

[Annex A]

Case examples of  
“Examination Guidelines for Patent and Utility Model”

For the purpose of clarifying the application of the "Examination Guidelines for Patent and Utility Model," the determination on requirements and applicant's responses are explained based on concrete examples.

This collection of examples includes examples relating to the following requirements.

1. Description requirements (Article 36)
2. Unity of invention (Article 37)
3. Eligibility for Patent and Industrial Applicability (the main paragraph in Article 29(1))
4. Novelty (Article 29(1))
5. Inventive step (Article 29(2))
6. Prior application (Article 39)
7. Amendment introducing new matter (Article 17bis(3))
8. Amendment for other than the prescribed purposes (Article 17bis(5))
9. Extension of Patent Term (Article 67septies(1)(i))

Each example is explained about the determination on the requirement or applicant's response relating to its subject. Therefore, there are no explanations about the requirements not relating to the subject, but this does not mean that there are no reasons for refusal on the requirements not relating to the subject.

Also, it should be noted that the statements of the scope of claims, etc. in the examples are modified, for example, simplified, for the purpose of illustration of each requirement.

(Points to note)

The following points should be noted when each case example is made reference to.

- (1) These cases provide a determination of an examiner based on the descriptions of prior art or the common general knowledge shown in each case.
- (2) These cases explain a determination of an examiner or a response of an applicant on the subject of patentability requirements in each case (for example, when a case is related to novelty, the requirements for novelty are only considered).
- (3) The descriptions of the claims in these cases are properly simplified as necessary to facilitate explanation on the requirements.