where several independent inventions are claimed by several different claims in a joint patent, and where one of those inventions was made by one of the joint applicants for the patent, without any co-operation of another joint applicant, the claim of the patent which covers that invention, is void.³ There is no statutory authority to grant a patent or a claim to a non-inventor jointly with an inventor, without an assignment or a death, any more than there is to grant a patent to a non-inventor alone. But very convincing evidence is required to establish the invalidity of a patent on the ground stated in this section.⁴

¹ *Arnold v. Bishop*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 36, 1841; *H. T. Slemmer's Appeal*, 58 Penn. 164, 1864; *Newgold v. American Electrical Novelty & Mfg. Co.*, 108 F. R. 959, 1901.

² *Ransom v. New York*, 1 Fisher. 269, 1856; *Hotchkiss v. Greenwood*, 4 McLean. 461, 1848; *Barrett v. Hall*, 1 Mason. 473, 1818; *Royer v. Coupe*, 29 F. R. 363, 1886; *Stewart v. Tenk*, 32 F. R.

665, 1887; *Welsbach Light Co. v. Cosmopolitan Incandescent Gaslight Co.*, 100 F. R. 650, 1900.

³ *Heulings v. Reid*, 58 F. R. 868, 1893; *Welsbach Light Co. v. Cosmopolitan Gaslight Co.*, 104 F. R. 86, 1900.

⁴ *Button Fastener Co. v. Lucas*, 28 F. R. 371, 1886; *Schlicht & Field Co. v. Machine Co.*, 36 F. R. 585, 1888; *Priestly v. Montague*, 47 F. R. 651, 1891.

CHAPTER III.

NOVELTY.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>52. Novelty necessary to patentability.</p> <p>53. Novelty defined.</p> <p>54. Not negatived by prior knowledge or use in a foreign country.</p> <p>55. Not negatived by any private patent granted in a foreign country.</p> <p>56. Prior printed publications.</p> <p>57. Fullness of prior patents and printed publications.</p> <p>58. Novelty not negatived by any prior abandoned application.</p> <p>59. Qualification of the last rule.</p> <p>60. Successful prior applications.</p> <p>61. Novelty not negatived by any unpublished drawing, or prior model.</p> <p>62. Novelty not negatived by anything substantially different.</p> <p>63. Abandoned experiments.</p> <p>64. Novelty in cases of designs.</p> <p>65. Novelty not negatived by anything apparently similar, but comparatively useless.</p> | <p>66. Novelty not negatived by antiquity of parts.</p> <p>67. Novelty not negatived by prior accidental and not recognized production.</p> <p>68. Novelty not negatived by anything neither designed, nor apparently adapted, nor actually used for the same purpose.</p> <p>69. Comparative dates.</p> <p>70. Dates of patented inventions.</p> <p>71. Novelty is negatived by one instance of prior knowledge and use in this country.</p> <p>72. Novelty is negatived by prior existence and knowledge in this country.</p> <p>73. Inventor's lack of knowledge of anticipating matter is immaterial.</p> <p>74. Old thing derived from new source, is not novel.</p> <p>75. Questions of novelty are questions of fact.</p> <p>76. Burden of proof relevant to novelty, and want of novelty.</p> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

§ 52. THE statutes of the United States have always provided that anything to be patentable must be new. Statements that some things are not patentable because, though new in a commercial sense, they are not new in the eye of the patent law, occur in a few reported cases. In every such instance, however, it would have been more accurate to say that some things are not patentable because, though new things, they are not invented things. Such things lack patentability not because they lack newness, but because

they lack invention. The subject belongs to the domain of invention and not to that of novelty, and it is therefore treated in the second chapter of this book. With this explanation, it is not untrue nor misleading to say that whatever is really new, is new in the eye of the patent law.

§ 53. Many things are new in the eye of the patent statutes, in addition to those things which are really new. The word has therefore a broader signification in those statutes than it has in the dictionaries; but that broader meaning is not capable of a short definition. Novelty is the conventional name of the statutory newness, but that name does not indicate the boundaries of the thing which it denotes. Those boundaries can be delineated only by enumerating and explaining those classes of facts which fall within them, but which fall without the boundaries of actual newness; those classes of facts which negative newness, but which do not negative novelty.

§ 54. Novelty is not negatived by prior knowledge and prior use in a foreign country, of the subject of a United States patent; provided that subject had nowhere been patented to another, and nowhere been described in a printed publication when it was invented by the applicant for that patent.¹

In former editions of this book, this rule was coupled with the additional proviso; that the patentee, at the time of making his application for a United States patent, believed himself to be the first inventor of the thing covered thereby. That proviso was based on Section 4923 of the Revised Statutes; but it now appears that that section does not attend to any case in which a person, at the time of making his application for a patent, does not believe himself to be the first inventor of the thing covered thereby. On the contrary, that section leaves that class of cases to the operation of Section 4886 of the Revised Statutes. That section prescribes that a patent may be obtained by any person who has invented any subject of a patent, not known or used by others

¹ Revised Statutes, Section 4886; *v. Saranac Lake Electric Light Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co.* *Co.*, 108 F. R. 226, 1901.

in this country, and not patented or described in any printed publication anywhere, before his invention thereof; but it does not couple that permission with the condition that the patentee, at the time of making his application for a patent, shall believe himself to be the first inventor of the thing covered thereby. Accordingly, it has now been held by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the first circuit, that novelty is not negatived by prior knowledge and use in a foreign country, of the subject of a United States patent, where that prior knowledge and use became known to the applicant for that patent, between the time when he made his invention, and the time when he made his application, and which information prevented him from believing himself, at the time of making his application, to be the first inventor of the invention covered thereby.¹

Prior knowledge, possessed in this country, by some other person than the applicant for a particular patent, that the subject of that patent was known and used in some foreign country, before its invention here, is not such knowledge in this country as will negative the novelty of the patent covering that subject.²

§ 55. Novelty is not negatived by any United States patent which was issued after the contested invention was made, though applied for before that event,³ nor by any prior private patent granted in any foreign country,⁴ nor by any public patent granted in England, unless the latter was sealed before the person obtaining the American patent made the invention.⁵ In neither of those three cases can it be truly said

¹ American Sulphite Pulp Co. v. Howland Falls Pulp Co., 80 F. R. 398, 1897.

² Doyle v. Spalding, 19 F. R. 746, 1884.

³ American Roll Paper Co. v. Weston, 45 F. R. 689, 1891; Diamond Drill & Machine Co. v. Kelly Bros., 120 F. R. 287, 1902; Anderson v. Collins, 122 F. R. 458, 1903.

⁴ Brooks v. Norcross, 2 Fisher, 661, 1851.

⁵ Siemens v. Sellers, 123 U. S. 283, 1887; Bliss v. Merrill, 33 F. R. 40, 1887; Electrical Accumulator Co. v. Julien Electric Co., 38 F. R. 141, 1889; American Roll Paper Co. v. Weston, 45 F. R. 691, 1891.

that the invention was antecedently patented, and therefore such transactions do not come within the statute. But though novelty is not negatived by any United States patent, issued after the contested invention was made; novelty may be negatived by the prior art, as that art was shown in the specification or the drawing of the application for such a patent, if that application was filed in the Patent Office before the contested invention was made.¹ And novelty is negatived by a full description, in the specification of a prior public patent, of the subject covered by an American patent, even though that subject was not covered by any of the claims of the prior patent, and therefore not patented to the prior inventor.² This rule must result from the fact that whatever is well described in a public patent is set forth to the public, whether it is claimed by the patentee or not. Indeed novelty is negatived by a prior patent which shows the invention in its drawings and describes it in its specification, but does not even state its use.³

§ 56. A printed publication is anything which is printed, and, without any injunction of secrecy, is distributed to any part of the public in any country; and such a publication may negative novelty.⁴ Indeed, it seems reasonable that no actual distribution need occur, but that exposure of printed matter for sale is enough to constitute a printed publication. But the mere existence of a printed thing is not a printed publication,⁵ though its deposit in a public library is.⁶ A drawing, in a prior patent or printed publication, if its meaning is really undeniable, may negative novelty in a later patent on a machine, manufacture, or design.⁷

Inasmuch as drawings can generally give information

¹ *Millett v. Duell*, 96 O. G. 1242, 1901.

² *United States Bung Mfg. Co. v. Independent Bung Co.*, 31 F. R. 79, 1887; *Saunders v. Allen*, 60 F. R. 613, 1894.

³ *Stow v. Chicago*, 104 U. S. 547, 1881.

⁴ *Rosenwasser v. Spieth*, 129 U. S. 47, 1889.

⁵ *Britton v. White Mfg. Co.*, 61 F. R. 95, 1894.

⁶ *John Crossley & Sons v. Hogg*, 83 F. R. 489, 1897.

⁷ *Millett v. Duell*, 96 O. G. 1242, 1901; *Britton v. White Mfg. Co.*, 61 F. R. 96, 1894.

which is as clear as that which words alone can give, relevant to the construction and character of a machine, or manufacture, or design, there is no reason for their not having the same effect on the novelty of subsequent patents. No injustice can result from this rule; because in order to have any effect on such novelty, drawings as well as words, must be able to endure the test stated in the next section.

§ 57. Novelty is not negatived by any prior patent or printed publication, unless the information contained therein, is full enough and precise enough to enable any person skilled in the art to which it relates, to perform the process or make the thing covered by the patent sought to be anticipated.¹ Testimony is not admissible to show that a prior patent or printed publication is out of conformity with the intention of its author.² And expert testimony, though admissible on the question of the meaning of a prior patent or publication, is not weighty, unless it is supported by reasoning; and is not conclusive in court, even if so supported.³ A prior patent or publication needs not to have been reduced to practice, or to be more than a paper proposition, in order to negative the novelty of a later patent.⁴ And a difference, which consists of a mere omission of something which a skillful mechanic would supply, is not fatal to anticipation.⁵ The phrase "skillful mechanic," as used in this connection, does not include mechanics who are skillful only in methods of servile imitation. It refers only to mechanics who know how to vary form without varying substance, and who, in constructing a machine or manufacture, from a printed description, or from Patent Office drawings, could readily, and would

¹ *Seymour v. Osborne*, 11 Wallace, 516, 1870; *Cawood Patent*, 94 U. S. 704, 1876; *Downton v. Milling Co.*, 108 U. S. 466, 1882; *Eames v. Andrews*, 122 U. S. 66, 1886; *Carnegie Steel Co. v. Cambria Iron Co.*, 89 F. R. 737, 1898; *Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. Saranac Lake Electric Light Co.*, 108 F. R. 227, 1901.

² *Badische Anilin & Soda Fabrik v. Kalle*, 94 F. R. 168, 1899; and 104 F. R. 808, 1900.

³ *Hanifen v. Godshalk Co.*, 84 F. R. 652, 1898.

⁴ *E. M. Miller Co. v. Meriden Bronze Co.*, 80 F. R. 525, 1897.

⁵ *Chase v. Fillebrown*, 58 F. R. 378, 1893.

freely, alter proportions and change details in order to adapt the contrivance to a particular use, or in order to secure greater merit of workmanship for the thing constructed.

But prophetic suggestions, in prior patents or publications, of what results can be achieved in a particular art, are not enough to negative the novelty of any patent on an invention which can accomplish that result.¹

And a claim for an article of manufacture may be anticipated by a prior patent or printed publication, which describes the article, without describing any process of making it; provided a knowledge of the article would teach a skillful mechanic some process of making it.²

§ 58. Novelty is not negatived by any prior abandoned application for a patent.³ Abandoned applications for patents are not, by the statutes, made bars to patents to later applicants. They furnish no evidence that the processes or things they describe were ever made or used anywhere. Being only pen and ink representations of what may have existed only as mental conceptions of the men who put them upon paper, they do not prove that the processes or things which they depict were ever known in any country. Nor can they be classed among printed publications, for they are usually in writing, and are not published by the Patent Office. It is true that certified copies of abandoned applications are sometimes obtained, and may be published by those who obtain them, but such a publication will operate as of its own date, and not as of the date of the application.

§ 59. When there is evidence that he who made and abandoned an application for a patent, made also some effort to carry his invention into practical use, then that application is admissible in evidence to aid the court to determine the date and the nature of the invention which was

¹ *Westinghouse Air-Brake Co. v. Great Northern Ry. Co.*, 88 F. R. 263, 1898.

² *Cohn v. Corset Co.*, 93 U. S. 366, 1876; *In re Schaeffer*, 2 App. D. C. 8, 1893.

³ *Corn-planter Patent*, 23 Wal-

lace, 211, 1874; *N. W. Extinguisher Co. v. Phila. Extinguisher Co.*, 1 Bann. & Ard. 177, 1874; *Lyman Ventilating & Refrigerator Co. v. Lalor*, 1 Bann. & Ard. 403, 1874.

sought to be embodied in a working form. If, however, upon the whole of the evidence, it appears that what the inventor did, outside of his abandoned application, did not amount to enough to negative the novelty of a subsequent patent to a later inventor, then that abandoned application becomes immaterial to that issue.¹

§ 60. Novelty is not negatived by any successful application for a patent, nor by any documents pertaining thereto, different from the letters patent issued in pursuance thereof.² When such an application, or such a document, is offered to prove the existence of something which is not shown by the letters patent themselves, the justice and propriety of this rule is apparent. But a successful application may be properly used to prove the date of the invention set forth therein, and claimed in the resulting patent.³

§ 61. Novelty of a machine or manufacture, is not negatived by any prior unpublished drawings, no matter how completely they may exhibit the patented invention,⁴ nor by any prior model, no matter how fully it may coincide with the thing covered by the patent.⁵ The reason of this rule is not stated with fullness in either of the cases which support it, but that reason is deducible from the statute and from the nature of drawings and of models. The statute provides, relevant to the newness of patentable machines and manufactures that they shall not have been previously known or used by others in this country.⁶ Now, it is clear that to use a model or a drawing is not to use the machine

¹ Corn-planter Patent, 23 Wallace, 211, 1874.

² Howes v. McNeal, 5 Bann. & Ard. 77, 1880.

³ Westinghouse v. Gas Co., 43 F. R. 588, 1890; Barnes Co. v. Walworth Co., 51 F. R. 88, 1892; 60 F. R. 606, 1894.

⁴ Ellithorp v. Robertson, 4 Blatch. 309, 1859; Draper v. Potomska Mills, 3 Bann. & Ard. 214, 1878; Detroit Lubricator Mfg. Co. v. Renchard, 9 F. R. 293, 1881;

Odell v. Stout, 22 F. R. 159, 1884; Pennsylvania Diamond Drill Co. v. Simpson, 29 F. R. 291, 1886.

⁵ Cahoon v. Ring, 1 Cliff. 593, 1861; Stainthorp v. Humiston, 4 Fisher, 107, 1864; Johnson v. McCullough, 4 Fisher, 170, 1870; Stillwell & Bierce Mfg. Co. v. The Cincinnati Gas Light & Coke Co., 1 Bann. & Ard. 610, 1875; Bowers v. Von Schmidt, 63 F. R. 577, 1894.

⁶ Revised Statutes, Section 4886.

or manufacture which it represents; and it is equally obvious that to know a drawing or a model is not the same thing as knowing the article which that drawing or model more or less imperfectly pictures to the eye. It follows that neither of those things can negative the newness required by the statute. Nor is the statutory provision on this point lacking in good reasons to support it. Private drawings may be mislaid or hidden, so as to preclude all probability of the public ever deriving any benefit therefrom; and even if they are seen by several or by many, they are apt to be understood by few or by none. Models also are liable to be secluded from view and to suffer change, and thus to fail of propagation. Moreover, if a patent could be defeated by producing a model or a drawing to correspond therewith, and by testifying that it was made at some sufficiently remote point of time in the past, a strong temptation would be offered to perjury. Several considerations of public policy and of private right combine, therefore, to justify the rule of this section.

§ 62. Novelty is not negatived by anything not substantially identical with the subject of the patent, even though the function of the prior process or thing was identical with that of the patented matter. This rule follows from the doctrine that a valid patent may be granted for a new means of producing an old result.¹ But substantial identity in some respects, is consistent with substantial difference in others. For novelty is negatived by a prior process or mechanism which included the subject of the patent, though it also included some other process or device. But if a patented process or thing possesses distinct and apparently important characteristics not possessed by any alleged anticipation, the defense for want of novelty will fail. But a prior process or thing, which will not defeat a patent for want of novelty, may defeat it for want of invention.² It will do so wherever the observed difference corresponds in character

¹ O'Reilly v. Morse, 15 Howard, 62, 1853.

F. R. 209, 1893; Universal Winding Co. v. Willimantic Linen Co.,

² Untermeyer v. Freund, 58

82 F. R. 239, 1897.

with either of those differences between a patented process or thing, and the prior art, which in the second chapter of this book were shown not to constitute invention.

Several judicial opinions contain the statement that "That which infringes, if later, would anticipate, if earlier." But that epigrammatic formula is too broad, and those who have used it must have overlooked the distinction between primary patents and secondary patents. That which would infringe a primary patent, if later, may or may not anticipate that patent, if earlier. Where an inventor believes his invention to be primary, but thinks it may possibly turn out to be secondary; he may properly make his claim in a form that can be construed to fit his invention, in either event. Afterward, when he seeks to suppress a different but competing contrivance, as being an infringement of his claim, when broadly construed; that contrivance may be held to infringe, if later, while not being held to anticipate, if earlier. If the competing contrivance turns out to be earlier, it may have no effect upon his patent, except to relegate it to the secondary position in the art, and thus to limit its claim so narrowly that the competing contrivance does not infringe it. The distinction between primary patents and secondary patents is further developed in sections 184, 359 and 362 of this book.

§ 63. The rule of section 62 will probably govern every case which justly comes within the doctrine that novelty is not negatived by any unsuccessful abandoned experiment. That rule is more comprehensive and reliable than that doctrine, because the latter is subject to such qualifications and explanations that its practical utility in deciding cases is but small. A thing may have been abandoned and still negative the novelty of a thing independently invented long after that abandonment.¹ Such will be the result if the

¹ *Waterman v. Thomson*, 2 *Extinguisher Co.*, 1 *Bann. & Ard.* Fisher, 463, 1863; *Shoup v. Hen-* 177, 1874; *McNish v. Everson*, 5 rici, 2 *Bann. & Ard.* 249, 1876; *Bann. & Ard.* 484, 1880.
N. W. *Extinguisher Co. v. Phila.*

earlier thing was identical with the later, and was used long enough to show that it would work.¹

If an experimental machine or manufacture was unsuccessful in the hands of its contriver, that fact must have been due either to one or more faults of principle, or to one or more faults of construction, or to one or more faults of each of these kinds. If partly or wholly due to any fault of principle, that very fact shows that the unsuccessful device was substantially different from subsequent successful patented things. For that reason alone it would have failed to negative the novelty of those things, even if it had not been unsuccessful. If, on the other hand, a prior device was unsuccessful merely because its construction was weak, it is far from certain that it will not be held to negative the novelty of subsequent devices identical with it in plan, mode of operation, and function.²

The truth, therefore, appears to be that an unsuccessful abandoned experimental machine or manufacture, may possibly negative the novelty of a later invention, and that where it fails to have that effect, it would have failed, even if it had been neither unsuccessful nor abandoned. Novelty is to be ascribed to new things, regardless of whether old and different things were successful or unsuccessful, abandoned or not abandoned. Novelty is to be denied to old things, regardless of the accidents which caused earlier specimens of the same things to fail to operate, or caused their use to be discontinued.

But a court is not called upon to struggle to decipher an anticipation, in the unfinished work and the surmises of earlier students of the same subject.³ And unsuccessful abandoned experiments in processes, cannot be properly held

¹ Gayler v. Wilder, 10 Howard, 477, 1850; Sayles v. Railway Co., 4 Fisher, 588, 1871; Stephenson v. Railroad Co., 14 F. R. 459, 1881; Electrical Accumulator Co. v. Julien Electric Co., 38 F. R. 131,

1889; American Roll Paper Co. v. Weston, 51 F. R. 240, 1892.

² Pickering v. McCullough, 104 U. S. 319, 1881.

³ American Graphophone v. Leeds, 87 F. R. 877, 1898.

to constitute prior uses of successful patented processes in the same art.¹

§ 64. The question of the novelty of a design, is to be determined by the comparative appearance of that design and of prior designs, in the eyes of average observers, and not by their comparative appearance in the eyes of experts making analytical inspections.² Nor is the novelty of any design negatived by the fact that all of its features can be collected out of scattered prior designs.³

§ 65. Novelty is not negatived by anything beneficially incapable of the function of the subject of the patent, even though apparently similar thereto.⁴

In *Morey v. Lockwood*⁵ the prior Mau syringe was set up to negative the novelty of the syringe of Dr. Davidson and his brother. The latter is the well-known soft rubber bulb apparatus. The former was exactly like it, except that the central part was a soft rubber cylinder with metallic heads, instead of a soft rubber bulb. The theoretical mode of operation of the two syringes was the same. But the Mau apparatus proved to be of no practical value, and very few specimens of it were ever sold; because the metallic heads of the cylinder strongly counteracted the user's efforts to compress its rubber walls. For these reasons, the Supreme Court held that it did not negative the novelty of the Davidson patent.

The *Wood Finishing Co. v. Hooper*⁶ is a case the patent involved in which, covered the employment of finely pow-

¹ *Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. Beacon Lamp Co.*, 95 F. R. 464, 1899.

² *Perry v. Starrett*, 3 Bann. & Ard. 489, 1878; *Foster v. Crossin*, 23 F. R. 402, 1885; *Kraus v. Fitzpatrick*, 34 F. R. 39, 1888; *Redway v. Ohio Stove Co.*, 38 F. R. 583, 1889; *Paine v. Snowden*, 46 F. R. 189, 1891; *Anderson v. Saint*, 46 F. R. 763, 1891.

³ *Simpson v. Davis*, 12 F. R. 144, 1882; *Stearns v. Beard*, 46

F. R. 193, 1891; *New York Belting Co. v. New Jersey Car Spring Co.*, 48 F. R. 557, 1891; *Matthews & Willard Mfg. Co. v. American Lamp & Brass Co.*, 103 F. R. 639, 1900.

⁴ *Crown Cork & Seal Co. v. Ideal Stopper Co.*, 123 F. R. 666, 1903.

⁵ *Morey v. Lockwood*, 8 Wallace, 230, 1868.

⁶ *Bridgeport Wood Finishing Co. v. Hooper*, 5 F. R. 63, 1880.

dered flint, quartz, or feldspar, mixed with oil or other fluent substance, for the purpose of filling the pores of the surface of wood. A prior patent had been granted for the employment of silicious marl or infusorial earth for the same purpose. It was shown that all five of these substances consisted mainly of silica, but that the first three differed from the last two in being non-absorbent instead of porous, and in consisting of angular instead of rounded particles. These two differences made the first three substances very valuable for wood-filling, whereas the others were not valuable for that purpose. Judge NATHANIEL SHIPMAN, therefore, decided that the prior patent did not negative the novelty of the later one.

*Matheson v. Campbell*¹ is a case which was based on a patent for a black dye stuff named "naphthol-black." A prior dye stuff, named "azo-black," though made from a different starting material, was chemically identical with "naphthol-black," or was at least chemically equivalent thereto. But the two dye stuffs were not beneficially alike; because "azo-black" rubbed off very badly, and "naphthol-black" was so superior thereto, that the latter dye stuff entirely superseded the former, in actual use. Judge TOWNSEND, therefore, decided that "azo-black" did not negative the novelty of "naphthol-black."

§ 66. Novelty is not negatived by antiquity of parts.² This rule follows from the doctrine which allows patents for new combinations of old elements or ingredients. In such cases the whole is different from the sum of all its parts, much as this printed page is different from what it would be, if the same words were arranged in alphabetical order.

¹ *Matheson v. Campbell*, 77 F. R. 282, 1896.

² *Bates v. Coc*, 98 U. S. 48, 1878; *Imhaeuser v. Buerk*, 101 U. S. 600, 1879; *Parks v. Booth*, 102 U. S. 104, 1880; *Cantrell v. Wallick*, 117 U. S. 694, 1885; *Johnson v. Railroad Co.*, 33 F. R. 501, 1888; *Consolidated Roller Mill*

Co. v. Coombs, 39 F. R. 32, 1889; *Bryam v. Friedberger*, 82 O. G. 1420, 1897; *A. B. Dick Co. v. Belke & Wagner Co.*, 86 F. R. 149, 1897; *German-American Filter Co. v. Erdrich*, 98 F. R. 308, 1899; *Goss Printing-Press Co. v. Scott*, 103 F. R. 657, 1900.

If, however, a new assemblage of old things amounts only to aggregation and not to combination,¹ or if it results in no new mode of operation,² the patent which covers it will be void for want of invention, though not void for want of novelty.

§ 67. Novelty is not negatived by any prior accidental occurrence or production, the character and function of which was not recognized until later than the date of the patented invention sought to be anticipated thereby.³ The reason of this rule arises out of that point of patent law policy, which rewards persons for teaching the public how to perform processes and construct things which nobody else in the United States knew how to perform or to construct, and relevant to which no adequate information could be found in any public patent or printed publication anywhere in the world. But novelty is negatived by proof of prior use of a process, where that use was understood in point of method, though not correctly understood in point of result.⁴

§ 68. Novelty is not negatived by anything which was neither designed, nor apparently adapted, nor actually used, to perform the function of the thing covered by the patent, though it might have been made to perform that function by means not substantially different from that of the patented invention;⁵ but this rule cannot govern any case which

¹ *Adams v. Stamping Co.*, 141 U. S. 542, 1891; *Campbell v. Bailey*, 45 F. R. 565, 1891.

² *Burt v. Evory*, 133 U. S. 349, 1890; *Florsheim v. Schilling*, 137 U. S. 77, 1890.

³ *Tilghman v. Proctor*, 102 U. S. 711, 1880; *Ransom v. New York*, 1 Fisher, 256, 1856; *Pelton v. Waters*, 1 Bann. & Ard. 399, 1874; *Andrews v. Carman*, 2 Bann. & Ard. 277, 1876; *Pittsburgh Reduction Co. v. Cowles Electric Co.*, 55 F. R. 307, 1893; *Chase v. Fillebrown*, 58 F. R. 377, 1893; *Taylor Burner Co. v. Diamond*, 72

F. R. 184, 1896; *National Harrow Co. v. Quick*, 74 F. R. 240, 1896; *Wickelman v. A. B. Dick Co.*, 88 F. R. 266, 1898; *Tannage Patent Co. v. Donallan*, 93 F. R. 821, 1899.

⁴ *Dorlon v. Guic*, 25 F. R. 816, 1885; *Schultz Belting Co. v. Belting Co.*, 40 F. R. 156, 1889.

⁵ *Topliff v. Topliff*, 145 U. S. 161, 1892; *Carnegie Steel Co. v. Cambria Iron Co.*, 185 U. S. 422, 1902; *Knickerbocker Co. v. Rogers*, 61 F. R. 297, 1894; *Kinnear & Sager Co. v. Capital Sheet-Metal Co.*, 81 F. R. 492, 1897:

lacks either of the circumstances upon which it is founded, for negation of novelty is not averted by the mere fact that the inventor of the prior device did not design it to perform the function of the patented device,¹ nor by the mere fact that its ability to perform that function is not apparent to every beholder, nor by the mere fact that it was never actually used for that purpose, nor by any two of these facts combined.

§ 69. Novelty is not negatived by anything which was invented, patented, or described in a printed publication prior to the granting of the patent sought to be anticipated, or even prior to the application therefor, unless the anticipating event occurred prior to the date of the invention secured by that patent.²

One apparent exception to this rule has been stated in one leading case by the Supreme Court,³ and indorsed in another good precedent by Judge McKINNON.⁴ In those instances it was said that where two patents for the same invention are granted to the same inventor, the last, and not the first, is void, even where the last was first applied for. The exception is, however, only apparent, because the patent last applied for is as much entitled to date from the making of the invention as the other. The date of invention assignable to the two patents being exactly the same, the first patent will negative the novelty of the last, regardless of which was first applied for. The saying of the Supreme Court in this matter is not inconsistent with the rule that, in the absence of other evidence of the dates of inven-

Bowers v. San Francisco Bridge Co., 91 F. R. 410, 1898; *National Hollow Brake-Beam Co. v. Interchangeable Brake-Beam Co.*, 10 F. R. 702, 1901.

¹ *Leonard v. Lovell*, 29 F. R. 315, 1886.

² *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U. S. 791, 1876; *Elizabeth v. Pavement Co.*, 97 U. S. 130, 1877; *Clark Thread Co. v. Willimantic Linen*

Co., 140 U. S. 486, 1891; *Pacific Cable Ry. Co. v. Butte City Ry. Co.*, 58 F. R. 422, 1893; *Western Electric Co. v. Capital Telephone & Telegraph Co.*, 86 F. R. 771, 1898.

³ *Suffolk Co. v. Hayden*, 3 Wallace, 315, 1865.

⁴ *McMillin v. Rees*, 5 Bann. & Ard. 269, 1880.

tion, the first application must be taken to represent the first invention,¹ because the fact of an identical inventor is evidence in such cases that the date of invention was identical.

And the saying in *Suffolk Co. v. Hayden* has no applicability to a case where an inventor takes out a patent which describes and claims what was described but not claimed in a prior patent of his, because in such a case the prior patent is not for the same invention as the last.²

Where several patents are granted to one inventor on different inventions in the same art, the dates of their applications, instead of the dates of the patents themselves, in the absence of evidence of the dates of the making of the respective inventions, determine the relative rank of those patents in the art to which they belong.³

§ 70. In order to apply the rule of the last section, it is necessary to fix the date of the invention covered by the patent sought to be anticipated. In cases where the invention may be exhibited in a drawing or in a model, it will date from the completion of such a model or such a drawing as is sufficiently plain to enable those skilled in the art to understand the invention;⁴ and patented inventions always date at least as early as the dates of the execution of the original applications therefor, provided the original applications exhibit the inventions with the above-mentioned extent of sufficiency.⁵ In cases where a patented

¹ *Pope Mfg. Co. v. Gormully Mfg. Co.*, 144 U. S. 244, 1892; *Pennington v. King*, 7 F. R. 462, 1881.

² *Suffolk Co. v. Hayden*, 3 Wallace, 315, 1865; *Singer v. Braunsdorf*, 7 Blatch. 521, 1870; *Wheeler v. McCormick*, 11 Blatch. 334, 1873; *Graham v. McCormick*, 5 Bann. & Ard. 244, 1880; *McMillin v. Rees*, 5 Bann. & Ard. 269, 1880; *Graham v. Mfg. Co.*, 11 F. R. 138, 1880.

³ *Barbed Wire Patent*, 143 U. S. 281, 1892.

⁴ *Loom Co. v. Higgins*, 105 U. S. 594, 1881; *Deering v. Harvester Works*, 155 U. S. 298, 1894; *Heath v. Hildreth*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 24, 1841; *Perry v. Cornell*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 78, 1847; *Farley v. Steam Gauge Co.*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 621, 1859; *Hubel v. Dick*, 28 F. R. 139, 1886; *Von Schmidt v. Bowers*, 80 F. R. 140, 1897.

⁵ *Kearney v. Railroad Co.*, 32 F. R. 322, 1887; *National Machine Co. v. Brown*, 36 F. R. 321, 1888.

invention was explained in words, without the aid of any model or any drawing, it will date from the completion of such a written description as would teach others how to make and use the invention described. In cases where the inventor makes a specimen of the thing invented, before he makes any model, or drawing, or written description to represent that thing, the invention will date from the completion of that specimen. Perfection is not necessary to such a specimen in order to entitle it to such an effect. Substantial completeness is enough.¹ And where the distinguishing characteristic of an invention, consists of a composition of matter capable of considerable variations in its ingredients; the invention will date from the time when the first of those variations was reduced to successful practice.²

No invention ought to date from any day wherein it had no existence or representation outside of the mind of the inventor, no matter how clear or how complete his mental conception of its character and mode of operation may have been. Mental conceptions are not useful inventions until they are so embodied that the world could use them after the deaths of the persons who conceived them.³ To allow inventions to take date from mental conceptions, would strongly tempt inventors to commit perjury in order to appear to anticipate real anticipations of their patents.

Whether an oral description given by the inventor to another, of a subsequently patented invention, can give that invention a date earlier than that to which it would otherwise be entitled, depends upon the nature of the invention and the capacity of the hearer to understand it and remember it. Where an invention is abstruse or is complicated, and where it is not certain that the hearer understood it and has remembered it well enough to communicate it to the world in case of the inventor's death, the invention

¹ National Cash Register Co. v. Store Service Co., 60 F. R. 603, 1894; Coffee v. Guerrant, 68 O. G. 279, 1894.

² American Sulphite Pulp Co. v.

Howland Falls Pulp Co., 80 F. R. 401, 1897.

³ Clark Thread Co. v. Willimantic Linen Co., 140 U. S. 489, 1891.

ought not to date from such a description.¹ But where it is shown that the person to whom such an oral description was given, understood it completely, and has remembered it accurately, a patented invention may date back to that oral description.² The reason for allowing a patented invention to date back to an oral or a written description, or to a drawing or a model, as the case may be, while an unpatented invention, which is set up to negative the novelty of a patented invention, is not allowed to date back to either of those things, resides in the fact that those things are incipient in their nature, and in the principle that an invention which is ultimately developed and given to the world in a patent, ought equitably to date from such an incipency, while the rights of a patentee ought not to be impaired by a similar incipency, which was never developed into a patent.³

When a patent is questioned in point of novelty, and when that question depends upon the date of the invention claimed in that patent, it is not material whether the event, which constituted that invention, occurred in the United States or in some other country.⁴

§ 71. Novelty is negatived by prior knowledge and use in this country, by even a single person, of the thing patented.⁵ This rule applies even to cases where that knowledge and use were purposely kept secret;⁶ and it applies no matter how limited that use may have been.⁷

¹ *Stephens v. Salisbury*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 385, 1855.

² *Philadelphia & Trenton R. R. v. Stimpson*, 14 Peters, 448, 1840; *Stephens v. Salisbury*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 385, 1855; *Hill v. Dunklee*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 483, 1857; *Davidson v. Lewis*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 599, 1858; *McCormick Machine Co. v. Harvester Works*, 42 F. R. 153, 1890; *Morrow v. Shoemaker*, 59 F. R. 122, 1893.

³ *Bowers v. Von Schmidt*, 63 F. R. 577, 1894.

⁴ *Hanifen v. E. H. Godshalk Co.*, 78 F. R. 811, 1896; *Hanifen v. Price*, 96 F. R. 441, 1899; *Welsh Light Co. v. American Incandescent Lamp Co.*, 98 F. R. 399.

⁵ *Offin v. Ogden*, 18 Wallace, 1873; *Brush v. Condit*, 132 U. S. 39, 1889.

⁶ *Reed v. Cutter*, 1 Story, 598, 1841.

⁷ *Bedford v. Hunt*, 1 Mason, 301, 1817; *Rich v. Lippincott*, 2 Fisher, 2, 1853.

In *Gayler v. Wilder*¹ the Supreme Court announced an exception to this rule, but in a later case it intimated a denial, or at least a doubt, of the validity of that exception.² According to the opinion of a majority of the court in the first case, a single instance of prior knowledge and use will not negative novelty, if that use had ceased when the patent was granted, and that knowledge was forgotten until called to mind by the reinvention.

This is the doctrine that novelty is not negated by a forgotten art, even if that art is remembered again by one who formerly knew it, when his mind is prompted by new knowledge of its reinvention by another. This doctrine is applicable to a forgotten "art" or "process;" because a process is intangible and exists only while its constituent acts are being performed. But the doctrine of lost or forgotten arts is not applicable to a machine or a manufacture, which still exists in its entirety, and can be found whenever it is diligently sought, and can be understood whenever it is intelligently inspected. In *Gayler v. Wilder*, the doctrine was applied to the use of gypsum in the spaces between the walls of iron safes. But the doctrine is not applicable to any composition of matter, which is patentable independent of any environment, and which still exists, and can be found and identified, when it is sought and analyzed. Nor is the doctrine applicable to a design, which may have remained forgotten and unseen in a book in a library for many years, but which can be found by regular searching, and can be appreciated when it is found.

§ 72. Novelty is also negated by evidence that even one specimen of the thing patented, existed and was known in this country prior to its invention by the patentee, even though it was not used prior to that time.³ This rule results from the statute which provides that things, in order to be

¹ *Gayler v. Wilder*, 10 Howard, 477, 1850.

² *Coffin v. Ogden*, 18 Wallace, 125, 1873.

³ *Corn-Planter Patent*, 23 Wallace, 220, 1874; *Parker v. Fergu-*

son, 1 Blatch. 408, 1849; *Pitts v. Wemple*, 2 Fisher. 15, 1855; *Stitt v. Railroad Co.*, 22 F. R. 650, 1884; *Universal Winding Co. v. Willimantic Linen Co.*, 82 F. R. 239, 1897.

patentable, must not have been known or used by others in this country.¹ If, however, the identity of the patented and the prior article can be known only by actual use, and if the prior article never was actually used till after the date of the patented invention, then its prior existence will not negative novelty.² In that case though its existence was known prior to the invention of the patented thing, it was not known to be what the patented thing afterward was. Knowledge, in order to negative novelty, must include knowledge of the character, as well as knowledge of the existence, of the prior thing.

§ 73. Negation of novelty is not averted by the fact that the inventor had no knowledge of the anticipating matter when he made the invention covered by the patent.³ The patent laws do not reward people for producing things which, though new to them, are old to others in this country.

§ 74. Negation of novelty in a machine is not averted by the fact that the anticipating machine operated upon a different material.⁴ A negation of novelty in a manufacture or a composition of matter, is not averted by the fact that the anticipating substance was made by a different process, or derived from a different source, from that which produced the patented substance; for it does not make an old thing new to derive it from a new and unexpected quarter⁵ or to make it by a new and improved method.⁶

§ 75. Questions of novelty are questions of fact.⁷ This point is very obvious, except in cases where the prior thing is a patent or printed publication. In those cases it may

¹ Revised Statutes, Section 4886.

² *Sayles v. Railway Co.*, 4 Fisher, 588, 1871; *Stitt v. Railroad Co.*, 22 F. R. 650, 1884.

³ *Derby v. Thompson*, 146 U. S. 481, 1892; *Many v. Sizer*, 1 Fisher, 19, 1849; *New Departure Bell Co. v. Bevin Bros. Mfg. Co.*, 73 F. R. 476, 1896; *Universal Winding Co. v. Willimantic Linen Co.*, 82 F. R. 240, 1897.

⁴ *United States Peg Wood, S. &*

L. B. Co. v. B. F. Sturtevant Co., 122 F. R. 472, 1903.

⁵ *Cochrane v. Badische Anilin & Soda Fabrik*, 111 U. S. 311, 1883; *Badische Anilin & Soda Fabrik v. Cummins*, 4 Bann. & Ard. 490, 1879.

⁶ *Cottle v. Krementz*, 31 F. R. 42, 1887.

⁷ *Battin v. Taggert*, 17 Howard, 74, 1854; *Turrill v. Railroad Co.*, 1 Wallace, 491, 1863.

be supposed that questions of novelty are questions of law arising on the construction of documents. The point has, however, been settled by the Supreme Court, in a case involving the consideration of a prior patent, and bearing with equal logical force upon a prior printed publication.¹ In that case it was held that the question whether the novelty of a patent is negatived by a prior patent, depends not upon the construction of the latter, but depends rather upon the outward embodiment of the terms contained in the latter document; and that such outward embodiment is to be properly sought, like the explanation of latent ambiguities arising from the description of external things, by evidence *in pais*. The court accordingly indorsed the proposition that such questions belong to the province of evidence, and not to that of construction; and said that even where no testimony is required to explain the terms of art or the description contained in the respective documents, the question is still to be treated as a question of fact.

§ 76. The burden of proof of a want of novelty rests upon him who avers it, and every reasonable doubt should be resolved against him.² Novelty can only be negatived by proof which puts the fact beyond a reasonable doubt.³ But

¹ *Bischoff v. Wethered*, 9 Wallace, 812, 1869.

² *Coffin v. Ogden*, 18 Wallace, 120, 1873; *Cantrell v. Wallick*, 117 U. S. 696, 1885; *Parham v. Machine Co.*, 4 Fisher, 482, 1871; *Webster Loom Co. v. Higgins*, 4 Bann. & Ard. 88, 1879; *Shirley v. Sanderson*, 8 F. R. 908, 1881; *Green v. French*, 11 F. R. 591, 1882; *Duffy v. Reynolds*, 24 F. R. 858, 1885; *Dreyfus v. Schneider*, 25 F. R. 481, 1885; *Osborne v. Glazier*, 31 F. R. 404, 1887; *Smith v. Davis*, 34 F. R. 785, 1888; *Howar v. Plow Works*, 35 F. R. 745, 1888; *Pacific Cable Ry. Co. v. Butte City Ry. Co.*, 55 F. R. 764, 1893; *Kinnear & Gager Co. v.*

Capital Sheet-Metal Co., 81 F. R. 492, 1897.

³ *Barbed Wire Patent*, 143 U. S. 284, 1892; *Wood v. Mill Co.*, 4 Fisher, 560, 1871; *Hawes v. Antisdell*, 2 Bann. & Ard. 10, 1875; *Bignall v. Harvey*, 5 Bann. & Ard. 636, 1880; *Worswick Mfg. Co. v. Buffalo*, 20 F. R. 126, 1884; *Thayer v. Hart*, 20 F. R. 694, 1884; *Everest v. Oil Co.*, 20 F. R. 849, 1884; *American Bell Telephone Co. v. People's Telephone Co.*, 22 F. R. 313, 1884; *McDonald v. Whitney*, 24 F. R. 600, 1885; *Jennings v. Kibbe*, 24 F. R. 698, 1885; *Wetherell v. Keith*, 27 F. R. 364, 1886; *Hobbie v. Smith*, 27 F. R. 659, 1886; *Cohansey Mfg. Co. v. Whar-*

such proof can be made with less evidence, where anticipation is probable, than where it is less to be expected.¹ And testimony of want of novelty is not overthrown, by *prima facie* improbability that has been explained away;² or by innocent errors on collateral points;³ or even by impeaching a principal witness, if his testimony is shown to be true by other evidence, which his bad character could not vitiate.⁴ The unsupported oral testimony of one witness is seldom strong enough to negative the novelty of the patent beyond a reasonable doubt;⁵ and the oral testimony of many witnesses, if unsupported by any evidence consisting of documents or things, must be very reasonable and very strong, in order to negative novelty.⁶ This rule of reasonable doubt applies where the question of novelty depends upon the identity of the patented thing or process with the alleged anticipation; as well as where that question depends upon the existence or the priority of the latter.⁷

ton, 28 F. R. 191, 1886; American Bell Telephone Co. v. Globe Telephone Co., 31 F. R. 733, 1887; Hunt Bros. Packing Co. v. Cassidy, 53 F. R. 260, 1893; Dodge v. Post, 76 F. R. 809, 1896; National Hollow Brake-Beam Co. v. Interchangeable Brake-Beam Co., 106 F. R. 703, 1901; Young v. Wolfe, 120 F. R. 959, 1903.

¹ Lee v. Upson & Hart Co., 43 F. R. 670, 1890; Rochester Coach Lace Co. v. Schaefer, 46 F. R. 190, 1891; Moline Plow Co. v. Parlin & Orendorff Co., 84 F. R. 351, 1897.

² Parlin & Orendorff Co. v. Moline Plow Co., 89 F. R. 330, 1898; Diamond Drill & Machine Co. v. Kelly Bros., 120 F. R. 299, 1903.

³ Simmonds v. Morrison, 44 F. R. 762, 1891.

⁴ Olin v. Timken, 155 U. S. 152, 1894; Timken v. Olin, 37 F. R. 207, 1888.

⁵ Bowman v. DeGraw, 60 F. R. 911, 1894; Mast, Foos & Co. v. Dempster Mill Mfg. Co., 82 F. R. 332, 1897; Single Track Overhead Ry. Mfg. Co. v. Roden, 98 F. R. 619, 1895; Peters v. Union Biscuit Co., 120 F. R. 683, 1903.

⁶ Barbed Wire Patent, 143 U. S. 284, 1892; Deering v. Harvester Works, 155 U. S. 300, 1894; American Roll Paper Co. v. Weston, 59 F. R. 150, 1893; Knickerbocker Co. v. Rogers, 61 F. R. 297, 1894; Pratt v. Sencenbaugh, 64 F. R. 781, 1893; Campbell Printing-Press Co. v. Marden, 64 F. R. 785, 1894; Wickes v. Lockwood, 65 F. R. 611, 1895; Singer Mfg. Co. v. Schenck, 68 F. R. 194, 1895.

⁷ Pittsburgh Reduction Co. v. Aluminum Co., 55 F. R. 308, 1892; Simonds Rolling-Mach. Co. v. Hathorn Mfg. Co., 93 F. R. 961, 1899.

Where an anticipating fact prior to the date of a patent is proved beyond reasonable doubt, the burden is shifted to the plaintiff to prove, by convincing preponderance of evidence, that his invention was made still earlier than that fact occurred; and if the plaintiff does not introduce enough evidence to strongly outweigh whatever evidence is introduced to the contrary, the patent must be held to be void for want of novelty.¹

¹ Clark Thread Co. *v.* Willimantic Linen Co., 140 U. S. 492, 1891; Caverly *v.* Deere, 52 F. R. 760, 1892; Curtis *v.* Atlanta Street Railway Co., 56 F. R. 600, 1892; Simmons *v.* Standard Oil Co., 62 F. R. 930, 1894; Ecaubert *v.* Appleton, 67 F. R. 925, 1895; Brooks *v.* Sacks, 81 F. R. 405, 1897; Rog-

ers *v.* Fitch, 81 F. R. 962, 1897; Wheaton *v.* Kendall, 85 F. R. 672, 1898; Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. *v.* Saranac Lake Electric Light Co., 108 F. R. 222, 1901; Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. *v.* Catskill Illuminating & Power Co., 121 F. R. 832, 1903.

CHAPTER IV.

UTILITY.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 77. Utility necessary to patentability. | 82. Functions which sometimes work evil, and sometimes work good. |
| 78. Utility is negatived by lack of function. | 83. Functions thought by some to be good, and by others to be bad. |
| 79. Perfection not necessary to utility. | 84. Good functions in wrong places. |
| 80. Beauty has utility. | 85. Doubts relevant to utility to be solved against infringers. |
| 81. Utility is negatived where function is evil. | |

§ 77. THE useful arts are those that Congress is authorized by the Constitution to promote, and accordingly the statute includes utility among the qualities which a process or a thing must have in order to be patentable.¹ To possess utility, a thing or a process must be capable of producing a result, and that result must be a good result. Both these elements inhere in the meaning of the word; and they are so distinct as to require separate explanation.

§ 78. Utility is absent from all processes and devices which cannot be used to perform their specified functions, and patents for such subjects are therefore void.² This rule applies even to cases in which, by simply adding new elements to useless contrivances, highly useful inventions are produced.

In *Burrall v. Jewett*,³ the patent covered the cylinder of a threshing-machine, having rows of teeth inserted in its convex surface and revolving within a barrel which had no teeth. The contrivance was confessedly useless. After the patent for it was granted, the patentee, or some other per-

¹ Revised Statutes, Section 4886.

² *Coupe v. Royer*, 155 U. S. 574, 1895; *Bliss v. Brooklyn*, 10 Blatch. 522, 1873; *Rowe v. Blanchard*, 18 Wisconsin, 465, 1864; *Carter Ma-*

chine Co. v. Hanes, 70 F. R. 864, 1895.

³ *Burrall v. Jewett*, 2 Paige, 143, 1830.

son, by simply inserting rows of teeth in the concave surface of the barrel, produced the successful threshing-machine, which has everywhere succeeded the ancient flail. The law applicable to these facts was stated by Chancellor WALWORTH in the following terms: "The patent is void if the machine will not answer the purpose for which it was intended, without some addition, adjustment, or alteration, which the mechanic who is to construct it must introduce of his own invention, and which had not been invented or discovered by the patentee at the time his patent was issued."

In *Bliss v. Brooklyn*¹ the patent covered a certain hose-coupling. The contrivance was worthless, because it proved on trial to be inoperative. The subsequent addition of a lug to one of its parts, transferred the coupling into a useful invention. Judge BENEDICT nevertheless held the patent to be invalid for want of utility.

§ 79. If, however, an invention performs a good function, though but imperfectly, its utility is not negatived by the fact that it is susceptible of improvement, which will make it operate much better,² nor by the fact that some prior invention performed the same function quite as well,³ or even performed it with superior excellence.⁴ Nor is utility negatived by later inventions which are so much superior to the patented process or thing, that they entirely superseded the use of the latter.⁵ Indeed, patents are never held to be void for want of utility, merely because the things covered by them perform their functions but poorly.⁶ In such cases no harm results to the public from the exclusive right, because few will use the invention, and because those who do use it without permission, will seldom or never be obliged to pay

¹ *Bliss v. Brooklyn*, 10 Blatch. 522, 1883.

² *Wheeler v. Reaper Co.*, 10 Blatch. 189, 1872; *Mergenthaler Co. v. Press Pub. Co.*, 57 F. R. 505, 1893; *Crowa Cork & Seal Co. v. Aluminum Stopper Co.*, 108 F. R. 848, 1901.

³ *Seymour v. Osborne*, 11 Wallace, 516, 1870; *Shaw v. Lead Co.*, 11 F. R. 715, 1882.

⁴ *Bell v. Daniels*, 1 Fisher, 375, 1858.

⁵ *Railway Co. v. Sayles*, 97 U. S. 559, 1878; *Poppenhusen v. Comb Co.*, 2 Fisher, 72, 1858; *McComb v. Ernest*, 1 Woods, 203, 1871.

⁶ *Vance v. Campbell*, 1 Fisher, 485, 1859; *Conover v. Roach*, 4 Fisher, 16, 1857.

for that use, anything beyond the small benefit they may really have realized therefrom.¹

§ 80. Utility in a manufacture, is not negatived by the fact that it has no function except to decorate the object to which it is designed to be attached.² In such case utility resides in beauty. Whatever is beautiful is useful, because beauty gives pleasure, and pleasure is a kind of happiness, and happiness is a kind of utility.

§ 81. Utility is negatived if the function performed by an invention is injurious to the morals, the health, or the good order of society.³ An invention to improve the art of forgery, or one to facilitate the spread of a contagious disease, or one to render air or water intoxicating, would of course be unpatentable for want of utility. The more completely such an invention could perform its function, the more objectionable it would be in this respect. But utility is not negatived by the fact that the article covered by a patent is an imitation of a natural substance,⁴ except where the imitation is a fraudulent counterfeit.⁵

§ 82. An important question relevant to utility in this aspect, may hereafter arise and call for judicial decision. It is perhaps true, for example, that the invention of Colt's revolver was injurious to the morals, and injurious to the health, and injurious to the good order of society. That instrument of death may have been injurious to morals, in tending to tempt and to promote the gratification of private revenge. It may have been injurious to health, in that it is very liable to accidental discharge, and to thereby cause wounds, and even homicide. It may also have been injurious to good order, especially in the newer parts of the country, because it facilitates and increases private warfare among

¹ *Gibbs v. Hoefner*, 19 F. R. 324, 1884.

² *Magie Ruffle Co. v. Douglas*, 2 Fisher, 330, 1863.

³ *Bedford v. Hunt*, 1 Mason, 301, 1817; *National Device Co. v. Lloyd*, 40 F. R. 89, 1889; *Reliance Novelty Co. v. Dworzek*, 80 F. R.

902, 1897; *Schultze v. Holtz*, 82 F. R. 448, 1897.

⁴ *In re Corbin and Martlett*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 521, 1857.

⁵ *Rickard v. DuBon*, 103 F. R. 868, 1900.

frontiersmen. On the other hand, the revolver, by furnishing a ready means of self-defense, may sometimes have prompted morals and health and good order. By what test, therefore, is utility to be determined in such cases? Is it to be done by balancing the good functions with the evil functions? Or is everything useful within the meaning of the law, if it is used, or is designed and adapted to be used, to accomplish a good result, though in fact it is oftener used, or is as well or even better adapted to be used, to accomplish a bad one? Or is utility negatived by the mere fact that the thing in question is sometimes injurious to morals, or to health, or to good order? The third hypothesis cannot stand, because if it could, it would be fatal to patents for steam-engines, dynamos, electric railroads, and indeed many of the noblest inventions of the nineteenth century. The first hypothesis cannot stand, because if it could it would make the validity of the patents to depend on a question of fact, to which it would often be impossible to give a reliable answer. The second hypothesis is the only one which is consistent with the reason of the case, and with the practical construction which the courts have given to the statutory requirement of utility.¹

§ 83. Another question revelant to utility of function will sooner or later demand the attention of counsel and of courts. A particular invention may invariably perform one specific function, which function is deemed good in some quarters, and in other quarters is thought to be bad. The function performed by a newly invented smoking-pipe, would be thought by many persons to be only evil, and that continually: would be deemed by many moralists to be injurious to the morals, and by many physicians to be injurious to the health of the people. On the other hand, there are many other persons who would regard such an invention as truly useful. Personal opinion cannot control the decision of such a question, for if it could there would be no stability to the jurisprudence of the subject. Nor ought former custom to be the criterion, for if it were, each age would be hampered by a prior and lower civilization. It seems, there-

¹ Fuller v. Berger, 120 F. R. 275, 1903.

fore, that in such cases of divided personal opinion on ethical questions, the only criterion of decision is the average public sentiment of the time when such a question arises.¹ Accordingly, the courts at present uphold patents which relate to tobacco, and will probably always sustain the utility of inventions which perform functions that average public sentiment is willing to have performed.

§ 84. Utility is negatived by the fact that the patented process or thing is injurious to the thing to which it is applicable,² and also by the fact that the function performed by the patented part of a machine, though good in itself, is injurious to the utility of the machine as a whole.³ The first of these points is well illustrated by the first case cited in this section: a case based on a patent for a process of treating leather to an application of fat liquor. The second point is equally well illustrated by the second case: a case based on a patent for a locomotive spark arrester. To arrest sparks is in itself a good thing to do, but where it must be done in such a way as to stop or seriously retard the locomotive, it is not desirable to attempt it. Therefore a device which would arrest sparks, but only at the expense of retarding the locomotive, from the smoke-pipe of which they issued, was rightly held to be wanting in utility.

§ 85. A patent is *prima facie* evidence of utility,⁴ and doubts relevant to the question should be resolved against infringers,⁵ because it is improbable that men will render themselves liable to actions for infringement, unless infringement is useful.⁶

¹ Pope Mfg. Co. v. Gormully, 144 U. S. 233, 1892.

² Klein v. Russell, 19 Wallace, 433, 1873.

³ Wilton v. Railroad Co., 1 Brightley's Federal Digest, 618, 1849.

⁴ Vance v. Campbell, 1 Fisher, 483, 1859; Crown Cork & Seal Co. v. Aluminum Stopper Co., 108 F. R. 848, 1901.

⁵ Western Electric Co. v. La Rue, 139 U. S. 608, 1891; Whitney v. Mowry, 4 Fisher, 215, 1870.

⁶ Lehnbeuter v. Holthaus, 105 U. S. 94, 1881; Gandy v. Belting Co., 143 U. S. 595, 1892; La Rue v. Electric Co., 31 F. R. 82, 1887; Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. Beacon Lamp Co., 95 F. R. 464, 1899; Goss Printing-Press Co. v. Scott, 108 F. R. 258, 1901.

CHAPTER V.

ABANDONMENT.

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 86. The several sorts of abandonment. | 98. Degree of identity necessarily involved between the thing constructively abandoned and the thing patented. |
| 87. Abandonment of inventions. | 99. Making, works no constructive abandonment. |
| 88. Actual abandonment of inventions. | 100. Public knowledge, works no constructive abandonment. |
| 89. Actual abandonment by express declaration. | 101. Public use or sale in a foreign country. |
| 90. Actual abandonment by formal disclaimer. | 103. Constructive abandonment after application, and before issue of letters patent. |
| 91. Actual abandonment resulting from laches before application. | 104. Rules of constructive abandonment are inflexible. |
| 92. Actual abandonment resulting from laches after application and before issue of letters patent. | 104a. Constructive abandonment in four new classes of cases. |
| 93. Constructive abandonment before application. | 105. Surrender of letters patent. |
| 94. "Public use," defined and delineated. | 106. Abandonment of invention after letters patent, unknown to the law. |
| 95. Experimental use. | 107. Acquiescence in unlicensed use of patented invention. |
| 96. "On sale," delineated and defined. | 108. Questions of abandonment are questions of fact. |
| 97. Sale of inchoate right to a patent. | |

§ 86. AN inventor may abandon an unsuccessful endeavor to make an invention; or having made an invention, he may abandon it to the public; or having made an invention and having applied for a patent thereon, he may abandon that application without abandoning that invention. Transactions of the first sort are commonly called unsuccessful abandoned experiments. They confer no rights upon those who make them, and they affect no rights of any other person.¹ Transactions of the third sort are

¹ *Deering v. Harvester Works*, 155 U. S. 302, 1894; *American Bell Telephone Co. v. Cushman Telephone Co.*, 35 F. R. 734, 1888;

treated in the chapter on applications; the sixth chapter of this book. Transactions of the second sort require treatment in respect that they are inventions; and also require separate treatment in respect that they are abandoned. Treatment of the first sort takes no account of the fact of abandonment, because abandoned inventions have the same effect on the rights of subsequent inventors that they would have if they had not been abandoned.¹ That subject, therefore, does not belong to this chapter. It is treated in the chapters on invention and letters patent, where the state of the art is a very important factor in the discussion; and also in the chapter on novelty, where anticipation is the point of inquiry. Treatment of the second sort indicated above, is the special function and scope of this chapter. Abandoned inventions are here considered with regard to the effect abandonment of them has upon the rights of their inventors, and with regard to the rules by means of which abandonment is to be affirmed or denied in particular cases.

§ 87. Abandonment of an invention may be actual, or it may be constructive. It is actual when it is the result of intention.² It is constructive when it is the result of some statute which operates regardless of the intention of the inventor. The two sorts require and will receive separate treatment in this chapter, but there are some points of fact and of law which apply equally to both. Either kind may occur before any application for a patent is made, or may occur after such an application, and before any letters patent are issued.³ So also, either actual or constructive abandonment of an invention, is fatal to the validity of any patent that may afterward be granted therefor. The inchoate right to a patent when once abandoned can never be resumed; for where gifts are once made to the public, they become absolute and irrevocable.⁴

Brush Electric Co. v. Ft. Wayne Electric Co., 44 F. R. 284, 1890; Ecaubert v. Appleton, 67 F. R. 922, 1895.

¹ Olds v. Brown, 41 F. R. 703, 1890.

² Mast, Foos & Co. v. Dempster Mill Mfg. Co., 82 F. R. 331, 1897.

³ Rifle & Cartridge Co. v. Arms Co., 118 U. S. 24, 1885.

⁴ Pennock v. Dialogue, 2 Peters, 1, 1829; Kendall v. Winsor, 21

§ 88. Actual abandonment of an invention occurs whenever there is an entire relinquishment of all expectation of securing a patent therefor, and an accompanying formation of an expectation that the invention will always be free to the public.¹ Such a relinquishment may be shown by direct, or by circumstantial evidence.² It may be proved by things done or omitted by the inventor, or it may be proved by his omission or delay to do what the law requires to be done in order to secure letters patent. And the fact which constitutes an actual abandonment of an invention, may have occurred within two years before the inventor endeavored to recall that abandonment, by filing an application for a patent on that invention.³

§ 89. An inventor abandons his invention to the public when he makes an express declaration to that effect.⁴ And a declaration that a particular invention is open to anybody, is a declaration of abandonment of any special right thereto.⁵

§ 90. So also an inventor will be held to abandon a particular invention, when he formally disclaims it in an application for a patent for some other invention;⁶ and where he cancels from an application, a claim for that invention, and substitutes no other claim for the same invention, before his patent is issued;⁷ and also when he formally disclaims a particular invention or claim, in a separate paper filed for that purpose. The Supreme Court decided in 1854, that no abandonment results from the mere fact that the inventor described the invention in an application for a

Howard, 328, 1858; Consolidated Fruit Jar Co. v. Wright, 94 U. S. 96, 1876; Planing Machine Co. v. Keith, 101 U. S. 484, 1879; Consolidated Fruit Jar Co. v. Stamping Co., 27 F. R. 377, 1886.

¹ Babcock v. Degner, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 616, 1859.

² Crown Cork & Seal Co. v. Aluminum Stopper Co., 108 F. R. 850, 1901.

³ Mast, Fogs & Co. v. Dempster Mill Mfg. Co., 82 F. R. 331, 1897.

⁴ Kendall v. Winsor, 21 Howard, 328, 1858; Rifle & Cartridge Co. v. Arms Co., 118 U. S. 24, 1885.

⁵ Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. Saranac Lake Electric Light Co., 108 F. R. 224, 1901, and 113 F. R. 885, 1902.

⁶ Leggett v. Avery, 101 U. S. 259, 1879.

⁷ Yale Lock Co. v. Berkshire Bank, 135 U. S. 403, 1890; Pittsburgh Reduction Co. v. Cowles Electric Co., 55 F. R. 320, 1893.

patent, without either claiming or disclaiming the same.¹ When the cited case was tried in the court below, the judge charged the jury "That a description, by the applicant for a patent, of a machine, or a part of a machine, in his specification, unaccompanied by a notice that he has rights in it as an inventor, or that he desires to secure title to it as a patentee, is a dedication of it to the public." But when the case reached the Supreme Court, that instruction was decided to be erroneous, and a new trial was therefore awarded. The paramount precedent thus established has been followed by the Supreme Court, in a recent case, by holding that a particular combination, which was described in an original patent, but neither claimed nor disclaimed therein, was lawfully claimed in a reissue of that patent.² This holding constituted a decision that no abandonment results from the mere fact that the inventor described the invention in an application for a patent, without either claiming or disclaiming the same; for the Supreme Court has always held that an abandonment of a right to a patent on a particular invention, whenever it occurs, is absolute and irrevocable.³

§ 91. Abandonment is also proved by evidence that the inventor is chargeable with laches, relevant to applying for a patent.⁴ Long delay constitutes laches, unless there was some reason which rendered that delay consistent with an expectation to finally secure a patent. Extreme poverty of the inventor is such a reason;⁵ but poverty which was not sufficient to prevent the inventor from securing patents on other inventions,⁶ or from spending money for an education,⁷

¹ *Battin v. Taggert*, 17 Howard, 83, 1854.

² *Topliff v. Topliff*, 145 U. S. 165, 1892.

³ *Pennock v. Dialogue*, 2 Peters, 1, 1829; *Kendall v. Winsor*, 21 Howard, 328, 1858; *Consolidated Fruit Jar Co. v. Wright*, 94 U. S. 96, 1876; *Planing Machine Co. v. Keith*, 101 U. S. 484, 1879.

⁴ *Consolidated Fruit Jar Co. v. Wright*, 94 U. S. 96, 1876; *Craver*

v. Weyhrich, 31 F. R. 607, 1837; *Wright v. Postel*, 44 F. R. 352, 1890.

⁵ *Smith v. Dental Vulcanite Co.*, 93 U. S. 491, 1876; *Celluloid Mfg. Co. v. Crofut*, 24 F. R. 796, 1885.

⁶ *Rifle & Cartridge Co. v. Arms Co.*, 118 U. S. 24, 1885; *Wickersham v. Singer*, 1 McArthur's Patent Cases, 689, 1859.

⁷ *Craver v. Weyhrich*, 31 F. R. 607, 1837.

is not such a reason. The fact that during all, or during much of the delay the inventor was within the rebellious Southern Confederacy, and therefore unable to apply for a United States patent, has also been repeatedly held to be such a reason.¹ Mental disorder which was great enough to generally incapacitate the inventor for business during the time of the delay, is also such a fact as will negative laches,² and physical disorder ought, under the same circumstances, to have the same effect.

Neither can laches be predicated of any delay which was caused by the experiments of the inventor in making or perfecting his invention,³ nor of any delay caused by absorbing misfortune,⁴ nor of any neglect of which his patent solicitor was guilty.⁵ Nor does delay constitute laches when it was caused by the fact that the invention could only be used in connection with one covered by another patent, and by the fact that the inventor failed to make any arrangement with the owner of that patent for the joint use of the two inventions.⁶ If under such circumstances the inventor waits till the older patent expires before securing his patent, his delay is amply accounted for by his desire to enjoy for the full statutory term of a patent the practically exclusive right to his invention. To predicate abandonment of delay suffered for such a purpose would be logically impossible.

But a delay of years, between reduction to practice and filing an application for a patent, which is taken for the purpose of profiting, first from secrecy, and finally from a patented monopoly, is a delay which constitutes actual abandonment, even if the inventor intended to apply for a patent, when he could maintain secrecy no longer.⁷

¹ *Johnsen v. Fassman*, 1 Woods. 142, 1871; *Knox v. Loweree*, 1 Bann. & Ard. 589, 1874.

² *Ballard v. Pittsburg*, 12 F. R. 784, 1882.

³ *Agawam Co. v. Jordan*, 7 Wallace, 583, 1868; *Von Schmidt v. Bowers*, 80 F. R. 143, 1897.

⁴ *Beedle v. Bennett*, 122 U. S. 76, 1886.

⁵ *Birdsall v. McDonald*, 1 Bann. & Ard. 165, 1874; *Howes v. McNeal*, 3 Bann. & Ard. 376, 1878.

⁶ *Webster v. New Brunswick Carpet Co.*, 1 Bann. & Ard. 84, 1874.

⁷ *In re Mower*, 15 App. D. C. 144, 1899.

§ 92. Abandonment is also established by evidence that an inventor is chargeable with laches relevant to prosecuting or renewing his application after it has been rejected or withdrawn.¹ For example, where an application for a patent is rejected when it ought to be allowed, and where the inventor long acquiesces in that erroneous rejection, supposing it to be right, he cannot, on receiving better information, renew his application or file another, and thereupon secure a valid patent.² In such a case the desire of the inventor to secure a patent may never have left him, but there was doubtless a complete, though perhaps reluctant, relinquishment of all expectation of so doing. An abandonment of an invention is not less real because it was unnecessary. But Congress by a special act may waive an abandonment and authorize a patent to issue for the abandoned invention.³ And laches cannot be predicated of any delay which was incurred by an applicant as the result of slowness of procedure in his case in the Patent Office, whether that slowness was due to neglect⁴ or to routine.⁵ Nor can laches be predicated of any delay to take a particular step, in prosecuting an application, where that delay was not longer than the time allowed by the statute, or by the rules of the Patent Office, for that particular step in such a prosecution.⁶

§ 93. Constructive abandonment of inventions prior to applications for letters patent, is the offspring of certain statutes, the earliest of which was the Patent Act of 1836.⁷ Sections 6 and 7 of that Act authorized the Commissioner of Patents to grant a patent only where the alleged invention had not been in public use or on sale with the appli-

¹ *Planing Machine Co. v. Keith*, 101 U. S. 484, 1879; *Rifle & Cartridge Co. v. Arms Co.*, 118 U. S. 22, 1885.

² *Marsh v. Commissioner*, 3 *Bissell*, 321, 1872; *Consolidated Fruit Jar Co. v. Stamping Co.*, 27 F. R. 377, 1886.

³ *Graham v. Johnston*, 21 F. R. 42, 1884.

⁴ *Sayles v. Railroad Co.*, 2 *Fisher*, 523, 1865.

⁵ *American Bell Telephone Co. v. United States*, 68 F. R. 542, 1895.

⁶ *Crown Cork & Seal Co. v. Aluminum Stopper Co.*, 108 F. R. 852, 1901.

⁷ 5 Statutes at Large, Ch. 357, p. 117.

cant's consent or allowance, prior to the application. Section 15 provided that in suits for infringement, judgment should be rendered for the defendant if he should have pleaded and proved that the thing patented had been in public use or on sale with the consent or allowance of the patentee before his application for a patent. Section 7 of the Patent Act of 1839¹ provided that no patent should be held to be invalid by reason of purchase, sale, or use of the thing covered thereby, prior to the application for a patent, except on proof of abandonment of such invention to the public, or on proof that such purchase, sale, or use had been for more than two years prior to such application for a patent. This provision of the Act of 1839 was in one respect restrictive of the enactments just cited from the statute of 1836, and in one respect it enlarged their operation. Its effect was to amend those enactments in the same way that it would have done if it had inserted the words "for more than two years" in the proper place in their phrasology, and had also canceled the qualification which related to consent and allowance.² This phrase "for more than two years" means earlier than two years,³ so that the law which the two statutes established on the subject is expressed in the following sentence. A patent is void if the invention covered thereby was in public use or on sale earlier than two years before the application for that patent. And that continued to be the law of the United States on the subject, under the Consolidated Patent Act of July 8, 1870,⁴ and also under the Revised Statutes.⁵ The two years contemplated by this law are ascertained by measuring backward from the date of the filing of the application in the Patent Office;⁶ but where a second or renewed applica-

¹ 5 Statutes at Large, Ch. 80, p. 354.

² *Andrews v. Hovey*, 123 U. S. 267, 1887; 124 U. S. 694, 1887.

³ *Consolidated Fruit Jar Co. v. Wright*, 94 U. S. 94, 1876.

⁴ 16 Statutes at Large, Ch. 230, p. 198.

⁵ Revised Statutes, Section 4886; 29 Statutes at Large, Ch. 391, *Anderson v. Eiler*, 46 F. R. 778, 1891; *In re Drawbaugh*, 67 O. G. 929, 1894.

⁶ *Campbell v. New York*, 35 F. R. 504, 1888.

tion is filed to take the place of another which described and claimed the same invention, and which was withdrawn or relinquished with intent to file the second application, the two years are ascertained by measuring backward from the date of the filing of the first application.¹ An application which described a particular invention, takes date on the day of its filing, whether or not it claimed that invention at that time.²

§ 94. What is "public use," within the meaning of the statute? This question has now received light from a sufficient number of decisions, affirming or negating the fact of public use in particular cases, to make it possible to deduce a nearly complete answer from judicial authorities.

If the inventor allows his invention to be used by other persons generally, either with or without compensation, then it will be in public use within the meaning of the statute.³ And the use is public, which follows a transfer of the thing used from its inventor to the user, without reserving any control over it, and without expecting to make any change in it, or without any restriction.⁴

If the inventor uses his invention for profit, and not by way of experiment, that is a public use,⁵ unless actual use resulting in profit is necessary to show the inventor how to perfect his invention, and unless he does perfect it in accordance with the teachings of such use;⁶ but experimental use becomes public use when it extends further, either in time, or in number of instances, than is reasonably required to test the invention.⁷ Nor will the fact that the inventor is but an employee in the place where he uses his invention, or the fact that the profit goes primarily to his employer, oust the operation of this rule.⁸

¹ *International Crown Co. v. Richmond*, 30 F. R. 778, 1887.

² *Edison v. American Mutoscope Co.*, 110 F. R. 662, 1901.

³ *Elizabeth v. Pavement Co.*, 97 U. S. 135, 1877.

⁴ *Root v. Third Avenue Railroad Co.*, 146 U. S. 221, 1892; *Deiemater v. Heath*, 58 F. R. 416, 1893.

⁵ *Elizabeth v. Pavement Co.*, 97 U. S. 137, 1877.

⁶ *Sprague v. Mfg. Co.*, 12 F. R. 724, 1882.

⁷ *International Tooth Crown Co. v. Gaylord*, 140 U. S. 63, 1891.

⁸ *Worley v. Tobacco Co.*, 104 U. S. 340, 1881.

To constitute public use, it is not necessary that more than one specimen of the thing invented should have been publicly used,¹ nor that more than one person should have known of that use.² Nor is it necessary to public use that the article used could have been seen by the public eye, if the ordinary use of such articles is veiled from view.³

A design is in public use whenever any article which embodies it, or any picture of it, is exhibited for the purpose of making its character publicly known.

§ 95. Experimental use is never public use within the meaning of the statute, if it is conducted in good faith for the purpose of testing the qualities of the invention, and for no other purpose not naturally incidental to that.⁴ In such a case it is immaterial whether the experimental use disclosed a necessity for improvement, or disclosed no such necessity; and it is also immaterial whether the use was conducted with secrecy or not. It may indeed have been had in the open air, and have continued every day for several years, and have been known to hundreds of persons, and have incidentally inured to the profit of the user and of the public, and still not be a public use, within the meaning of the statute, if the nature of the invention was such that only long-continued out-door use could show whether the invention possessed utility, or show in what respects, if any, it required to be improved.⁵

The liberal ideas which underlie the decision just cited will doubtless be applied to every variety of invention, as occasion serves, and will be found elastic enough to cover every meritorious case. Indeed, Judge JOHN LOWELL went still further in the direction of liberally allowing scope to experimental use, and decided that such use is not public

¹ Consolidated Fruit Jar Co. v. Wright, 94 U. S. 94, 1876; Jones v. Barker, 11 F. R. 597, 1882.

² Egbert v. Lippmann, 104 U. S. 336, 1881.

³ Egbert v. Lippmann, 104 U. S. 336, 1881; International Tooth Crown Co. v. Gaylord, 140 U. S. 58, 1891.

⁴ Beedle v. Bennett, 122 U. S. 77, 1886; Harmon v. Struthers, 43 F. R. 443, 1890; Pacific Cable Railroad Co. v. Butte City Ry. Co., 55 F. R. 765, 1893; Harmon v. Struthers, 57 F. R. 641, 1893.

⁵ Elizabeth v. Pavement Co., 97 U. S. 134, 1877.

use within the meaning of the law, where, in order to test its comparative as well as its absolute utility, and in order to convince others of its merits, an inventor allows them to use his invention after he has himself become satisfied that it is useful.¹

But where the main object of the use was profit, and improvement was only an incidental aim, the use is not experimental in the eye of the law;² though incidental profit is not inconsistent with use being only experimental;³ and absence of profit is not inconsistent with use being not experimental, but public.⁴

The use of a minor invention in a large machine, may be a public use thereof, though the use of the machine as a whole is experimental.⁵

Evidence of the experimental character of any use which occurred earlier than two years before the application for a patent, must be full, unequivocal, and convincing, or it cannot prevail to save that patent from invalidity.⁶

Public use by a stranger, without the knowledge of the inventor, more than two years before the inventor applies for a patent, generally has the same operation of constructive abandonment, that public use by the inventor himself would have;⁷ but Judge WHEELER decided, that where the inventor continued his experiments legitimately, until less than two years before he applied for his patent, that patent will not be defeated by the fact that another person constructed, and still another used, his invention, without his knowledge, more than two years before the application for the patent was made.⁸

¹ *Sinclair v. Backus*, 5 Bann. & Ard. 81, 1880.

² *Smith & Griggs Mfg. Co. v. Sprague*, 123 U. S. 256, 1887.

³ *Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co. v. Saranac Lake Electric Light Co.*, 108 F. R. 230, 1901; 113 F. R. 888, 1902.

⁴ *Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Lorain Steel Co.*, 117 F. R. 252, 1902.

⁵ *Thomson-Houston Electric Co. v. Lorain Steel Co.*, 110 F. R. 654, 1901; 117 F. R. 249, 1902.

⁶ *Smith & Griggs Mfg. Co. v. Sprague*, 123 U. S. 264, 1887; *Swain v. Holyoke Machine Co.*, 111 F. R. 408, 1901.

⁷ *Andrews v. Hovey*, 123 U. S. 267, 1887; 124 U. S. 694, 1887.

⁸ *Campbell v. New York*, 47 F. R. 515, 1891.

§ 96. What is being "on sale," within the meaning of the statute? The answer to this question also, can now be accurately delineated in nearly or quite all of its boundaries.

A single instance of sale of one specimen of the thing invented is enough to constitute putting the invention on sale,¹ and it is immaterial if the purchase price is not paid more than two years before the application.² Indeed a device will be on sale within the meaning of the law, if it is offered for sale, whether any specimen of it is actually sold or not.³ If, however, the nature of the invention is such that the inventor is obliged to put it into the hands of others for crucial experiment, he may sell specimens to those others for that purpose, and such a sale will not be obnoxious to the law now under consideration.⁴ But if the invention could have been tested by the inventor on his own premises, as well as by any one there or elsewhere, then either an absolute or a conditional sale of a specimen of the thing invented, will be putting the invention on sale, unless there is unequivocal evidence that the sale was made for the purpose of experimental use.⁵

Where an inventor furnishes a specimen of his invention for use on approval, to be paid for if successful; there is an instance of being "on sale" if the use is successful and the specimen is paid for;⁶ but if the use is unsuccessful and is abandoned, there is no instance presented of being "on sale," even if the specimen was partly or wholly paid for, while being constructed.⁷ A sale for the purpose of testing the commercial merits of an invention, will constitute being "on

¹ Consolidated Fruit Jar Co. v. Wright, 94 U. S. 94, 1876.

² Anderson v. Monroe, 55 F. R. 405, 1893.

³ Plimpton v. Winslow, 14 F. R. 921, 1883; Covert v. Covert, 106 F. R. 188, 1901.

⁴ Graham v. McCormick, 5 Bann. & Ard. 244, 1880; Graham v. Mfg. Co., 11 F. R. 142, 1880.

⁵ Henry v. Soapstone Co., 5 Bann. & Ard. 108, 1880; De Lama-ter v. Deeley, 53 F. R. 380, 1892.

⁶ Craig v. Michigan Lubricator Co., 72 F. R. 173, 1896.

⁷ Huntington Dry-Pulverizer Co. v. Newell Universal Mill Co., 109 F. R. 269, 1901.

sale;"¹ but where a specimen of an invention is built or made to order, it is not "on sale" till it is completed, delivered, and accepted.²

§ 97. An assignment of the inchoate right to an invention, is not such a sale as will be obnoxious to the statute now under explanation.³ So far from furnishing evidence of abandonment, the sale of the inchoate right to a patent indicates an expectation that such a patent will be obtained, and that right be thus translated into a legal title.

§ 98. Precise identity between the thing covered by the patent, and the thing which the inventor allowed to be in public use or on sale more than two years before he applied for that patent, is not necessary to constitute constructive abandonment of the invention covered by the latter. It is enough if the two devices are substantially the same,⁴ or if the advance from one to the other did not amount to invention;⁵ but it is not enough that the two devices perform the same function, and are somewhat similar in construction and in mode of operation.⁶

§ 99. No constructive abandonment results from any mere making of a specimen of an invented thing more than two years before the application for a patent.⁷ But where an invention consists in a process of making a thing, the making of a specimen of that thing, by that process, is a use of that process, and is therefore subject to the rules which govern using, and not to that which applies to making only.

§ 100. Public knowledge of an invention, acquired with the consent of the inventor, prior to his application for a patent, was formerly fatal to the validity of any patent

¹ *Smith & Davis Mfg. Co. v. Mellon*, 58 F. R. 707, 1893.

² *Campbell v. New York*, 36 F. R. 261, 1888.

³ *Elm City Co. v. Wooster*, 6 Fisher, 452, 1873.

⁴ *Hall v. Macneale*, 107 U. S. 90, 1882; *Theberath v. Trimming Co.*, 15 F. R. 251, 1883.

⁵ *International Tooth Crown Co. v. Gaylord*, 140 U. S. 62, 1891.

⁶ *Draper v. Wattles*, 3 Bann. & Ard. 613, 1878.

⁷ *Comstock v. Sandusky Seat Co.*, 3 Bann. & Ard. 188, 1878; *Campbell v. New York*, 36 F. R. 261, 1888.

granted for that invention. The Patent Act of 1793¹ provided that to be patentable, a thing must not have been known before the making of an application for a patent thereon. The Supreme Court construed that enactment to mean only that the invention must not have been known to the public with the consent of the inventor.² The Patent Act of 1836 repealed all prior statutes on the subject of patents, and did not provide that any unfavorable effect on an inventor's right should result from public knowledge of his invention, acquired at any time after its production by him.³ Nor has any later statute made any such provision.

§ 101. A public use or a sale of a specimen of a newly invented thing, occurring in any foreign country after its invention by an applicant for an American patent, but more than two years before his application is made, will not have the same effect upon such a patent, that it would have had if that public use or that sale had occurred in the United States. The language of Section 4886 of the Revised Statutes, contains no restriction as to the country wherein the public use or the sale of a newly invented thing, more than two years prior to an application for a patent thereon, must occur, in order to constitute constructive abandonment of that invention; and it was held by one Circuit Court, that no such restrictions exists.⁴ But the Supreme Court reversed that decision, and decided that Sections 4886, 4887, 4920 and 4923 of the Revised Statutes, taken together, show that the right of an inventor, to obtain a United States patent, is not lost by reason of the fact that his invention was in public use or on sale, in some foreign country, more than two years before his application for a United States patent thereon.⁵

§ 103. Constructive abandonment of an invention, after an application for a patent thereon, necessarily results from

¹ 1 Statutes at Large, Ch. 11, Section 1, p. 318.

² *Pennock v. Dialogue*, 2 Peters, 18, 1829.

³ *Elizabeth v. Pavement Co.*, 97 U. S. 136, 1877.

⁴ *Gandy v. Belting Co.*, 28 F. R. 570, 1886.

⁵ *Gandy v. Belting Co.*, 143 U. S. 592, 1892.

constructive abandonment of that application, in certain classes of cases which are explained in the chapter on applications.¹ In still another class of cases, constructive abandonment of an invention, after an application for a patent thereon, necessarily results from a particular kind of constructive abandonment of that application, unless a new application is filed within a certain time after such abandonment. That class of cases is the following: Where an applicant omits to pay the final fee within six months from the time at which his application was allowed, and notice thereof sent to him or to his agent, and where he also omits to make any new application for a patent on the same invention within two years after such an allowance, he loses all right to obtain a patent for that invention.²

§ 104. The statutory law relevant to constructive abandonment, resulting from a public use or from a sale of a newly invented thing, more than two years before an application for a patent, is a law which operates inflexibly upon all cases coming within it. Its effect cannot be obviated by any evidence showing reasons for the delay, however ample and meritorious those reasons may be.³ The rule of this section doubtless applies also to the constructive abandonment explained in the last.

§ 104a. Constructive abandonment of inventions prior to applications for letters patent, in two new classes of cases, is enacted by the Patent Act of 1897; and in two other new classes of cases, by the Patent Act of 1903.

The first of these classes of cases is confined to patents applied for after 1897. Constructive abandonment of any invention claimed in such a patent, will be found to have occurred, if its inventor did not make his application for that patent, until more than two years after some person, not in privity with him, received a patent on the same subject in some country, or until more than two years after that subject was described in some printed publication somewhere.⁴

¹ Section 147 of this book.

² Revised Statutes, Section 4897.

³ *Sisson v. Gilbert*, 9 Blatch. 189, 1871.

⁴ 29 Statutes at Large, p. 692, Ch. 391. Sections 1, 3, and 8 construed together.

The second class of cases is confined to patents which were applied for after 1897, and on or before March 3, 1903. Constructive abandonment of any invention claimed in such a patent, will be found to have occurred, if its inventor did not make his application for that patent, till more than seven months after he, or some person in privity with him, filed an application for a patent on the same invention, in some foreign country, and if a foreign patent was granted on that foreign application.¹

The third class of cases is confined to patents applied for after March 3, 1903; on processes, machines, manufactures, or compositions of matter. Constructive abandonment of any invention claimed in such a patent, will be found to have occurred, if its inventor did not make his application for that patent, till more than twelve months after he, or some person in privity with him, filed an application for a patent on the same invention, in some foreign country, and if a foreign patent was granted on that foreign application.²

The fourth class of cases is confined to patents on designs, applied for after March 3, 1903. Constructive abandonment of any invention claimed in such a patent, will be found to have occurred, if its inventor did not make his application for that patent, till more than four months after he, or some person in privity with him, filed an application for a patent on the same invention, in some foreign country, and if a foreign patent was granted on that foreign application.³

An application for a patent in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, is filed within the meaning of the law of this section, at the time of the filing of a provisional specification in the British Patent Office, in cases where a provisional specification is filed in that office, in advance of the complete specification.⁴

¹ 29 Statutes at Large, p. 692, Ch. 391. Sections 3 and 8 construed together, and with Section 1 of Ch. 1019 of 32 Statutes at Large.

² 32 Statutes at Large, Part 1, p. 1225, Ch. 1019, Section 1.

³ 32 Statutes at Large, Part 1, p. 1225, Ch. 1019, Section 1.

⁴ *In re Swinburne*, 19 App. D. C. 565, 1902.

§ 105. Surrender of an invention may be effected after the grant of letters patent therefor, by means of a formal surrender of those letters patent. A proceeding of the kind was mentioned by the Supreme Court as being undoubtedly proper as early as 1832,¹ and an actual surrender of the sort was tacitly approved by that tribunal about twenty years later.²

§ 106. No abandonment of an invention after the issue of letters patent thereon has ever been judicially decided to exist in the United States. The Patent Act of 1832³ provided that a certain class of aliens might obtain United States patents who had theretofore been excluded from that privilege; but it coupled with that provision an enactment that every patent granted by virtue of that Act should cease and determine in case of failure on the part of the patentee to introduce the invention into public use in the United States within one year from the issuing of the patent, or in case of a discontinuance of such public use for any period of six months, or in case of failure on the part of the patentee to become a citizen of the United States. In providing such a rule of constructive abandonment for a certain class of aliens, Congress showed that it did not overlook the subject of non-user of patented inventions; and in omitting to provide any such rule for citizens of the United States, Congress showed that it did not intend constructive abandonment to result from non-user in their cases. Even as to aliens, the policy of the law upon the point was soon changed. The Act of 1836 repealed all former patent statutes, and did not re-enact the provision just cited from the Act of 1832, nor put any corresponding restrictions upon any class of patentees. Nor has any later statute contained any provision of the kind. The fair inference from this course of legislation seems to be that Congress does not intend any patent right to be lost on any ground of non-

¹ Grant v. Raymond, 6 Peters, 240, 1832.

² Battin v. Taggert, 17 Howard, 74, 1854.

³ 4 Statutes at Large, Ch. 203, p. 577.

user of that right. Even before Congress had thus indicated its intention on the subject, Justice WASHINGTON instructed a jury that no disuser of an invention, after it is patented, can amount to an abandonment, so as to deprive the patentee or his assignees of their exclusive right to it for the term of the patent.¹ So, also, the Supreme Court has held that no presumption arises against a patent, from any use of the invention by the public after the patent is granted.² Since no abandonment of an invention, after it is patented, can arise out of any existing statute, nor be based on any non-user by the patentee, or on any user by the public, we are shut up to the conclusion that no such abandonment is known to our laws.

§ 107. Acquiescence by a patentee in unlicensed use of his invention during the life of the patent, has sometimes been said or been intimated by courts to amount to an abandonment of the patent and of the invention. Four cases containing such statements or suggestions are to be found in the reports. In two of them the judges made their observations on the subject, in spite of their decisions that no such question was involved in the pleadings. In the other two cases the views of the judges were inserted in charges to juries, but inasmuch as the juries found for the respective plaintiffs, it seems that there were no facts in the cases which called for such statements in the charges. The opinions of the four judges on the point seem, therefore, to be no more weighty than the reasons which support them. But no reasons applicable to the subject of abandonment of a patent are contained in either of the cases, though one of them contains statements of reasons adapted to support the doctrine of estoppel. Nor do the four cases agree among themselves relevant to the character or to the quantity of acquiescence needed to support an hypothesis of abandonment of a patent. In *Wyeth v. Stone*³ Justice STORY inti-

¹ *Gray v. James*, 1 Peters C. C. Rep. 403, 1817.

² *Shaw v. Cooper*, 7 Peters, 320, 1833; *Crown Cork & Seal Co. v.*

Aluminum Stopper Co., 108 F. R. 869, 1901.

³ *Wyeth v. Stone*, 1 Story, 282, 1840.

mated that such acquiescence must be without objection, and must continue for a series of years. In *Ransom v. New York*,¹ Judge HALL placed no such limitation as the last of these upon the doctrine, and if he hinted at the first of them he hinted but vaguely. In *Bell v. Daniels*,² Judge LEAVITT said that it would require a strong case to prove abandonment of a patent actually granted. In *Williams v. Railroad Co.*,³ Judge WALLACE said: "Neither does mere delay or acquiescence establish an abandonment or dedication of the patent. There must be an acquiescence in the appropriation of the right of such a character as reasonably to induce the belief that the owner intended to relinquish it to the public use." The opinions cited in this section, so far as they disagree with the statutes and decisions cited in the last, do not agree in that disagreement, and they seem insufficient to outweigh, or even to modify, the doctrine set forth in that section.

§ 108. Questions relevant to actual or to constructive abandonment of inventions are questions of fact;⁴ and every reasonable doubt relevant to any such question should be solved in favor of the patent, for the law does not favor forfeiture.⁵

¹ *Ransom v. New York*, 1 Fisher, 273, 1856.

² *Bell v. Daniels*, 1 Bond, 219, 1858.

³ *Williams v. Boston & Albany Railroad Co.*, 4 Bann. & Ard. 441, 1879.

⁴ *Battin v. Taggert*, 17 Howard, 84, 1854; *Kendall v. Winsor*, 21 Howard, 330, 1858.

⁵ *Pitts v. Hall*, 2 Blatch. 238, 1851; *McCormick v. Seymour*, 2 Blatch. 256, 1851; *Birdsall v. McDonald*, 1 Bann. & Ard. 165, 1874; *Comstock v. Sandusky Seat Co.*, 3 Bann. & Ard. 188, 1878; *Anderson v. Eiler*, 46 F. R. 779, 1891; *Crown Cork & Seal Co. v. Aluminum Stopper Co.*, 108 F. R. 850, 1901.

CHAPTER VI.

APPLICATIONS.

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 109. Constituents of applications for patents. | 132. Appeals in the Patent Office. |
| 110. The petition. | 133. Appeals to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. |
| 111. Constituents of specifications. | 134. Bills in equity to compel the Commissioner to grant patents. |
| 112. The preamble. | 135. Amendments of applications. |
| 113. The general statement of the invention. | 136. The foundation of the right of amendment. |
| 114. The description of the drawings. | 137. When an applicant may amend. |
| 115. The detailed description of the invention. | 138. How an applicant may amend. |
| 116. The claim or claims. | 139. When an applicant must amend. |
| 117. Claims in machine patents. | 140. Interferences. |
| 117a. Methods of specifying parts in claims. | 141. Interferences. |
| 118. Claims in patents for manufactures. | 141a. Interferences. |
| 119. Claims in patents for compositions of matter. | 141b. Interferences. |
| 120. Claims in process patents. | 141c. Interferences. |
| 120a. Claims in design patents. | 141d. Appeals in interferences. |
| 121. The signatures. | 142. Decisions in interferences are not conclusive. |
| 122. The form of the oath. | 143. Caveats. |
| 123. The constituents of the oath. | 144. Appeals from decrees on bills in equity. |
| 124. Affirmations. | 145. Abandonment of applications. |
| 125. The Patent Office fees. | 146. Constructive abandonment of applications. |
| 126. Drawings. | 147. Constructive abandonment of applications working and not working constructive abandonment of inventions. |
| 127. Models. | 148. Commissioner's actions on prerequisites to applications. |
| 128. Specimens of compositions of matter. | |
| 129. Dates of applications. | |
| 129a. The register of Patent Office attorneys. | |
| 130. The examination by the Patent Office. | |
| 131. Notification of rejection. | |

§ 109. AN application for a patent consists of the following transactions: The deposit in the Patent Office of a written petition to the Commissioner of Patents; the like

deposit of a written specification of the invention; the making of an oath; the payment of the Patent Office fee; and in some cases the deposit of a drawing; and in some cases the deposit of a model; and in some other cases the deposit of specimens.¹ Applications and proceedings on applications are primarily governed by the provisions of the Revised Statutes. Where those provisions do not cover a particular point, that point is governed by the rules of the Patent Office.² Every such rule, unless it is inconsistent with law, is as authoritative as the Revised Statutes themselves.³

§ 110. The petition is a communication, signed by the applicant and addressed to the Commissioner of Patents, stating the name, present nationality, residence, and present post office address of the petitioner; and requesting the grant of a patent for the invention therein designated by name, and by a reference to the specification for a full disclosure thereof.⁴ The petition must be the petition of the inventor, and not of an assignee of the inventor, though it may properly request that the patent, when granted, shall be granted to an assignee.⁵ If, however, the inventor becomes insane or dies before executing a petition, the petition may be made and signed by his guardian, conservator, or representative in trust for his estate, in case of his insanity;⁶ or by his executor or administrator in case of his death.⁷ And if the inventor was not domiciled in the United States at the time of his death, the executor or administrator, duly authorized under the law of any foreign country to administer upon his estate, and whose authority is proved by a certificate of a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States, may make and sign the petition.⁸

¹ Revised Statutes, Sections 4888, 4889, 4890, 4891, 4892, 4893, 4933; Rules of Practice of the United States Patent Office, revised Jan. 2, 1903, Rule 30.

² Revised Statutes, Section 483.

³ *United States v. Commissioner of Patents*, 22 O. G. 1365, 1882; *United States v. Commissioner of Patents*, 104 O. G. 856, 1903.

⁴ Patent Office Rule 33.

⁵ Revised Statutes, Section 4895.

⁶ 30 Statutes at Large, p. 915, Ch. 227.

⁷ Revised Statutes, Section 4896, and as amended Feb. 28, 1899, in 30 Statutes at Large, Ch. 227.

⁸ 32 Statutes at Large, Part 1, p. 1225, Ch. 1019, Section 3.

§ 111. The specification properly consists of seven parts. 1. The preamble. 2. A general statement of the nature and object of the invention. 3. A brief description of the drawings, if drawings are made. 4. A detailed description of the invention. 5. The claim or claims. 6. The signature of the applicant. 7. The signatures of two witnesses.

§ 112. The preamble states the name, present nationality, residence, and present post office address, of the applicant; and where the applicant is acting as representative of an insane or deceased inventor, the preamble states his name, and his nationality and residence at the time of his making the invention, and states also that the applicant is acting in his capacity as guardian, conservator, representative in trust, executor, or administrator, as the case may be. The preamble also states the title of the invention, in order to connect it by name, with the same title in the petition.

§ 113. The general statement of the nature and object of the invention is a convenient mode of introducing the detailed description. Every such statement should be free from any particularity or limitation which, if imported, by implication, into one or more of the claims, might operate to reduce the area covered by the patent, to territory more narrow than the state of the prior art required.

§ 114. The description of the drawings states what each figure is, but does not state the details of the figures; those details being passed over in that description, to be attended to in the detailed description of the invention.

§ 115. The detailed description of the invention must be full enough, and clear enough, and concise enough, and exact enough, to enable any person skilled in the art or science to which it appertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention, if it is a machine or a manufacture, or to compound the invention, if it is a composition of matter, or to perform the invention, if it is a process,¹ or to identify the invention, if it is a design. If the description falls below this standard, the patent, if

¹ Revised Statutes, Section 4888.

granted, will be void.¹ But this standard may be reached, in the case of a design, by a reference to the drawing or photograph² annexed to the specification. In the statute by which this standard is established, the phrase "any person skilled in the art or science" includes persons of ordinary and fair information and skill in the relevant art or science; and that phrase is not confined to the most eminent scientists, or to the most competent experts, in that science or art.³

The description, in a case of a manufacture, and particularly in a case of a machine, must make constant reference to the drawings, by means of reference letters or reference numerals, incorporated in the description, and placed upon the face of the drawings.⁴ Numerals are every way better than letters for this purpose. They are unlimited in number; instead of being only twenty-six. They are distinguishable from each other in sound; instead of being often indistinguishable, when separately pronounced, as several pairs of the letters of the alphabet are. They are always alike; instead of being printed sometimes as Roman letters and sometimes as Italics, and in either event, sometimes as small letters, and sometimes as capitals. For these reasons it is probable, that the relevant rule of the Patent Office will soon be amended, so as to prescribe numerals and prohibit letters, as reference characters, in the specifications and on the drawings of applications for patents.

The statute also says that in case of a machine, the applicant shall explain the principle thereof, and the best mode in which he has contemplated applying that principle, so as to distinguish it from other inventions.⁵ These provisions must be read in the light of their avowed object. That object is identification. The first provision cannot mean that the inventor must infallibly explain the law of nature which makes his machine work; for if it means that, neither Morse nor Bell complied with it when describing the telegraph or

¹ O'Reilly v. Morse, 15 Howard, 62, 1853.

² Dohson v. Dornan, 118 U. S. 14, 1885; Anderson v. Saint, 46 F. R. 760, 1891.

³ Tannage Patent Co. v. Zahn, 66 F. R. 989, 1895.

⁴ Patent Office Rule 38.

⁵ Revised Statutes, Section 4888.

the telephone,¹ and, indeed, neither Morse nor Bell nor any man could have done so. The second provision cannot mean that every inventor must infallibly judge which of several forms of his machine will eventually be found to work best, for if it means that, it requires what is often impossible: requires the inventor to foresee the ultimate effects of new and comparatively untried causes. The first provision means that the essential distinctive characteristic of the machine shall be explained;² and the second provision means that the inventor shall state the mode which he contemplates to be the best.³ Inasmuch as the validity of a patent depends on the sufficiency of the description, the subject of this section is treated with more detail in the chapter on letters patent, the seventh of this book. Enough has been outlined in this connection, to show what kinds of statements those descriptions need to contain.

§ 116. The claim or claims constitute a necessary part of every specification. The statutory requirement in this regard is, that the applicant "shall particularly point out and distinctly claim the part, improvement, or combination which he claims as his invention."⁴ The practice of the Patent Office has always been to require the claim or claims to be made in that part of the specification which immediately precedes the signatures.

It is a practice of some solicitors of patents to write claims in vague phraseology, with an idea that vagueness is elasticity, and that elasticity is excellence. They stretch their claims to catch infringers; and are apt to stretch them to the breaking point, by making them vague and elastic enough to cover inventions in the prior art, and to be invalidated thereby.⁵ It is a practice of some solicitors, to multiply claims, with variant language. Thus they hope to hit every competitor, with one claim or another; or to

¹ *Emerson Co. v. Nimocks*, 99 F. R. 739, 1900; *National Meter Co. v. Thomson Meter Co.*, 106 F. R. 538, 1900.

² *National Meter Co. v. Thomson Meter Co.*, 106 F. R. 538, 1900.

³ *Carver v. Mfg. Co.*, 2 Story, 432, 1843; *Page v. Ferry*, 1 Fisher, 309, 1857.

⁴ Revised Statutes, Section 4888.

⁵ *Bracewell v. Passaic Print Works*, 107 F. R. 473, 1901.

divert them all from competition, by a multiplicity of appearances. But the courts have frequently expressed their disapprobation of multiplying claims unnecessarily,¹ and such multiplication is dangerous to the validity of patents.²

It is a proper practice to make a generic claim and also a specific claim, in an application for a patent on a generic invention, even where only one species is described in the specification.³ In such a case, if the inventor's understanding that his invention is primary, turns out to be true, both claims will be valid. But if some invention is afterward discovered in the prior art, which relegates the patent to a secondary place, the specific claim may stand and be valid, though the generic claim is too broad to be maintained.

§ 117. In a case where the description sets forth an entire machine, the applicant may lawfully make a claim co-extensive with the description, if the machine as a whole possesses novelty. But such a claim ought seldom to be the only one in a patent; because, for reasons stated in the chapter on infringement, it can, in most cases, be readily evaded. The proper practice is to fix upon the new parts, or new combinations, which the described machine contains, and to make a separate claim for each of those parts, and for each of those combinations.⁴

But one patent or claim having been granted to an inventor, upon a particular part or combination, as performing particular functions, no valid claim or patent can be afterward granted to him, on the same part or combination, as performing a part only of the functions called for by the claim of the first patent.⁵ And it is advisable to take out all patents, on the same day, on different combinations of parts, some of which are in each of the different combinations. To secure a particular part of a machine, a claim must spec-

¹ *Westinghouse Air-Brake Co. v. New York Air-Brake Co.*, 112 F. R. 431, 1901.

² *Carlton v. Bokee*, 17 Wallace, 463, 1873.

³ *Hill v. Hodge*, 12 App. D. C. 530, 1898.

⁴ *Gill v. Wells*, 22 Wallace, 24, 1874; *Adams v. Jones*, 1 Fisher, 530, 1859.

⁵ *Miller v. Eagle Co.*, 151 U. S. 199, 1894.

ify that part; and to secure a particular combination of some of the parts of a machine, a claim must specify all of those parts, and the description must explain their joint mode of operation, and must state their joint function.¹

And a part or a combination may be claimed separately, though it cannot do useful work separately from the residue of the machine or apparatus of which it constitutes a part.² Otherwise an infringer might take the most important part of an invention, and by changing the method of adapting it to its environment, might avoid any charge of infringement. The invention of a needle with an eye near the point, is the one essential element of all sewing machines. But the possible mechanisms for operating such a needle are many, and if its inventor had been obliged to make his own mechanism a part of every claim in which his needle was an element, his patent would have been destitute of value to him;³ though his invention was one of the most valuable in the history of mankind.

§ 117*a*. A part of a machine when claimed alone, may be specified by the use of its name in the claim, where no other part of the machine has a similar name; but where the use of a name alone, is not sufficiently specific to show what part of the machine is referred to, that object can be accomplished by mentioning, in the claim, the reference letter or numeral, which is used to indicate that part in the description and in the drawings. Such a use of a reference letter or numeral does not necessarily confine the claim to a part having all the characteristics of the part which, in the drawings, is indicated by that letter or numeral;⁴ because

¹ Parks *v.* Booth, 102 U. S. 102, 1880; Forbush *v.* Cook, 2 Fisher, 669, 1857.

² Hancock Inspirator Co. *v.* Jenks, 21 F. R. 915, 1884; Rapid Service Store Ry. Co. *v.* Taylor, 43 F. R. 251, 1887; Roberts *v.* Nail Co., 53 F. R. 920, 1892; Holloway *v.* Dow, 54 F. R. 516, 1893; Bram-

mer *v.* Schroeder, 106 F. R. 929, 1901.

³ Deering *v.* Winona Harvester Works, 155 U. S. 302, 1894; Chambers-Bering-Quinlan Co. *v.* Faries, 75 F. R. 663, 1896.

⁴ Campbell Printing-Press Co. *v.* Marden, 64 F. R. 785, 1894; National Hollow Brake-Beam Co. *v.*

a claim which expressly covers a particular device, impliedly covers any equivalent of that device; and other devices will be held to be equivalent or not equivalent, by means of certain tests, which are explained in the chapter on infringement, and which are quite foreign to the question whether a particular device is designated in a claim by a reference letter or numeral, or by a name alone, or in some other way.

It is true that where the particular characteristics of the parts of the combination shown in the drawings of a patent, are all that differentiate it from the prior art; and where those parts are specified in an amended claim by reference letters or numerals, in pursuance of a rejection by the Patent Office of a prior claim which was broad enough to cover the prior art; the amended claim is limited to a combination of parts having those particular characteristics; for if not so restricted, the effect would be to make the claim co-extensive with what the Patent Office rejected.¹ But the same thing is true, in an otherwise similar case, where the parts of the combination are specified, in an amended claim, by names alone, or in any other way.² The breadth or the narrowness of a claim as the case may be, does not depend upon any artificial rule of interpretation;³ and to narrow a broad invention by reference letters or numerals alone, would be to frame and enforce such a rule.

Where some of the parts of a combination, operate therein to give motion to other parts, which do the final work of the combination, it is proper to specify the former by the use of such terms as "means," "mechanism," or "devices" for giving that motion.⁴ But such general lan-

Interchangeable Brake-Beam Co.,
106 F. R. 715, 1901.

¹ Knapp v. Morss, 150 U. S.
228, 1893; Lehigh Valley Railroad
Co. v. Kearney, 158 U. S. 469,
1895.

² McCormick Harvesting Mach.
Co. v. C. Aultman & Co., 69 F. R.
393, 1895.

³ Topliff v. Topliff, 145 U. S.
171, 1892.

⁴ Brush Electric Co. v. Ft.
Wayne Electric Light Co., 40
F. R. 833, 1889; Brush Electric
Co. v. Western Electric Co., 43
F. R. 537, 1890; Brush Electric
Co. v. Electric Imp. Co., 52 F. R.
975, 1892.

guage will not include all means, mechanism, or devices which can perform that function, but only those which are shown in the patent, and their equivalents.¹ And in this case also, the question whether other means, mechanism, or devices are equivalents of those shown in the patent, will be determined by the established rules on that subject, rather than by any apparent precision or elasticity of the language used in the claims to designate the parts involved in the inquiry.

§ 118. In cases where the description sets forth a manufacture, there ought to be a separate claim for each of its patentable features, or at least for the article without any dispensable feature; for if there is but one claim, and if all those features are covered by it, then those persons who manage to dispense with even the least of them, incur no liability by making, using, or selling articles which possess all the others.²

§ 119. In cases where the description relates to a composition of matter, the claim should cover that composition in its entirety, and should, either expressly, or by reference to the description, specify the respective proportions which the different ingredients bear to each other.³ But where some of the described ingredients may be dispensed with, the applicant, if he states that fact in the description, may have a separate claim for a composition of matter composed only of the residue; or he may have a single claim covering the indispensable ingredients, whether with or without the others.⁴

§ 120. In cases where the description relates to a process, the claim should cover all the necessary occurrences in that process, and cover no more. If it covers less it will be void for want of utility; and if it covers more, it can be evaded

¹ *Dudley E. Jones Co. v. Munger Mfg. Co.*, 49 F. R. 64, 1891; *Williams v. Steam Gauge & Lantern Co.*, 47 F. R. 323, 1891.

² *Prouty v. Ruggles*, 16 Peters, 336, 1842.

³ *Tyler v. Boston*, 7 Wallace, 327, 1868.

⁴ *Rubber Co. v. Goodyear*, 9 Wallace, 788, 1869.

by persons who omit any one which is unnecessary, when using the others.

§ 120*a*. In cases where the description and its accompanying drawing or photograph represent a design, the claim may identify its subject by a reference to that drawing or photograph.¹ But where a claim for a design ends with the words "substantially as shown" that claim refers to the description as well as to the drawing.² And a design patent may contain a claim for the entire design, with other claims for such of the parts of the design as are independently patentable.³ But several unconnected ornaments cannot lawfully be aggregated and claimed together in one claim.⁴

§ 121. The signatures of the applicant and of the witnesses must embody the full names of those persons, and must be legibly written.⁵ The grammatical construction of the statutory provisions, relevant to signatures, seems to indicate that the document signed by the applicant, and not the signature of that applicant, is the thing which is to be attested by the two witnesses. In cases where language of similar character has been used in statutes which prescribe the mode of attesting wills, it has been decided to be immaterial, whether the witnesses sign before or sign after the execution of the document;⁶ but where such statutes have provided for attesting the signatures rather than the will, it is the law that the document is void if the witnesses sign before the testator.⁷ It is the practice of the Patent Office to regard the attestation as being attestation of the signatures, and, accordingly, to require two witnesses for each signature, in cases of joint applications for joint letters patent. The same two witnesses may indeed attest all the

¹ *Dobson v. Dornan*, 118 U. S. 14, 1885.

² *Whittall v. Lowell Mfg. Co.*, 79 F. R. 789, 1897.

³ *Dobson v. Hartford Carpet Co.*, 114 U. S. 446, 1885; *Britton v. White Mfg. Co.*, 61 F. R. 95, 1894.

⁴ *Dukes v. Bauerle*, 41 F. R. 781, 1890.

⁵ Patent Office Rule 40.

⁶ *O'Brien v. Gallagher*, 25 Conn. 229, 1856.

⁷ *Wharton on Evidence*, Section 888.

signatures; but where one witness attested the signature of one joint inventor, and another witness attested the signature of the other, of two joint inventors, the Patent Office has held the attestation to be insufficient.

§ 122. The oath is not required by the statute to be in writing, nor to be recorded. It may be taken anywhere in the United States, before any person authorized by law to administer oaths at that place; or, when the applicant resides in a foreign country, it may be taken before any minister, chargé d'affaires, consul, or commercial agent, holding commission under the government of the United States, or before any notary public, judge, or magistrate, having an official seal, and authorized to administer oaths in the foreign country in which the applicant may be, and whose authority may be proved by a certificate of a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States.¹

Recital in the letters patent, that the required oath was made by the applicant, is, in the absence of fraud, conclusive evidence of that fact.² The presence, in the files of the Patent Office, of a paper purporting to be the oath in a given case, but void for lack of a jurat, or for some other fault, is a harmless circumstance.³ In such a case the law presumes that the oath recited in the letters patent was made orally, or was embodied in some other paper. It is presumed that the Commissioner will never issue a patent till he is satisfied that the applicant has somehow made oath to the facts to which the statute requires him to swear. When the Commissioner is so satisfied, and recites the fact in the letters patent, all inquiry on the subject is foreclosed, except in cases of actual fraud. Rule 47 of the Patent Office provides, however, that the oath or affirmation is to be attested in all cases by the proper official seal of the officer before whom it is taken. That

¹ Revised Statutes, Section 4892, as amended in 32 Statutes at Large, Part 1, p. 1225, Ch. 1019, Section 2.

² Seymour v. Osborne, 11 Wallace, 516, 1870.

³ Crompton v. Belknap Mills, 3 Fisher, 536, 1869; De Florez v. Reynolds, 14 Blatch. 506, 1878; Hoe v. Kahler, 12 F. R. 111, 1882; Hancock Inspirator Co. v. Jenks, 21 F. R. 914, 1884.

implies that the Commissioner requires the oath to be put into writing. If, however, he were to waive that requirement in a given case, and were to content himself with an oral oath, and were to recite in the patent that the required oath was made, the law would still have been complied with.

§ 123. The statute requires an applicant to make oath that he does verily believe himself to be the first inventor of the invention for which he solicits a patent, and to state of what country he is a citizen.¹ The Patent Office rule requires that this last-mentioned statement shall also be made in the oath; and that the applicant shall also state in the oath, where he resides; and that the invention has not been patented to himself, or to any other person with his consent or knowledge, in any country, more than two years prior to his application, or on an application filed in any foreign country, by any person in privity with him, more than twelve months prior to his application; and that, to the best of his knowledge and belief, the invention has not been in public use or on sale in the United States, nor described in any printed publication or patent in any country, for more than two years prior to his application in this country.²

The Patent Office rule also requires certain other statements to be made in oaths, in certain special cases.²

The statute of 1836, which was in force till the approval of the Act of 1870, required the applicant to make oath or affirmation of what country he was a citizen,³ whereas the Act of 1870, and the Revised Statutes, require only his statement on that subject. The old law governs all applications made before July 8th, 1870; and under it Justice GRIER decided, for certain reasons which have not existed since 1870, that where an applicant mentioned a wrong country in his oath, that error rendered his patent void, even though it arose from an erroneous opinion relevant to what

¹ Revised Statutes, Section 4892, as amended in 32 Statutes at Large, Part 1, Ch. 1019, Section 2.

² Patent Office Rule 46.

³ 5 Statutes at Large, Ch. 357, Section 6, p. 119.

constituted citizenship of the United States.¹ But under the statute of 1870, re-enacted in the Revised Statutes, such an error does not invalidate a patent.²

When an application for a patent is made by an executor or administrator of a deceased inventor, the statute directs the oath to be so varied in form that it can be made by him.³ Whether, in such a case, it is necessary for the applicant to swear that he believes that the deceased believed himself to be the first inventor, or whether it is necessary for the applicant to swear that he believes that the deceased was in fact the first inventor of the invention, is an unsettled question. If the first is the true view, then an executor may obtain, without perjury, a patent for an invention which he may know to have been previously used in the United States. If the second is the true view, then an executor may be unable to obtain, without perjury, a patent for an invention never before known or used in this country, and not previously patented or described in any printed publication, in this or in any foreign country, and not known or believed by its inventor, to have been previously known or used anywhere in the world. In the first of these contingencies, a wrong may result to the public, and in the last, a wrong may result to the beneficiaries of the deceased.

§ 124. An affirmation in judicial form may always be substituted for any oath required by any United States statute.⁴ Nor is this rule confined, as it is in the statutes of some of the States, to cases where the affiant informs the magistrate that he has scruples of conscience against taking an oath.

§ 125. The Patent Office fee, due with the application for a patent for a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, is fifteen dollars, and a final fee of twenty dollars is payable after such a patent has been allowed and before it is issued. The fees for patents for designs, vary with the length of the terms of the patents applied for.

¹ Child v. Adams, 1 Fisher, 193, 1954.

² Tonduer v. Chambers, 37 F. R. 337, 1889.

³ Revised Statutes, Section 4896, as amended in 32 Statutes at Large, Ch. 1019, Section 3.

⁴ Revised Statutes, Section 1.

For such a patent for three years and six months, the fee is ten dollars: for such a patent for seven years, the fee is fifteen dollars: for such a patent for fourteen years, the fee is thirty dollars.¹ Fees for design patents are required to be paid in advance.² The final fee, above mentioned, must be paid within six months after the patent is allowed, and notice thereof is sent to the applicant or his agent: and if that fee is not paid within that time, the statute provides that the patent shall be withheld.³ The Commissioner of Patents has no jurisdiction to do what the statute forbids. Therefore if he were to issue a patent on an application, the final fee for which was not paid till more than six months after the patent was allowed, he would be acting without authority, and the patent would, for that reason, be void. At common law, a month is a lunar, not a calendar month.⁴ Many of the States have reversed this definition by statute, and though Congress has never done so, the Supreme Court of the United States has reached that good result by judicial interpretation: and the word "month" wherever it occurs in the patent laws, must now be taken to mean a calendar and not a lunar month.⁵

§ 126. Drawings are required by the statute to be furnished by applicants for patents, in all cases wherein the invention admits of representation by drawings.⁶ The statutory requirement relevant to the character of such drawings, is merely that they shall be signed by the applicant or by his attorney in fact, and shall be attested by two witnesses. The Patent Office rules require, in addition, that drawings must show every feature of the invention covered by the claims; and when the invention consists of an improvement on an old machine, must exhibit, in one or more views, the invention itself, disconnected from the old structure, and also, in another view, so much only of the old structure as will suffice to show the connection of the in-

¹ Revised Statutes, Section 4934.

² Patent Office Rule 202.

³ Revised Statutes, Section 4885.

⁴ Blackstone, Book 2, Ch. 9.

⁵ Guaranty Trust Co. v. Railroad Co., 139 U. S. 145. 1891.

⁶ Revised Statutes, Section 4839.

vention therewith.¹ Those rules also describe numerous other characteristics for drawings,² which must be carefully followed, in order to secure favorable action from the Patent Office.

To be as useful as possible, all drawings for letters patent ought to show the true positions and proportions of the parts of the inventions which they purport to delineate; but it is not necessary that they be accurate enough to be used as working drawings, from which to construct specimens of those inventions.³

Drawings in applications filed prior to July 8, 1870, and after July 4, 1836, were required to have "written references."⁴ The object of such references was to connect the various parts of the drawings with the corresponding parts of the specification; but it was a sufficient compliance with that statute, where those references were made on the drawings, though not made in the specifications.⁵ The present statute says nothing about any references, or other means of connecting drawings with specifications; but the Patent Office rules require that they shall be connected by figures adjacent to the different views, and by letters or numerals adjacent to the different parts of the drawings, and by incorporating those figures and letters or numerals in the descriptive part of the specification.⁶

§ 127. A model of the invention is required by the statute to be furnished by the applicant, in all cases wherein the invention admits of representation by model, provided the Commissioner requires a model.⁷ This proviso was not in the statute of 1836, but it was inserted in that of 1870, in order to enable the Commissioner to dispense with models, in all cases where their utility is inferior in value to their cost, and to the room they would occupy in the Patent

¹ Patent Office Rule 50.

² Patent Office Rule 51.

³ *American Hide and Leather Splitting Machine Co. v. Machine Co.*, 4 Fisher, 284, 1870; *Royer v. Coupe*, 29 F. R. 369, 1886.

⁴ 5 Statutes at Large, Ch. 357, Section 6, p. 119.

⁵ *Emerson v. Hogg*, 2 Blatch. 1, 1845.

⁶ Patent Office Rules 38 and 51.

⁷ Revised Statutes, Section 4891.

Office. Under the operation of the proviso, models are at present called for by the Commissioner in very few of the cases which admit of representation thereby.

§ 128. Specimens of compositions of matter, and of the ingredients thereof, are required by the statute to be furnished by applicants for patents for such compositions of matter, in all cases where the Commissioner calls for such specimens.¹ He always does call for at least a specimen of the composition, put up in proper form to be preserved, unless that composition is in its nature perishable.²

§ 129. An application for a patent dates from its filing in the Patent Office, and not from the day of its execution by the applicant, nor from the day of the deposit of a model in the Patent Office, nor from the day of the deposit of anything there less than the full application;³ but where an application is divided by filing a new one for part of its subject, the new one will date from the date of the old one.⁴ In the absence of other evidence, the date of the application for a particular patent, is taken to be identical with the date of the letters patent itself.⁵ Letters patent, and printed certified Patent Office copies of letters patent, not old enough to have expired, always have upon them, in the space under the title, a memorandum that the application therefor was filed on a particular specified day. But no such memorandum is evidence of the fact it recites. It is not evidence at common law, nor in pursuance of any statute. That section of the Revised Statutes⁶ which gives evidential character to certain certified copies, does not include any such memorandum, because it is no part of the letters patent upon which it is placed, and because it is not a copy of any record, book, paper, or drawing belonging to the Patent Office. It is an indication of what some such

¹ Revised Statutes, Section 4890.

² Patent Office Rule 62.

³ *Draper v. Wattles*, 3 Bann. & Ard. 618, 1878; *Henry v. Francetown Soap Stone Stove Co.*, 5 Bann. & Ard. 108, 1880; *Campbell v. New York*, 35 F. R. 504, 1888.

⁴ *Smith & Griggs Mfg. Co. v. Sprague*, 123 U. S. 250, 1887.

⁵ *Worley v. Tobacco Co.*, 104 U. S. 342, 1881; *Fay v. Mason*, 120 F. R. 511, 1903.

⁶ Revised Statutes, Section 892.