

LAW AND PRACTICE

RELATING TO

LETTERS PATENT FOR INVENTIONS.

TREATISE

c#

ON THE

LAW AND PRACTICE

RELATING TO

Letters Patent for Inventions.

WITH

AN APPENDIX

OF

*STATUTES, INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION, RULES,
FORMS AND PRECEDENTS, ORDERS, &c.*

BY

ROBERT FROST, B.Sc. (LOND.),

FELLOW OF THE CHEMICAL SOCIETY;
OF LINCOLN'S INN, ESQUIRE, BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

VOLUME I.

FOURTH EDITION.

0

LONDON:

STEVENS AND HAYNES,

Law Publishers,

BELL YARD, TEMPLE BAR.

1912.

S
UK
945
FR

Tx
F-0392
ed4

LONDON:

PRINTED BY C. F. ROWORTH, 88, FETTER LANE, E.C.

OCT 16 1912

TO

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD ALVERSTONE,

LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF ENGLAND,

THIS WORK IS BY PERMISSION

Dedicated.

PREFACE.

THIS book is now issued in its Fourth Edition. The Patents and Designs Acts of 1907 and 1908 have occasioned a large amount of re-writing and the addition of much fresh matter dealing with new statutory provisions.

The case law has been brought up to date. The Author ventures to hope that the present Edition may merit a reception as favourable as was accorded to each of its predecessors.

ROBERT FROST.

5, NEW COURT, LINCOLN'S INN,

January, 1912.

PREFACE
TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THIS book is my attempt to bring within a reasonable compass our law, as it at present exists, in reference to Letters Patent for Inventions. Any complete history of our legislation in the past upon the subject would have inconveniently added to the bulk of the volume; and, consequently, it has not been referred to, except where necessary to explain the present practice. For the same reason I have omitted all reference to the laws of foreign countries where legal protection to Inventors is afforded.

To the extent that the book approximates to the end I had in view, so must be the measure of its success or failure. Whatever its shortcomings, I hope it may be found of use.

ROBERT FROST.

8 KING'S BENCH WALK, TEMPLE,
January 1891.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS WORK.

- ◆—
- A. & E. Adolphus and Ellis' Reports.
- B. & Ad. Barnewall and Adolphus' Reports.
- B. & Ald. Barnewall and Alderson's Reports.
- B. & C. Barnewall and Cresswell's Reports.
- Beav. Beavan's Reports.
- B. & S. Best and Smith's Reports.
- Bing. N. C. Bingham's New Cases.
- B. & P. N. R. Bosanquet and Puller's New Reports.
- Brod. & Bing. Broderip and Bingham's Reports.
- Bull. N. P. Buller's Nisi Prius.
- Camp. Campbell's Reports.
- C. B. Common Bench Reports.
- C. B. N. S. Common Bench Reports, New Series.
- Car. & K. Carrington and Kirwan's Reports.
- Car. & P. Carrington and Payne's Reports.
- Carp. P. C. Carpmuel's Patent Cases.
- C. L. R. Common Law Reports.
- Cl. & F. Clark and Finnely's Reports.
- Co. R. Coke's Reports.
- Coop. Ch. Ca. Cooper's Chancery Cases.
- Cr. M. & R. Crompton, Meeson, and Roscoe's Reports.
- D. & L. Danson and Lloyd's Reports.
- Dav. P. C. Davies' Patent Cases.
- De G. F. & J. De Gex, Fisher, and Jones' Reports.
- De G. & J. De Gex and Jones' Reports.
- De G. M. & G. De Gex, Macnaghten, and Gordon's Reports.
- De G. J. & S. De Gex, Jones, and Smith's Reports.
- Dowl. & Ry. Dowling and Ryland's Reports.
- Dr. & S. Drewry and Smale's Reports.
- E. & B. Ellis and Blackburn's Reports.
- E. B. & E. Ellis, Blackburn, and Ellis' Reports.
- E. & E. Ellis and Ellis' Reports.
- Eng. The Engineer (a weekly publication).
- Eq. Rep. Equity Reports.
- Exch. Exchequer Reports.
- F. & F. Foster and Finlason's Reports.
- Giff. Giffard's Reports.
- Griff. L. O. C. Griffin's Patent Cases decided by the Comptroller-General
and Law Officers in 1887.
- Griff. P. C. Griffin's Patent Cases.
- G. P. C. Goodeve's Patent Cases.
- G. P. P. Goodeve's Patent Practice.
- H. Bl. H. Blackstone's Reports.
- H. & M. Hemming and Miller's Reports.
- H. L. C. House of Lords Cases.
- Holt N. P. Holt's Nisi Prius Cases.
- H. & N. Hurlstone and Norman's Exchequer Reports.
- I. O. J. The Illustrated Official Journal (Patents).
- Ir. Ch. Rep. Irish Chancery Reports.
- Iron Iron (a weekly publication).

Johns.	Johnson's Reports.
J. & H.	Johnson and Hemming's Reports.
Jur. N. S.	Jurist, New Series.
Jur. O. S.	Jurist, Old Series.
K. & J.	Kay and Johnson's Reports.
L. J. N. S. Ch.	Law Journal Reports, New Series, Chancery.
L. J. N. S. C. P.	" " " Common Pleas.
L. J. N. S. Ex.	" " " Exchequer.
L. J. N. S. Q. B. ..	" " " Queen's Bench.
L. J. O. S.	Law Journal Reports, Old Series.
L. O. C.	Griffin's Patent Cases decided by the Comptroller-General and Law Officers in 1887.
L. R. App. Cas.	Law Reports, Appeal Cases.
L. R. Ch.	" Chancery Appeals.
L. R. Ch. D.	" Chancery Division.
L. R. C. P.	" Common Pleas Cases.
L. R. E. & I. App. ...	" English and Irish Appeal Cases.
L. R. Eq.	" Equity Cases.
L. R. Ex.	" Exchequer Cases.
L. R. H. J.	" House of Lords.
L. R. P. C.	" Privy Council Cases.
L. R. Q. B. D.	" Queen's Bench Division.
L. T.	Law Times, Old Series.
L. T. N. S.	Law Times, New Series.
M. & G.	Manning and Granger's Reports.
M. & S.	Maule and Selwyn's Reports.
M. & W.	Meeson and Welsby's Reports.
Mac. & G.	Macnaghten and Gordon's Reports.
Macr. P. C.	Macrory's Patent Cases.
Marsh.	Marshall's Reports.
Mer.	Merivale's Reports.
Moo. P. C. N. S. ...	Moore's Reports of Cases in the Privy Council, New Series.
Moo. P. C. O. S. ...	Moore's Reports of Cases in the Privy Council, Old Series.
Myl. & Cr.	Mylne and Craig's Reports.
N. R.	The New Reports.
Newt. L. J. C. S. ..	Newton's London Journal of Arts and Sciences, Conjoined Series.
Newt. L. J. N. S. ...	Newton's London Journal of Arts and Sciences, New Series.
Parl. Rep.	Parliamentary Reports.
Phill.	Phillips' Reports.
P. O. R.	Patent Office Reports of Patent Cases.
Q. B.	Queen's Bench Reports.
R.	The Reports.
R. P. C.	Patent Office Reports of Patent Cases.
R. S. C.	Rules of the Supreme Court.
Russ.	Russell's Reports.
Russ. & M.	Russell and Mylne's Reports.
Ry. & M.	Ryan and Moody's Reports.
Scott N. R.	Scott's New Reports.
Stark. R.	Starkie's Reports.
Taunt.	Taunton's Reports.
T. R.	Term Reports.
Times R.	Times Law Reports.
Tyr.	Tyrwhitt's Reports.
Ves.	Vesey's Reports.
W. N.	Weekly Notes.
W. P. C.	Webster's Patent Cases.
W. R.	The Weekly Reporter.
Y. & C.	Youngo and Collyer's Reports.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

VOLUME I.

	PAGE
ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS WORK	xi
TABLE OF CASES	xvii
NOTES OF RULINGS BY THE COMPTROLLER-GENERAL	lxxi
LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS	lxxiii

CHAPTER I.

THE STATUTE LAW OF PATENTS.

Introductory	1
Statute of Monopolies	1
Acts between 1623 and 1883	4
Acts between 1883 and 1907	4
Patents and Designs (Amendment) Act, 1907, and Patents and Designs Act, 1907	5

CHAPTER II.

THE PATENTEE.

Who may apply for Letters Patent	13
True and First Inventor	14
Master and Servant	18
Communicators of Foreign Inventions	22
Persons incapable of being Patentees	26

CHAPTER III.

SUBJECT-MATTER.

General	28
Any manner of new Manufacture	28
Subject-matter must be an Art	31
Discovery and Invention	32
Invention	34
Classes of Invention	46
Principles	47
Processes	58
Products	70
Combinations	73
Improvements	82
New Uses of Old Appliances	88

CHAPTER IV.

NOVELTY.

	PAGE
Novelty at Common Law	102
Public Knowledge	105
Want of Novelty in Part	110
Analogous Uses	114
Novelty and Discovery	114
Anticipation and Publication	115
Equivalents	115
Rediscovery of Lost Art	116
Publication by Prior User	117
Publication by Personal Communications	134
Publication by Documents	136

CHAPTER V.

UTILITY.

Utility at Common Law	154
Meaning of Utility in Law	159
Amount of Utility	161
Invention must be Useful as Specified	162
Utility of Improvements	168

CHAPTER VI.

THE SPECIFICATIONS.

Origin and Development	170
The Title	173
The Provisional Specification	176
Functions of Provisional Specifications	176
Provisional Protection	181
Variations between the Specifications	182
Legitimate Developments of the Invention	182
Disconformity	184
The Complete Specification	193
Conditions by Law required	194
The Claiming Clauses	244
Construction of the Specifications	260

CHAPTER VII.

REVOCATION ON PETITION TO THE COURT.

The Petition	288
The Petitioner	291
Grounds for Revocation	295
Practice	300

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xv

CHAPTER VIII.

ACTION TO RESTRAIN THREATS OF LEGAL PROCEEDINGS.

PART I.

	PAGE
General	308
Person aggrieved	313
What is a Threat?	313
The Proviso	318

PART II.

Practice	323
Pleadings	323
Issues	323
Particulars	324
Interlocutory Injunction	325
Damages	328
Certificate of Validity	329
Certificate as to Particulars	329
Breach of Injunction	330
Costs	330

CHAPTER IX.

ACTION OF INFRINGEMENT.

General	332
Infringement	336
Proceedings before commencement of Action	390
Parties	393
Pleadings	398
Writ	398
Statement of Claim	399
Particulars of Breaches	401
Defence	408
Particulars of Objections	422
Interlocutory Injunction	435
Discovery and Inspection	450
Discovery	450
Inspection	459
Evidence	465
Trial	485
Consolidation of Actions	493
New Trial	494
Appeal	494
Perpetual Injunction	499
Account or Damages	507
General	507
Account	512
Damages	514
Destruction or Delivery to Plaintiff of Infringing Articles	525

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Costs	528
Discontinuance	530
Separate Issues	531
Apportionment	532
Certificates as to Particulars	536
Certificate of Validity	543
Public Authority	550
Party and Party	551
Experts' Fees	551
Drawings and Models	551
Three Counsel	552
Shorthand Notes	552
Inquiry as to Damages	552
Costs on Higher Scale	553
Stay pending Appeal	555

INDEX.

TABLE OF CASES.

	PAGE
A. B.'s Patent (1902), 19 R. P. C. 403	ii. 72
A. B.'s Patent (1902), 19 R. P. C. 556	ii. 73
A. & B.'s Patent (1896), 13 R. P. C. 63	ii. 72
A. & B.'s Application (1911), 28 R. P. C. 454	ii. 12
Abel's Patent (1876), Johns. Pat. Man. 178	ii. 120
Acetylene Illuminating Co., Ltd. v. Midland Acetylene (Parent) Syndi- cate (1900), 17 R. P. C. 534	546
Acetylene Illuminating Co., Ltd. v. United Alkali Co., Ltd., [1902] 1 Ch. 494; 19 R. P. C. 213; 20 R. P. C. 161; 22 R. P. C. 145 ..34, 63, 90, 539, 540, 545 : ii. 29	
Ackroyd and Best, Ltd. v. Thomas (1904), 21 R. P. C. 403, 737	57, 200
Actien Gesellschaft für Cartonagen Industrie v. Remus (1895), 12 R. P. C. 94	492
Actien Gesellschaft für Cartonagen Industrie v. Temler (1899), 16 R. P. C. 447; 18 R. P. C. 6	438 : ii. 79, 148
Actien Gesellschaft für Cartonagen Industrie v. Schroeder (1896), 13 R. P. C. 466	42
Adair v. Young (1879), L. R. 11 Ch. D. 136; 12 Ch. D. 13; (1879) W. N. 8	338, 385, 386, 395, 505, 512, 555, 556
Adair's Patent (1881), L. R. 6 App. Cas. 176; L. J. P. C. 68ii. 218, 219, 236, 240, 241, 243	
Adam's Patent (1896), 13 R. P. C. 548	ii. 63
Adam's Patent (1898), 16 R. P. C. 1	ii. 219
Adamant Stone Paving Co. v. Corporation of Liverpool (1896), 14 R. P. C. 11, 264	45, 95, 98, 176, 191, 249, 384
Adams v. North British Railway Co. (1873), 25 L. J. N. S. 367	394
Adamson's Patent (1856), 6 De G. M. & G. 420; 25 L. J. Ch. 456....	121
Adhesive Dry Mounting Co., Ltd. v. Trapp & Co. (1910), 27 R. P. C. 341	376
Adolph Spiel's Application (1888), 5 R. P. C. 281	ii. 43, 46
Adie v. Clark (1876), L. R. 2 App. Cas. 423. <i>See also Clark v. Adie</i> ..	ii. 203
African Gold Recovery Co. v. Sheba Gold Mining Co. (1897), 14 R. P. C. 660	ii. 207
Ainsworth's Patent (1895), 13 R. P. C. 76	ii. 122
Aire and Calder Glass Bottle Works, and Walker's Application (1888), 5 R. P. C. 345	ii. 51, 53, 54
Airey's Patent (1888), 5 R. P. C. 348	ii. 37, 51, 64
Aktiebolaget Separator v. Dairy Outfit Co. (1896), 13 R. P. C. 725; 14 R. P. C. 473	279, 344, 370, 423

	PAGE
Albo-Carbon Light Co. <i>v.</i> Kidd (1887), 4 R. P. C. 535 ; 5 R. P. C. 581 ; 6 R. P. C. 194	540
Alcock <i>v.</i> Cooke (1829), 5 Bing. 340	198
Alexander <i>v.</i> Henry (1895), 12 R. P. C. 360	522
Alexander Turnbull & Co., Ltd. <i>v.</i> Cruikshank (1905), 22 R. P. C. 363, 521	289
Allan's Patent (1867), L. R. 1 P. C. 507 ; 4 Moo. P. O. N. S. 443	477 :
	ii. 231, 232
Allen <i>v.</i> Douulton (1887), 4 R. P. C. 377	ii. 125, 142
Allen <i>v.</i> Duckett (1893), 10 R. P. C. 397	193, 222, 490
Allen <i>v.</i> Flood, (1898) A. C. 1	376
Allen <i>v.</i> Horton (1893), 10 R. P. C. 412.....	424, 490
Allen <i>v.</i> Oates (1898), 15 R. P. C. 298, 744	422
Allen <i>v.</i> Pyatt (1898), 15 R. P. C. 723 ; 16 R. P. C. 135	346
Allen <i>v.</i> Rawson (1845), 1 C. B. 551.....	18, 19, 20, 21, 73
Allen's Patent (1887), Griff. L. O. C. 3	ii. 113, 122
Alliance Pure White Lead Syndicate <i>v.</i> MacIvor's Patents (1891), 8 R. P. C. 321 ; 39 W. R. 487	433, 456
Allison's Patent (1898), 15 R. P. C. 408.....	ii. 122
Allison's Patent (1900), 17 R. P. C. 298, 513	302 : ii. 128, 142
Alma Veneer Felt Co. <i>v.</i> Fisher (1897), 14 R. P. C. 159.....	ii. 208
Alsop Flour Process, Ld. <i>v.</i> Flour Oxidizing Co., Ld., In the matter of Andrews' Patent (1908), 25 R. P. C. 477	148, 373, 467
Alsop's Patent (1905), 23 R. P. C. 65 ; 24 R. P. C. 684, 733 ; [1906] 1 Ch. 85	60, 165 : ii. 102, 129
Aluminium Co. <i>v.</i> Domeiere (1897), 15 R. P. C. 32.....	500
American Braided Wire Co. <i>v.</i> Thomson (1887), 4 R. P. C. 316 ; 5 R. P. C. 113, 375, 538, 696 ; 6 R. P. C. 518 ; 7 R. P. C. 47, 152 ; L. R. 44 Ch. D. 274 ; (1890) W. N. 68. <i>See</i> Thomson <i>v.</i> Braided American Wire Co.	41, 89, 98, 100, 478, 496, 512, 522, 524, 525
American Steel and Wire Co. <i>v.</i> T. W. Glover & Co., Ld. (1902), 19 R. P. C. 111 ; (1902), W. N. 17	539, 540
Amory <i>v.</i> Brown (1869), L. R. 8 Eq. 663 ; 38 L. J. Ch. 593.....	471, 473
Amos <i>v.</i> Chadwick (1876), L. R. 4 Ch. D. 869	493
Anderson and McKinnell's Application (1887), Griff. L. O. C. 23	ii. 57, 62
Anderson <i>v.</i> Bank of British Columbia (1875), L. R. 2 Ch. D. 644	458
Anderson <i>v.</i> Liebig's Extract of Meat Co. (1881), 45 L. T. N. S. 757..	312, 323
Anderson <i>v.</i> Patent Oxonite Co. (1886), 3 R. P. C. 279	393, 446
Anderton, <i>In re</i> (1887), Griff. L. O. C. 25	ii. 52, 66
Andrew <i>v.</i> Crossley (1892), 9 R. P. C. 165 ; [1892] 1 Ch. 492 ; 61 L. J. Ch. 437	ii. 130
Andrew's Patent (1906), 23 R. P. C. 441 ; 24 R. P. C. 349 ; 25 R. P. C. 477	148, 373
Anglo-American Brush Electric Light Corporation <i>v.</i> Crompton (1886), L. R. 34 Ch. D. 152 ; 4 R. P. C. 27 ; 59 L. J. Ch. 167	427
Anglo-American Brush Electric Light Corporation <i>v.</i> King, Brown & Co. (1891), 9 R. P. C. 313	146
Annand <i>v.</i> Taylor. <i>See</i> Taylor <i>v.</i> Annand.	
Anti-Vibration Incandescent Lighting Co., Ld. <i>v.</i> Crossley (1904), 22 R. P. C. 157, 441.....	99
Anti-Vibration Incandescent Lighting Co., Ld. <i>v.</i> Wholesale Incan- descent Fittings Co. (1906), 23 R. P. C. 399.....	549

TABLE OF CASES.

xix

	PAGE
Appleby's Twin Roller Chain, Ld. v. Albert Eadie Chain, Ld. (1899), 16 R. P. C. 318	321, 322, 329, 432, 480, 487
Appostoloff's Patent (1896), 13 R. P. C. 275.....	ii. 22
Arkwright v. Nightingale (1785), 1 W. P. C. 60; Dav. P. C. 55	15, 20, 201, 214, 390, 413, 415, 525
Armstrong's Patent (1896), 13 R. P. C. 501; 14 R. P. C. 747; 77 L. T. N. S. 267	305, 306, 307: ii. 113, 142
Arnold v. Bradbury (1871), L. R. 6 Ch. App. 706; 24 L. T. N. S. 613..	49, 249, 274, 275, 427
Arnold's Application (1882), Griff. L. O. C. 5	ii. 135
Arnot v. Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. (1904), 22 R. P. C. 105, 472;	
25 R. P. C. 309	42
Ashenhurst's Patent (1853), 2 W. R. 3	ii. 8
Ashton and Knowles' Application (1910), 27 R. P. C. 181	ii. 44
Ashworth v. English Card Clothing Co., Ld. (1901), 18 R. P. C. 367;	
19 R. P. C. 463; 20 R. P. C. 790; 21 R. P. C. 553	55, 57, 278, 337, 358, 462, 499
Ashworth v. Law (1890), 7 R. P. C. 231	409: ii. 162, 201
Ashworth v. Roberts (1890), L. R. 45 Ch. D. 623; 7 R. P. C. 451;	
9 R. P. C. 89, 309; 60 L. J. Ch. 27.....	432, 454, 456: ii. 203
Ashworth's Application (1878), Griff. L. O. C. 6..	ii. 114, 117, 119, 121, 122, 133
Atherton's Patent (1889), 16 R. P. C. 547	ii. 58
Atkins and Applegarth v. Castner-Kellner Alkali Co. (1891), 18 R. P. C. 281	63, 161, 162, 196
Atkinson v. Britton (1910), 27 R. P. C. 81, 469	38
Attorney-General v. Emerson (1899), L. R. 24 Q. B. D. 56	556
Attorney-General v. Vestry of Bermondsey (1883), L. R. 23 Ch. D. 60 .	395
Aube's Patent (1854), 9 Moo. P. C. 48	ii. 187
Automatic Coal-Gas Retort Co. v. Mayor of Salford (1897), 14 R. P. C. 450	95, 184, 508, 509
Automatic Diversions Syndicate v. Urry (1897), 14 R. P. C. 365	352
Automatic Weighing Machine Co. v. Combined Weighing Machine Co. (1889), 6 R. P. C. 121, 367	57, 150, 312, 339, 367, 415, 548
Automatic Weighing Machine Co. v. Fearby (1893), 10 R. P. C. 442..	368, 527, 549
Automatic Weighing Machine Co. v. International Hygienic Society (1889), 6 R. P. C. 475.....	150, 368, 548, 554
Automatic Weighing Machine Co. v. Knight (1889), 6 R. P. C. 113, 297; W. N. (1888) 250..	57, 67, 70, 150, 266, 269, 270, 355, 360, 361, 367, 431, 480, 481, 532, 545, 553
Automatic Weighing Machine Co. v. National Exhibitions Association (1891), 8 R. P. C. 345; 9 R. P. C. 41	57, 150, 278, 367, 368
Aveling v. Maclaren (1881), L. R. 17 Ch. D. 139	425
Avery's Patent (1887), 4 R. P. C. 152, 322; L. R. 36 Ch. D. 307; 56 L. J. Ch. 580, 1007	24, 293, 297, 298, 299, 300: ii. 5, 34
Axman v. Lund (1874), L. R. 18 Eq. 330; 43 L. J. Ch. 655	308, 417, 418: ii. 205
Aylott's Patent (1911), 28 R. P. C. 227	304

	PAGE
BABCOCK and Wilson, Ld. v. Edwin Danks & Co. (Oldbury), Ld. (1910), 27 R. P. C. 713	390
Babcock and Wilson, Ld. v. Water Tube Boiler and Engineering Co. (1910), 27 R. P. C. 626	512
Bacon v. Jones (1839), 4 M. & C. 436	436, 437, 447, 448
Bacon v. Spottiswood (1839), 1 Beav. 382	500, 514
Badham v. Bird (1888), 5 R. P. C. 238	473, 489
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v. Basle Chemical Works. See Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v. Johnson.	
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v. Chemische Fabrik vormals Sandoz (1903), 20 R. P. C. 413; 21 R. P. C. 345, 533	399
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v. Dawson (1889), 6 R. P. C. 387 ..	483, 484
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v. Hickson (1904), 22 R. P. C. 63; [1905] 2 Ch. 495; 23 R. P. C. 433	380, 492, 528
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v. Isler, [1906] 1 Ch. 605; [1906] 2 Ch. 449; W. N. 163; 23 R. P. C. 173, 633	382, 383
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v. Johnson, [1896] 1 Ch. 25; [1897] 2 Ch. 322; [1898] A. C. 200; 65 L. J. Ch. 174; 12 R. P. C. 535; 14 R. P. C. 211, 405, 919	379, 380, 389, 396, 399, 555
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v. La Société des Usines du Rhône (1897), 14 R. P. C. 875; 15 R. P. C. 359	63, 142, 196, 202, 203, 214, 219, 277, 426, 490, 545, 552
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v. Levinstein (1883, 1885, 1887), L. R. 24 Ch. D. 156; 29 Ch. D. 366; 12 App. Cas. 710; 52 L. J. Ch. 704; 2 R. P. C. 73, 143; 4 R. P. C. 449; 6 R. P. C. 387	55, 63, 67, 81, 116, 149, 161, 162, 163, 196, 198, 204, 205, 208, 213, 214, 225, 232, 281, 282, 342, 355, 373, 455, 471, 477, 478, 485, 489, 526, 535.
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v. Nobel's Explosive Co., Ld. (1909), 26 R. P. C. 638	447, 461
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v. Spivey (1904), 22 R. P. C. 65	499
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v. Thomson (W. G.), Ld. (1902), 19 R. P. C. 502; 20 R. P. C. 422; 21 R. P. C. 469	172, 399, 501
Bagot Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Clipper Pneumatic Tyre Co., [1901] 1 Ch. 196; [1902] 1 Ch. 146; 19 R. P. C. 69	ii. 168
Bailey, Ex parte (1872), L. R. 8 Ch. 61	ii. 73
Bailey, Re (1884), Griff. P. C. 269	ii. 55
Bailey, Re (1887), Goodeve, P. C. 57	ii. 51
Bailey v. Airey (1905), 22 R. P. C. 461; 23 R. P. C. 277	358
Bailey v. Robertson (1878), L. R. 3 App. Cas. 1055..	131, 171, 178, 182, 186, 187, 202, 218, 247, 510
Bailey v. Taylor (1829), 1 Russ. & M. 73	510
Bailey's Patent (1884), 1 R. P. C. 1	ii. 241, 243, 247
Bailey's Patent (1887), Goodeve, P. C. 57	ii. 53
Bainbridge v. Wrigley (1810), Parl. Rep. 192; 1 Carp. P. C. 270	175, 199
Baird v. Moule's Earth Closet (1881), L. R. 17 Ch. D. 139	425
Baird v. Neilson, 8 Cl. & Fin. 726	418: ii. 201
Bairstow's Patent (1888), 5 R. P. C. 286	ii. 8, 46, 49
Baker v. Kinnell (1892), 9 R. P. C. 441	435
Baker v. White (1884), 1 Times R. 64	446
Bakewell's Patent (1862), 15 Moo. P. C. 385	477: ii. 232, 234

TABLE OF CASES.

xxi

	PAGE
Bamlett v. Picksley (1875), Griff. P. C. 40	60, 95
Bancroft v. Smith (1897), 14 R. P. C. 172	496
Bancroft's Application (1905), 23 R. P. C. 89	244: ii. 15
Barber v. Grace (1847), 1 Exch. 339; 17 L. J. Ex. 122	57, 58, 67, 282
Barff and Bower's Patent (1895), 12 R. P. C. 383; [1895] A. C. 675; 73 L. T. N. S. 36; 11 R. 579	ii. 239
Barker v. Shaw, 1 W. P. C. 126, n.	20
Barlow v. Bayliss (1875), Griff. P. C. 44	117
Barnett v. Barnett's Screw Stopper Bottling Co., Ltd. (1884), 1 R. P. C. 9	312, 328: ii. 210
Barney v. United Telephone Co. (1885), 2 R. P. C. 173; L. R. 28 Ch. D. 394	312, 326, 327
Bartlett's Patent (1892), 9 R. P. C. 511	ii. 51, 55
Bassett v. Graydon (1897), 13 R. P. C. 79, 537, 608; 14 R. P. C. 701 ..	384, 505: ii. 183, 190, 193
Bateman v. Gray (1853), Macr. P. C. 102	354
Bateman and Moore's Patent (1854), Macr. P. C. 116	ii. 109, 110
Bates v. Horsfall (1905), 22 R. P. C. 519	542
Bates v. Redgate (1876), L. R. 4 Ch. 577; 38 L. J. Ch. 501	ii. 73
Bates' Patent (1836), 1 W. P. C. 739	ii. 233
Batley v. Kynock (1874), L. R. 19 Eq. 90, 229; L. R. 20 Eq. 642; 44 L. J. Ch. 891, 565; 31 L. T. N. S. 573; 33 L. T. N. S. 45..	403, 405, 460, 461, 551
Baxter v. Combe (1850), 1 Ir. Ch. R. 284	436, 437
Beard v. Egerton (1846), 2 Car. & K. 667; 3 C. B. 97; 8 C. B. 165; 15 L. J. C. P. 270; 19 L. J. C. P. 36	25, 175, 197, 211, 213, 225, 232, 261, 274
Beard v. Turner (1866), 13 L. T. N. S. 746	509
Beardsell v. Schwan, Seton, 3rd ed. 910	449, 463
Beavis v. Rylands Glass and Engineering Co., Ltd. (1899), 17 R. P. C. 93, 704	46, 150, 472
Beck and Justice, <i>Re</i> (1877), Griff. L. O. C. 10	ii. 119
Beddon v. Beddon (1878), L. R. 9 Ch. D. 89	309
Beldam's Patent, [1910] 1 Ch. 60; 27 R. P. C. 758	ii. 88, 100
Bell, <i>Re</i> (1887), Griff. L. O. C. 10	ii. 135, 136, 137
Bell and Coleman's Patent, Griff. P. C. 320	294
Bell's Patent (1846), 2 W. P. C. 160; 10 Jur. 363; 1 Moo. P. C. N. S. 49	74: ii. 229
Bennett v. Lord Bury (1880), L. R. 5 C. P. 339	493
Bennington v. Hill (1891), 8 R. P. C. 326	536
Benno Jaffé und Darmstaedter Lanolin Fabrik v. Richardson (1893), 10 R. P. C. 136; 11 R. P. C. 93, 261; 62 L. J. Ch. 710	42, 65, 109, 263, 271, 344, 454, 455, 456
Bentley v. Flemming (1844), 1 C. & K. 587; 1 C. B. 479	123, 127
Bentley v. Keighley (1844), 7 M. & G. 652; 8 Scott. N. R. 372	433
Bercham v. Wren (1904), 21 R. P. C. 683	ii. 167
Berdan's Patent (1875), L. R. 20 Eq. 346	ii. 82, 120, 136
Bereton v. Richardson (1884), 1 R. P. C. 165	119, 122, 123
Bergman v. McMillan (1881), L. R. 17 Ch. D. 423	393, 514: ii. 159, 206
Berliner v. Edison Bell Consolidated Phonograph Co., Ltd. (1899), 16 R. P. C. 336	321

	PAGE
Berrington's Patent, cited L. R. 1 P. C. 509; 4 Moo. P. C. N. S. 445; Coryton, 225.....	ii. 232
Borry's Patent (1850), 7 Moo. P. C. 187	ii. 216, 217
Beryl, The, L. R. 9 P. D. 137	487
Bessmans v. Wright (1858), 6 W. R. 719	ii. 201
Beston v. Watts (1907), 24 R. P. C. 219; 25 R. P. C. 19	84, 280
Bethell v. Gage (1897), 14 R. P. C. 699.....	530, 539
Bett's Patent (1862), 1 Moo. P. C. N. S. 49; 9 Jur. N. S. 137; 7 L. T. N. S. 177	ii. 229, 231, 242
Betts v. De Vitro (1864—73), L. R. 3 Ch. App. Cas. 429; L. R. 5 H. L. 1; L. R. 6 H. L. 319; 34 L. J. Ch. 289, 291; 37 L. J. Ch. 325; 11 Jur. N. S. 9, 217, 445; Seton, 4th ed. 354 .. 143, 395, 396, 499, 525, 550	
Betts v. Gallairs (1870), L. R. 10 Eq. 392.....	500
Betts v. Menzies (1857—62), 1 E. & E. 990; 3 Jur. N. S. 357; 4 Jur. N. S. 477; 27 L. J. Q. B. 154; 28 L. J. Q. B. 361; 30 L. J. Q. B. 81; 31 L. J. Q. B. 233; 7 L. T. N. S. 110; 10 H. L. C. 117 108, 123, 128, 137, 141, 144, 148, 242, 243, 263, 264, 270, 273, 274	
Betts v. Neilson (1866—71), W. N. (1866) 170; 2 De G. J. & S. 82; L. R. 3 Ch. 429; 5 H. L. 1; 34 L. J. Ch. 537; 40 L. J. Ch. 317; 3 De G. J. & S. 22; 6 N. R. 221; 18 L. T. N. S. 159	108, 124, 137, 218, 260, 385, 387, 395, 450, 470
Betts v. Noel, Seton, 4th ed. 355	512
Betts v. Walker (1850), 14 Q. B. 363	409
Betts v. Willmott (1870), L. R. 6 Ch. 239; 16 W. R. 305; 18 W. R. 946.....	381, 392, 482, 484: ii. 181, 182, 196
Bevan v. Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ltd. (1902), 20 R. P. C. 69	315, 330
Bibby and Baron, Ltd. v. Duerden (1910), 27 R. P. C. 283; 28 R. P. C. 305	456, 531
Bickford v. Skewes (1837—41), 1 W. P. C. 211; 8 L. J. Ch. 188; 10 L. J. Q. B. 302; 1 Q. B. 938	196, 205, 211, 214, 236, 261, 280, 440, 443, 447
Bidder v. Bridges (1885), L. R. 29 Ch. D. 29	451, 452
Bimm v. Shoppee (1911), 28 R. P. C. 265	472
Birch v. Harrap (1895), 12 R. P. C. 431; 13 R. P. C. 615	80, 358, 432
Birch v. Mather (1883), L. R. 22 Ch. D. 629; 52 L. J. Ch. 292	450, 451
Birmingham Pneumatic Tyre Syndicate v. Reliance Tyre Co. (1900), 17 R. P. C. 277; 19 R. P. C. 298; 20 R. P. C. 288.....	427, 428, 430, 495
Birt's Patent (1892), 9 R. P. C. 489	ii. 70
Bishop v. Inman (1900), 17 R. P. C. 749	314, 318, 323
Blackett v. Dixon and Mann, Ltd. (1909), 26 R. P. C. 73	408
Blackwell v. Crabb, 36 L. J. Ch. 504	334
Blake's Patent (1873), L. R. 4 P. C. 535; 9 Moo. P. C. N. S. 373	ii. 240
Blakey v. Latham (1888), 6 R. P. C. 29, 184 41, 71, 84, 424, 474, 496, 497, 535, 536, 554	
Blamond's Patent (1860), 3 L. T. N. S. 800	ii. 121
Blank v. Footman (1888), 5 R. P. C. 653; L. R. 39 Ch. D. 678; 57 L. J. Ch. 909	135
Blofield v. Payne, 4 B. & A. 410	334
Bloxam v. Elsee (1825-27), 1 C. & P. 558; 6 B. & C. 169; 1 Cowp. 444; 1 W. P. C. 132, n.; 9 Dowl. & Ry. 215; 3 L. J. (O. S.) Q. B. 93..... 18, 19, 110, 164, 165, 169, 175, 198, 218, 285, 393, 467: ii. 173	

TABLE OF CASES.

xxiii

	PAGE
Boake, Roberts & Co. v. Stevenson (1895), 12 R. P. C. 228	530
Board's Patent (1908), 25 R. P. C. 537	ii. 233, 246
Bodmer's Patent (1849), 6 Moo. P. C. 468	ii. 170, 214, 216
Bodmer's Patent (1853), 8 Moo. P. C. 282	ii. 229, 245
Booth v. Kennard (1856), 1 H. & N. 527; 2 H. & N. 84; 26 L. J. Ex. 23, 305	49, 61, 67, 79, 82, 202, 247, 411, 474
Borrowman's Patent (1902), 19 R. P. C. 156; (1902) W. N. 56	303
Bosch's Application (1909), 26 R. P. C. 710	51, 53
Bostock v. Ramsey Urban District Council, [1900] 1 Q. B. 357	581
Boult's Patent (1893), 10 R. P. C. 275	ii. 51, 53
Boult's Patent (1909), 26 R. P. C. 219	ii. 93, 100
Boult's Patent (1909), 26 R. P. C. 383	ii. 96, 97
Boulton v. Bull (1795), 2 H. Bl. 463, 482, 493; Dav. P. C. 162; 3 Ves. 140	16, 29, 31, 47, 48, 58, 66, 70, 73, 82, 155, 201, 224, 270, 285, 393
Bovill v. Cowan (1867), W. N. 115	457
Bovill v. Crate (1865), L. R. 1 Eq. 388	391, 436, 437, 448, 500, 512
Bovill v. Finch (1870), L. R. 5 P. C. 523; 39 L. J. C. P. 277	ii. 244
Bovill v. Goodier (1865-71), L. R. 1 Eq. 35; L. R. 2 Eq. 195; 35 L. J. Ch. 174; 36 L. J. Ch. 360; 35 Beav. 427; Griff. L. O. C. 47....	409, 444, 445, 488, 548
Bovill v. Hadley (1864), 17 C. B. N. S. 435; 10 L. T. N. S. 650.....	544, 548
Bovill v. Hitchcock (1868), L. R. 3 Ch. 417	486, 488
Bovill v. Keyworth (1857), 7 E. & B. 725; 29 L. T. 191; 5 Jur. N. S. 817	73, 78
Bovill v. Moore (1815), 2 Coop. Ch. Ca. 56, n.; Dav. P. C. 361; 2 Marsh. R. 211; reported as Brown v. Moore, 3 Bli. 178 ..	73, 78, 156, 160, 227, 237, 238, 285, 460, 463, 472
Bovill v. Pimm (1856), 11 Exch. 718	57, 67, 261, 358
Bovill v. Smith (1866-68), L. R. 2 Eq. 459; W. N. (1867) 240; Griff. L. O. C. 52	398, 438, 444, 447, 452, 457, 473, 476, 480
Bovill's Patent (1863), 1 Moo. P. C. N. S. 318.....	ii. 171, 215, 229
Bowden's Patent (1904), 22 R. P. C. 49.....	306
Bowden's Patents Syndicate (E. M.), Ltd. v. Smith (1904), 2 Ch. 122; 21 R. P. C. 438, 596; 22 R. P. C. 498	ii. 169
Bowden's Patent Syndicate, Ltd. v. Wilson (1903), 20 R. C. P. 644....	377
Bower-Barff's Patent (1895), 12 R. P. C. 383; [1895] A. C. 675. <i>See</i> Barff and Bower's Patent	ii. 216, 217
Bowman v. Taylor (1834), 1 W. P. C. 292; 2 A. & E. 278 ..	127, 417: ii. 162, 201, 205
Bown v. Centaur Cycle Co. (1891), 8 R. P. C. 119	552
Bown v. Humber (1889), 6 R. P. C. 9	ii. 192
Boxwell v. Cochran (1895), 12 R. P. C. 169	432, 480
Boyd v. Farrar (1887), 5 R. P. C. 33	423, 430
Boyd v. Horrocks (1886-89), 3 R. P. C. 285; 5 R. P. C. 557; 6 R. P. C. 152, 528; 9 R. P. C. 77	77, 270, 281, 339, 357, 358, 360, 361, 370, 430, 475, 533, 536, 539, 540
Boyd v. Tootal Broadhurst Leo Co. (1894), 11 R. P. C. 175	507, 518, 524
Bradford Dyers Association v. Bury (1901), 18 R. P. C. 161; 19 R. P. C. 125	218, 337, 552
Bramah v. Hardcastle (1789), Holroyd, 8; 1 Carp. P. C. 168; 1 W. P. C. 44, n.	128, 130

	PAGE
Brandon's Patent (1884), 1 R. P. C. 154; 53 L. J. P. C. 84; L. R. 9 App. Cas. 589	ii. 219, 220
Brand's Patent (1895), 12 R. P. C. 102	ii. 39, 65
Bray v. Gardner (1887), 4 R. P. C. 40, 400	143, 212, 280: ii. 130, 142
Bremer's Patent (1909), 26 R. P. C. 114, 449	173: ii. 90, 96, 97
Bridge's Patent (1901), 18 R. P. C. 267	40: ii. 53
Bridson v. Bencke (1849), 12 Peav. 1	436, 439
Bridson v. McAlpine (1846), 8 Beav. 230.....	440, 446
Bridson's Patent (1852), 7 Moo. P. C. 499	ii. 247
Briggs v. Larleur (1884), 1 R. P. C. 126; 2 R. P. C. 13	395, 436, 442, 446
Britain v. Hirsch (1838), 5 R. P. C. 74, 226	33, 423, 465, 466
British Dynamite Co. v. Krebs (1875-79), G. P. C. 88; 13 R. P. C. 190..	207, 208, 217, 254, 255, 261, 262, 287
British Insulated Wire Co., Ld. v. Dublin Tramway Co., Ld. (1899),	
17 R. P. C. 14	480, 510, 519
British Liquid Air Co., Ld. v. British Oxygen Co., Ld. (1907), 25	
R. P. C. 218, 577; 26 R. P. C. 509	90, 95, 100, 343
British Motor Syndicate, Ld. v. Andrews & Co. (T. E. H.), Ld. (1899),	
16 R. P. C. 577; 18 R. P. C. 85	262, 280, 282
British Motor Syndicate, Ld. v. Friswell (1901), 18 R. P. C. 497.....	247
British Motor Syndicate, Ld. v. Taylor & Sons (John), Ld. (1899), 17	
R. P. C. 189; [1900] 1 Ch. 577; [1901] 1 Ch. 122	379, 381, 385, 389, 519, 524
British Motor Syndicate, Ld. v. Sherrin (1901), 18 R. P. C. 265	539
British Mutoscope and Biograph Co., Ld. v. Homer (1901), 18 R. P. C.	
177	ii. 174, 175
British Ore Concentration Syndicate, Ld. v. Minerals Separation, Ld.	
(1908), 25 R. P. C. 741; 26 R. P. C. 124; 27 R. P. C. 33.....	200, 428, 472
British Tanning Co. v. Groth (1889), 7 R. P. C. 1; 8 R. P. C. 113; 60	
L. J. Ch. 235	358, 443, 448: ii. 29
British Thomson-Houston Co., Ld. v. Mayor of Manchester (1903), 20	
R. P. C. 461.....	550
British United Shoe Machinery Co., Ld. v. Claughton (Hugh), Ld.	
(1906), 23 R. P. C. 321	269, 278
British United Shoe Machinery Co., Ld. v. Fussell (A.) & Sons, Ld.	
(1908), 25 R. P. C. 365, 631; 27 R. P. C. 205	28, 73, 237, 241, 243, 244, 511, 521
British United Shoe Machinery Co., Ld. v. Simon Collier, Ld. (1908),	
26 R. P. C. 21, 534; 27 R. P. C. 567	385
British United Shoe Machinery Co., Ld. v. Thomson (1904), 22 R. P. C.	
177	39, 240, 241, 370
British Vacuum Cleaners Co., Ld. v. London and South Western Rail.	
Co. (1910), 27 R. P. C. 638; 28 R. P. C. 77	45, 62, 556
British Vacuum Co., Ld. v. Exton Hotels Co., Ld. (1908), 25 R. P. C.	
617	342, 550
British Vacuum Cleaners Co., Ld. v. Suction Cleaners, Ld., 21 R. P. C.	
300, 303	41, 45, 62, 506
British Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Co., Ld. v. Branlick	
(1910), 27 R. P. C. 209	75, 479
British Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Co., Ld. v. Electrical	
Co., Ld. (1911), 28 R. P. C. 517	75

TABLE OF CASES.

XXV

	PAGE
Broard's Patent (1908), 25 R. P. C. 537	ii. 246
Brockie's Patent (1908), 25 R. P. C. 813	ii. 50, 63
Brodribb v. Brodribb (1886), L. R. 11 Pr. D. 66	506
Brook v. Aston (1857-59), 8 E. & B. 478; 27 L. J. Q. B. 145; 28 L. J. Q. B. 175; affirmed 5 Jur. N. S. 1025	36, 42, 96, 159
Brooke v. Wigg (1878), L. R. 8 Ch. D. 510	488
Brookes' Patent (1909), 26 R. P. C. 161	ii. 100
Brooks v. Hall (1903), 21 R. P. C. 29	542
Brooks v. Lamplugh (1897), 15 R. P. C. 33; 16 R. P. C. 41	98, 189, 280, 352, 357, 358, 369, 370, 412, 543
Brooks v. Lycett (E.), Ltd. (1902), 19 R. P. C. 166, 334; 20 R. P. C. 390	492, 511, 530, 546
Brooks v. Lycett's Saddle and Motor Accessories Co., Ltd. (1903), 20 R. P. C. 575; 21 R. P. C. 651; [1904] 1 Ch. 512	446: ii. 140
Brooks (J. B.) & Co., Ltd. v. Rendall, Underwood & Co., Ltd. (1907), 24 R. P. C. 17	544
Brooks v. Steel (1896), 14 R. P. C. 47	340, 470, 471
Brown, <i>Re</i> (1887), Griff. L. O. C. 1	ii. 8
Brown v. Evered (1904), 21 R. P. C. 501	507
Brown v. Hastie (1904), 21 R. P. C. 390; 22 R. P. C. 85; 23 R. P. C. 361	336, 369, 370, 424, 426
Brown v. Jackson (1895), 17 R. P. C. 324; [1895] A. C. 446; 64 L. J. P. C. 180	84, 360, 361
Brown v. Sansom (1888), 5 R. P. C. 510	458
Brown's Patent, Griff. L. O. C. 1	280
Brown's Patent (1906), 23 R. P. C. 792; 24 R. P. C. 61, 313; 25 R. P. C. 86	99, 149, 174, 280, 429, 432, 450
Brownhill's Patent (1889), 6 R. P. C. 135	ii. 51, 67
Brunton v. Hawkes (1820), 1 Carp. P. C. 405; 4 B. & Ald. 541	73, 82, 111, 156
Buchan v. Hill, W. N. (1888) 233	ii. 173
Bulnois v. Mackenzie (1837), 1 W. P. C. 260; 4 Bing. N. S. 127	409
Bunge v. Higginbottom (1901), 18 R. P. C. 20; 19 R. P. C. 187	278, 337, 344
Burgess v. Hanley (1859), 26 Beav. 249	391, 529
Burgess v. Hills (1859), 26 Beav. 244	391
Burlington's Patent (1898), 15 R. P. C. 195	ii. 229
Burnett v. Tate (1882), 45 L. T. N. S. 743	310, 312, 354
Burt v. Morgan (1887), 4 R. P. C. 278; W. N. (1887) 123	314, 318
Bush v. Fox (1852-1856), Macr. P. C. 152, 166, 178; 23 L. J. Ex. 275; 24 L. J. Ex. 251; 5 H. L. C. 707	66, 92, 143, 412, 474
Butler v. Butler (1888), L. R. 13 Pr. D. 73	506
C.'s Patent (1890), 7 R. P. C. 250	ii. 17
Caldwell v. Van Vlissingen (1851), 9 Hare, 415; 21 L. J. (N. S.) Ch. 97; 16 Jur. 115	385, 388, 396, 441
Campion v. Benyon (1821), 6 B. Moo. 71; 3 Brod. & Bing. 5	175, 200
Canham v. Jones, 2 Ves. 218	ii. 146

	PAGE
<i>Cannington v. Nuttall</i> (1871), L. R. 5 H. L. 205; 40 L. J. Ch. 739 ..	79, 107, 117, 354, 384 : ii. 118, 132
<i>Cardiff Steamship Co. v. Barwick</i> (1885), 53 L. J. N. S. 56	554
<i>Cardwell's Patent</i> (1856), 10 Moo. P. C. 488.....	ii. 227, 228, 234
<i>Carey's Application</i> (1889), 6 R. P. C. 552	26 : ii. 28
<i>Carmont's Patent</i> (1897), 14 R. P. C. 239	ii. 217, 235
<i>Carnegie Steel Co. v. Bell Bros., Ltd.</i> (1907), 24 R. P. C. 82; 26 R. P. C. 265	429
<i>Carpenter v. Smith</i> (1841), 1 W. P. C. 530, 540; 11 L. J. Ex. 213; 9 M. & W. 300	73, 119, 122, 123, 124, 128, 136, 144, 238
<i>Carpenter's Patent</i> , 2 Moo. P. C. (N. S.) 191, n.	ii. 245
<i>Carr's Patent</i> (1873), L. R. 4 P. C. 530; 9 Moo. P. C. 379	ii. 243
<i>Cars v. Bland Light Syndicate, Ltd.</i> (1911), 28 R. P. C. 33	311
<i>Carter v. Leyson</i> (1901), 18 R. P. C. 508; 19 R. P. C. 473.....	37, 86, 94, 105
<i>Cartsburn Sugar Refining Co. v. Sharp</i> (1884), 1 R. P. C. 181	379, 484
<i>Cartwright v. Amatt</i> (1799), 2 Bos. & Pul. 43	ii. 149
<i>Cartwright v. Eamer</i> (1807), 14 Ves. 131	192, 332
<i>Case v. Cressey</i> (1900), 17 R. P. C. 255; 18 R. P. C. 419	34, 94
<i>Cassel Gold Extracting Co v. Cyanide Gold Recovery Syndicate</i> (1894), 11 R. P. C. 638; 12 R. P. C. 232	48, 64, 147, 149, 178, 184, 187, 190, 248, 277, 280, 536
<i>Cassella v. Levinstein</i> (1891), 8 R. P. C. 473	403, 450
<i>Castner-Kellner Alkali Co. v. The Commercial Development Corpora-</i> <i>tion</i> (1898), 15 R. P. C. 645; 16 R. P. C. 251; 17 R. P. C. 593; [1899] 1 Ch. 803.....	186, 187, 188, 390, 543, 552
<i>Cera Light Co. v. Dobbie</i> (1892), 11 R. P. C. 10	189
<i>Cerokel's Patent</i> (1898), 15 R. P. C. 500.....	305
<i>Chadburn v. Mechan</i> (1895), 12 R. P. C. 120	109, 187, 249, 432, 556
<i>Chadburn's (Ship) Telegraph Co. v. Robinson</i> (1905), 22 R. P. C. 468	546
<i>Challender v. Royle</i> (1887), L. R. 36 Ch. D. 425; 56 L. J. Ch. 995; 4 R. P. C. 363.....	312, 317, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 326, 327
<i>Chamberlain and Hookham, Ltd. v. Mayor, &c. of Bradford</i> (1900), 17 R. P. C. 762; 19 R. P. C. 78; 20 R. P. C. 673.....	55, 57, 159, 340, 342, 357, 358, 550
<i>Chamberlain and Hookham, Ltd. v. Mayor, &c. of Huddersfield</i> (1901), 18 R. P. C. 454	530, 550
<i>Chambers v. Crichley</i> (1864), 33 Beav. 374.....	418
<i>Chameleon Patents Manufacturing Co., Ltd. v. Marshalls, Ltd.</i> (1900), 17 R. P. C. 527.....	335
<i>Chandler's Patent</i> (1884), Griff. P. C. 270	ii. 66
<i>Chanter v. Dewhurst</i> (1844), 12 M. & W. 823; 13 L. J. Ex. 198.....	ii. 180
<i>Chanter v. Johnson</i> (1845), 14 M. & W. 408	ii. 180
<i>Chanter v. Leese</i> (1838), 8 L. J. Ex. 58; 9 L. J. Ex. 327; 4 M. & W. 295; 5 M. & W. 698; 1 W. P. C. 295	ii. 204
<i>Chappell v. Davidson</i> (1856), 8 De G. M. & G. 1	447
<i>Chappell v. Purday</i> (1845), 14 M. & W. 310	25
<i>Chartered Institute of Patent Agents v. Lockwood</i> (1893), 10 R. P. C. 167; 11 R. P. C. 374	ii. 3
<i>Chatwood's Patent</i> (1899), 16 R. P. C. 370	ii. 128
<i>Chatwood's Patent</i> , 37 Eng. 285	ii. 243

TABLE OF CASES.

xxvii

	PAGE
Chatwood's Patent Safe and Lock Co., Ld. v. Mercantile Bank o Lancashire, Ld. (1899), 17 R. P. C. 23	ii. 142
Chatwood's Patent Safe and Lock Co., Ld. v. Ratner Safe Co., Ld. (1899), 16 R. P. C. 449	ii. 143
Cheavin v. Walker (1877), L. R. 5 Ch. D. 858; 46 L. J. Ch. 265; 35 L. T. 757	ii. 13
Cheeseborough's Patent (1884), Griff. P. C. 303	ii. 40, 123
Cheetham v. Nuttall (1893), 10 R. P. C. 321	ii. 187, 189, 196
Cheetham v. Oldham (1888), 5 R. P. C. 617, 622, 624; 7 R. P. C. 116.. 403, 405, 460, 461, 463, 464	130,
Cheltenham and Swansea Railway Carriage and Waggon Co., <i>In re</i> (1868), L. R. 8 Eq. 58	506
Chemische Fabrik vorm. Sandoz v. Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik (1904), 21 R. P. C. 533	399
Child's Patent, 56 Eng. 435	ii. 243
Chollet v. Hoffman (1857), 7 E. & B. 686; 26 L. J. Q. B. 249.....	ii. 176, 177
Church (Walter C.) Engineering Co. v. Wilson (1886), 3 R. P. C. 123 .	405
Church's Patent (1886), 3 R. P. C. 95	ii. 215, 218, 229, 245, 246
Claridge's Patent (1851), 7 Moo. P. C. 394	ii. 215, 216, 217
Clark v. Adie (1873), L. R. 10 Ch. 667; 3 Ch. D. 134; 2 App. Cas. 315; 46 L. J. Ch. 583; 21 W. R. 456	78, 79, 237, 239, 241, 243, 251, 262, 263, 266, 268, 270, 273, 274, 283, 285, 286, 340, 345, 349, 353, 357: ii. 196, 201, 203
Clark v. Nicholls (1895), 12 R. P. C. 310	448
Clark's Patent (1870), L. R. 3 P. C. 421; 7 Moo. P. C. N. S. 255	ii. 218, 226, 235, 236, 243
Clark's Patent (1899), 16 R. P. C. 431	ii. 216, 236, 239
Cloughton v. Foster (1903), 21 R. P. C. 17	547
Clay v. Allcock & Co., Ld. 1906), 23 R. P. C. 381, 745.....	220, 538
Cleaver v. Wallwork (1896), 13 R. P. C. 277.....	358
Clement, Talbot & Co., Ld. v. Wilson (1909), 24 R. P. C. 511; 26 R. P. C. 467	518
Clifton's Patent, [1904] 2 Ch. 357; 21 R. P. C. 515	304
Clothworkers of Ipswich Case (1615), Godb. R. 252; S. C. 1 Roll. R. 4...2, 22, 103	
Cochrane (I. P.) & Co. v. Martins (Birmingham), Ld. (1911), 28 R. P. C. 284	ii. 210
Cochrane v. Smethurst (1816), 2 Coop. Ch. Cas. 57; 1 Stark. R. 205 ..	174
Cochrane's Patent (1885), Griff. P. C. 304.....	ii. 103, 113, 114
Cocking's Patent (1885), 2 R. P. C. 151	ii. 230, 232, 243, 244
Codd, <i>Re</i> (1884), Griff. P. C.	305; ii. 29, 88, 95
Codd v. Bratby (1884), 1 R. P. C. 209	ii. 124, 137
Coghlan v. Cumberland, [1898] 1 Ch. 704	498
Colburn v. Simms (1843), 2 Hare, 543; 12 L. J. Ch. 338	529
Cole v. Saqui (1888), 5 R. P. C. 489; 6 R. P. C. 41; 58 L. J. Ch. 237; L. R. 40 Ch. D. 132	198, 232, 478, 518, 537, 538, 539, 544, 553
Coles v. Baylis (1886), 3 R. P. C. 178.....	444
Collard v. Allinson (1839), 4 My. & Cr. 487	442
Colley v. Hart (1888), 6 R. P. C. 17; 7 R. P. C. 101; L. R. 44 Ch. D. 179; 38 W. R. 501; 62 L. T. 424	313, 321, 322, 327, 331
Collinge v. Bowman (1834), 1 W. P. C. 295	ii. 207
Collins v. Walker (1859), 7 W. R. 222	511

	PAGE
<i>Collyer v. Isaacs</i> (1882), 45 L. J. N. S. 567; 30 W. R. 71	552
<i>Combination Hubs, Ltd. v. Seabrook</i> (1906), 23 R. P. C. 205.....	354
<i>Combined Weighing Machine Co. v. Automatic Weighing Machine Co.</i> (1889), 6 R. P. C. 502; L. R. 42 Ch. D. 665; 61 L. T. 474; 58 L. J. Ch. 709; 38 W. R. 233	314, 320, 321, 323, 328, 331
<i>Commercial Development Corporation v. Castner-Kellner Alkali Co.</i> (1897), 14 R. P. C. 939	310
<i>Commissioners of Sewers v. Glace</i> (1873), L. R. 15 Eq. 302	452
<i>Conniff's Application</i> (1872), Johns. Pat. Man. 6th ed. 165	21
<i>Consolidated Car Heating Co. v. Came</i> (1903), 20 R. P. C. 745	55, 57, 340, 343, 346, 352, 353
<i>Consolidated Pneumatic Tool Co., Ltd. v. Churchill & Co., Ltd.</i> (1905), 22 R. P. C. 209, 367	425, 531, 546
<i>Consolidated Pneumatic Tool Co., Ltd. v. Clark.</i> See <i>Ingersoll Sergeant Drill Co. v. Consolidated Pneumatic Tool Co., Ltd.</i>	
<i>Consolidated Pneumatic Tool Co., Ltd. v. Ingersoll Sergeant Drill Co.</i> (1906), 23 R. P. C. 666; 24 R. P. C. 593; 25 R. P. C. 574	551
<i>Continental Gas Glühlicht Actien Gesellschaft (Meteor) Petition</i> (1897), 15 R. P. C. 732	ii. 187
<i>Cook v. Pearce</i> (1844), 8 Q. B. 1044, 1054; 13 L. J. Q. B. 189; 12 L. J. Q. B. 187	175
<i>Cooper v. Cooper</i> (1875), L. R. 2 Ch. D. 492	556
<i>Cooper v. Whittingham</i> (1880), L. R. 15 Ch. D. 501; 49 L. J. Ch. 752 ..	529
<i>Cooper & Co. (Birmingham), Ltd. v. Baedeker</i> (1899), 16 R. P. C. 363; 17 R. P. C. 209	96
<i>Cooper Patent Anchor Rail Co., Ltd. v. British Electric Equipments Co., Ltd.</i> (1896), 23 R. P. C. 606	539
<i>Cooper Patent Anchor Rail Joint Co., Ltd. v. London County Council</i> (1906), 23 R. P. C. 289	539
<i>Cooper's Patent</i> (1901), 19 R. P. C. 53.....	31, 32: ii. 7
<i>Copeland v. Webb</i> (1862), 11 W. R. 134; 1 N. R. 119	449
<i>Coppin v. Lloyd</i> (1898), 15 R. P. C. 373	ii. 188
<i>Cornish v. Keen</i> (1835—37), 1 W. P. C. 501, 513; 6 L. J. C. P. 225; 3 Bing. N. S. 570.....	15, 31, 66, 104, 117, 118, 122, 130, 131, 136, 162, 163, 471, 472, 473, 479, 480
<i>Corrigal v. Armstrong, Whitworth & Co., Ltd.</i> (1903), 20 R. P. C. 523; 22 R. P. C. 268	274: ii. 127
<i>Couchman v. Greener</i> (1884), 1 R. P. C. 197	284: ii. 203
<i>Crabtree's Patent</i> , Eng. Rep. Jan. to Mar. 1881	ii. 123, 124
<i>Craig v. Dawding</i> (1907), 25 R. P. C. 1, 259	311, 321
<i>Craig and Macfarlane's Application</i> , P. M. J. vol. iv. 3 series 366 ..	ii. 12, 47, 64
<i>Crampton v. Patents Investments Co.</i> (1888), 5 R. P. C. 392; 6 R. P. C. 287.....	183, 184, 190, 234, 312, 314, 322, 329, 470, 554
<i>Crane v. Price</i> (1842), 1 W. P. C. 377, 393; 12 L. J. C. P. 81; 4 M. & G. 580.....	15, 29, 35, 39, 58, 59, 60, 61, 65, 71, 74, 75, 78, 83, 480
<i>Craven v. Pinto Leite</i> (1871), L. R. 7 Ch. App. 90	452
<i>Crighton's Patent</i> , 3 Eng. 135	ii. 226
<i>Crist's Patent</i> (1903), 20 R. P. C. 475.....	ii. 22
<i>Crocker v. Aerators, Ltd.</i> (1903), 20 R. P. C. 621	360
<i>Crofts v. Peach</i> (1830), 1 W. P. C. 268	462
<i>Croll v. Edge</i> (1847), 9 C. B. 479; 19 L. J. C. P. 261	175

TABLE OF CASES.

xxix

	PAGE
Crompton v. Anglo-American Brush Corporation (1886), L. R. 35 Ch. D. 283; 56 L. J. Ch. 802; 4 F. P. C. 197	434
Crompton v. Ibbotson (1828), 6 L. J. O. S. 214; 1 W. P. C. 83	208
Cropper v. Smith (1884), 1 R. P. C. 81; 2 R. P. C. 17, 61; L. R. 24 Ch. D. 305; L. R. 26 Ch. D. 700; L. R. 28 Ch. D. 148; L. R. 10 App. Cas. 249; 53 L. J. Ch. 891; 54 L. J. Ch. 287; 55 L. J. Ch. 12	110, 247, 251, 259, 268, 271, 273, 318, 420, 426, 524, 544, 545, 555: ii. 139, 141, 165
Cross, Bevan and Beadle's Patent (1906), 23 R. P. C. 485	ii. 236, 246
Crossdale v. Fisher (1884), 1 R. P. C. 21	124
Crossley v. Beverley (1829), 1 W. P. C. 106, 112; 3 Car. & P. 513; 1 Russ. & M. 166, n.; 9 B. & C. 63	55, 110, 204, 224, 234, 280, 342, 470, 501
Crossley v. Contes (1904), 21 R. P. C. 282	121, 490
Crossley v. Derby Gas Co. (1829), 1 W. P. C. 119; 44 L. J. Ch. 25; 3 My. & Cr. 428	501, 508, 509, 510, 514
Crossley v. Dixon (1863), 10 H. L. C. 293; 32 L. J. Ch. 617	417: ii. 180, 188, 201, 203
Crossley v. Potter (1853), Macr. P. C. 240	48, 158, 178, 199, 247, 250
Crossley v. Stewart (1863), 1 N. R. 426; 7 L. T. N. S. 848	452, 457
Crossley v. Tomey (1876), L. R. 2 Ch. D. 533	450, 456
Crossthwaite v. Moorwood (1894), 11 R. P. C. 558	414
Crossthwaite v. Steel (1888), 5 R. P. C. 220; 6 R. P. C. 190	284, 419
Crossthwaite Fire Bar Syndicate v. Senior, [1909] 1 Ch. 801; 20 R. P. C. 260, 713	281, 429
Crow v. Wallis (1886), 3 R. P. C. 1	126
Crowther v. United Flexible Metallic Tubing Co., Ltd. (1905), 22 R. P. C. 549	317
Croysdale v. Fisher (1884), 1 R. P. C. 21	124
Cumming's Patent (1884), Griff. P. C. 277	ii. 51
Cunningham v. Collings, Seton, 4th ed., p. 355	512
Currie and Timmis's Patent, [1898] A. C. 347; 15 R. P. C. 63....	244, 246, 247
Curtis and André's Patent (1892), 9 R. P. C. 495	ii. 56
Curtis v. Cutts (1839), 8 L. J. Ch. 184; 2 Coop. C. C. 60, n.; 3 Jur. 34	399, 440, 442
Curtis v. Platt (1863-66), L. R. 3 Ch. D. 135, n.; 8 L. T. N. S. 657; 10 L. T. N. S. 383; 11 L. T. N. S. 245; 33 L. J. C. P. 255; 35 L. J. Ch. 852; L. R. 1 H. L. 337; 10 Jur. N. S. 823; Good, P. C. 102; Griff. L. O. C. 53	57, 67, 68, 177, 280, 340, 342, 357, 358, 361, 363, 370, 413, 423, 427, 433, 466
Cutlan v. Dawson (1896), 13 R. P. C. 710; 14 R. P. C. 249	485: ii. 188
Cutler v. Bower (1848), 11 Q. B. 973; 17 L. J. Q. B. 217	417: ii. 201, 207
DALGLISH v. Jarve (1850), 2 Mac. & G. 231	440
Dangerfield v. Jones (1865), 13 L. T. N. S. 142	52, 417: ii. 205
Daniel's Application (1888), 5 R. P. C. 413	51, 53, 54, 55
Daniell's Patent, Godson Pat. 274	74
Dansk Rekylriffel Syndikat Aktieselskab v. Snell, [1908] 2 Ch. 127; 25 R. P. C. 421	ii. 168

	PAGE
Darby's Patent (1891), 8 R. P. C. 380	ii. 217, 228, 237, 246
Darcy v. Allin (1602), Noy, R. 178, 182; 1 W. P. C. 1; Moore's Reps. 675; 11 Co. R. 84	2, 103, 155, 290: ii. 1
Darraah v. Purser (1889), 6 R. P. C. 365.....	425
Dart's Patent, Griff. P. C. 307	ii. 21
Davenport v. Goldberg (1865), 2 H. & N. 282	444, 445
Davenport v. Jepson (1862), 4 De G. F. & J. 440; 1 N. R. 173, 307 ..	398, 441, 444, 460, 463
Davenport v. Phillips (1865), 5 N. R. 485	487
Davenport v. Richards (1860), 3 L. T. N. S. 503	393, 443, 484
Davenport v. Rylands (1865), L. R. 1 Eq. 302; 35 L. J. Ch. 204	338, 379, 501, 510, 512, 513, 521, 549, 550
David v. Woodley (1884), Griff. L. O. C. 26	18, 21
Davidson v. San Fan Co., Ltd. (1906), 23 R. P. C. 493	208, 505
Davies v. Curtis and Harvey, Ltd. (1902), 19 R. P. C. 580; 20 R. P. C. 561	ii. 161
Davies v. Davies' Patent Boiler, Ltd. (1908), 25 R. P. C. 823.....	ii. 161
Davies and Davies' Patent (1911), 28 R. P. C. 50.....	ii. 122
Davies v. Townsend (1899), 16 R. P. C. 497	337
Davies' Patent (1893), 11 R. P. C. 27.....	ii. 214, 246
Daw v. Eley (1865-67), 2 H. & M. 925; 36 L. J. Ch. 482; L. R. 1 Eq. 38; L. R. 3 Eq. 496; 14 W. R. 126.....	149, 245, 424, 451, 452, 505, 506
Day v. Davies (1904), 22 R. P. C. 34	395
Day v. Foster (1890), 7 R. P. C. 54; W. N. (1890) 36; L. R. 43 Ch. D. 435.....	319, 321
De Joung v. United Motor Co. (1903), 20 R. P. C. 472. See Addenda.	
De la Rue v. Dickinson (1857), 29 L. T. 194; 7 E. & B. 738; 3 K. & J. 388	453, 456, 507
De Mare's Patent (1899), 16 R. P. C. 150	316
De Vitre v. Betts (1873), L. R. 6 H. L. 319; 21 W. R. 705.....	507, 515
Deacon's Patent (1887), 4 R. P. C. 119	ii. 239
Dedge's Patent (1895), 12 R. P. C. 448	294, 305
Deeley v. Perks (1896), 13 R. P. C. 581; 14 R. P. C. 3; 65 L. J. Ch. 912; [1896] A. C. 496; 75 L. T. N. S. 233	305, 306, 307, 390: ii. 126, 129, 131
Deeley's Patent (1894), 11 R. P. C. 72; 12 R. P. C. 65, 192; 13 R. P. C. 581; [1895] 1 Ch. 687; [1896] A. C. 496; 64 L. J. Ch. 480; 65 L. J. Ch. 912; 72 L. T. N. S. 702; 75 L. T. N. S. 233; 43 W. R. 517; 12 R. 272	305, 307, 416, 498: ii. 77, 106, 112, 141
Defries v. Sherwood (1897), 14 R. P. C. 313	474
Dellwick's Patent (1896), 13 R. P. C. 591; 65 L. J. Ch. 905	ii. 108, 114
Dellwick's Patent (1898), 15 R. P. C. 682	63, 196
Delta Metal Co. v. Maxim Nordenfolt Guns and Ammunition Co. (1891), 8 R. P. C. 169, 247	435, 446, 447, 450, 456
Denley v. Blore (1851), 38 Lond. Jour. 224	395
Dent v. Turpin (1861), 2 J. & H. 139; 50 L. J. Ch. 495	ii. 112
Derosne v. Fairie (1835), 1 W. P. C. 154; 2 Cr. M. & R. 476; 5 Tyre, 393	175, 205, 216, 217, 228, 231, 232, 287, 414: ii. 204, 209
Derosne's Patent (1835-44), 2 W. P. C. 2; 4 Moo. P. C. 417; 24 Newton, L. J. O. S. 459; Carp. P. C. 698.....	74: ii. 222, 227, 228, 230, 234, 247

TABLE OF CASES.

xxxi

	PAGE
Deutsche Gasglühlicht Aktiengesellschaft's Application (1909), 26 R. P. C. 101.....	ii. 51, 53
Deutsche Gold und Silber-Scheide Anstalt vorm. Kössler's Application (1907), 24 R. P. C. 209.....	ii. 31
Deutsche Nähmaschinen Fabrik vorm. Wertheim v. Pfaff (1890), 7 R. P. C. 16, 251.....	82
Dewrance v. Fletcher (1899), 16 R. P. C. 150.....	121
Diamond Steel Manufacturing Co. v. Harrison Bros. (1910), 27 R. P. C. 451.....	420
Dick v. Ellams Duplicator Co. (1899), 16 R. P. C. 414; 17 R. P. C. 196..	147, 247
Dick v. Haslam (1891), 8 R. P. C. 196.....	503
Dick v. Tullis (1826), 13 R. P. C. 149.....	473
Dicks v. Brooks (1880), L. R. 15 Ch. D. 22; 49 L. J. Ch. 812.....	310, 518
Dilly v. Doig (1794), 2 Ves. 486.....	397
Dismore's Patent (1853), 18 Beav. 538.....	ii. 119
Dixon v. The London Small Arms Co. (1875), L. R. 10 Q. B. D. 130; L. R. 1 App. Cas. 632; 44 L. J. Q. B. 63; 46 L. J. Q. B. 617.....	ii. 194, 245
Dobbie's Patent (1909), not reported.....	ii. 115
Dobbs v. Penn, 3 Exch. 427.....	136
Dolbear's Patent (1896), 13 R. P. C. 203.....	ii. 234
Dollond's Case (1776), 1 W. P. C. 43; 2 H. Bl. 463.....	16, 114, 723
Donnersmarckhütte Oberschlesische Eisen und Kohlenwerke Actiengesellschaft v. Electric Construction Co., Ltd. (1910), 27 R. P. C. 321, 774.....	74
Douglass v. Pintsch's Patent Lighting Co. (1895), 13 R. P. C. 601. 673; 65 L. J. Ch. 919; [1897] 1 Ch. 176; 75 L. T. N. S. 332; 45 W. R. 108.....	315, 328
Dover (H. W.) and Dover, Ltd. v. New Townsend Cycle Co., Ltd. (1903), 21 R. P. C. 135.....	499
Dowler v. Keeling (1898), 15 R. P. C. 214.....	119
Dowling v. Billington (1890), 7 R. P. C. 191....	45, 62, 265, 390, 407, 502, 503
Downes v. Hughes & Co. (1880), 69 L. T. 150.....	486
Downton's Patent (1839), 1 W. P. C. 565.....	ii. 228, 232, 247
Dowson Taylor v. Drosophore Co. (1894), 11 R. P. C. 536; 12 R. P. C. 95.....	224, 225
Drake v. Muntz Metal Co. (1886), 3 R. P. C. 43.....	460, 463
Dredge v. Parnell (1896), 13 R. P. C. 392; 15 R. P. C. 84; 16 R. P. C. 625.....	37, 46, 86, 94, 310
Driffield v. Waterloo & Co. (1886), 3 R. P. C. 46; L. R. 31 Ch. D. 638; 55 L. J. Ch. 391.....	314, 318, 328
Drummond's Patent (1889), 6 R. P. C. 756.....	301
Dubowski v. Goldstein (1896), L. R. 1 Q. B. 478.....	ii. 155
Duckett v. Sankey (1899), 16 R. P. C. 357.....	537
Duckett v. Whitehead (1895), 12 R. P. C. 187, 376.....	42, 74, 502
Dudgeon v. Thomson (1874-77), 30 L. T. N. S. 244; L. R. 3 App. Cas. 34; 32 W. R. 464....	57, 244, 265, 336, 337, 339, 343, 419, 440, 442, 444, 503, 505; ii. 108, 114, 118, 130
Duncan and Wilson's Patent (1884), 1 W. P. C. 257.....	216, 241, 242
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ltd. v. Actien Gesellschaft für Motor, &c. (1902), 19 R. P. C. 46.....	386

	PAGE
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. British and Colonial Motor Car Co., Ld. (1901), 18 R. P. C. 313	385, 386
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. Buckingham and Adams Cycle and Motor Co., Ld. (1901), 18 R. P. C. 423	ii. 190
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. Clifton Rubber Co., Ld. (1902), 19 R. P. C. 433, 527; 20 R. P. C. 393	316, 348
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. Cresswell (1901), 18 R. P. C. 473	ii. 190
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. Excelsior Tyre and Cement Co. (1901), 18 R. P. C. 209.....	377: ii. 182
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. Green (1900), 17 R. P. C. 234	521
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Gunn (1900), 17 R. P. C. 234	520
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. Holborn Tyre Co., Ld. (1901), 18 R. P. C. 222	377: ii. 182
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. Hubbard Patents and Tyre Syndicate, Ld. (1902), 19 R. P. C. 546.....	436
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Hyde Rubber Co., Ld. (1904), 21 R. P. C. 208.....	348
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. Moseley (David) & Sons, Ld. (1903), 21 R. P. C. 53, 274; [1904] 1 Ch. 612	375, 376
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. Neal, [1899] 1 Ch. 807; 16 R. P. C. 247	377, 483: ii. 182
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. New Lamb Tyre Co., 20 R. P. C. 303	348
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. New Ixion Tyre and Cycle Co., Ld. (1898), 15 R. P. C. 389; 16 R. P. C. 16	348, 500, 549
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. New Seddon Pneumatic Tyre and Self-closing Tube Co., Ld. (1897), 14 R. P. C. 332; 76 L. T. N. S. 405	316
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. North British Rubber Co. (1901), 21 R. P. C. 208	ii. 189, 190, 191
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. Rimington (1900), 17 R. P. C. 665..	391
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. Stone and Corser (1897), 14 R. P. C. 263	438
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. United Rubber Works, Ld. (1902), 19 R. P. C. 406	348
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. Wapshaw Tube Co., Ld. (1900), 17 R. P. C. 433	348
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v. Wilson (1900), 17 R. P. C. 332 ..	377, 549: ii. 182
Dunnicliff v. Mallett (1859), 7 C. B. N. S. 209; 29 L. J. C. P. 70	393: ii. 154, 162, 179
Dutton v. Brierly (1897), 14 R. P. C. 685	119
Duvergier v. Fellows (1828), 10 B. & C. 829; 1 C. & F. 39	ii. 147
EADES v. Starbuck Waggon Co. (1881), W. N. 160.....	223
Earl de la Warr v. Miles (1881), L. R. 19 Ch. D. 80	552
Earl of Devon's Case, 11 Co. R. 90	14

TABLE OF CASES.

xxxiii

	PAGE
Easterbrook v. Great Western Railway Co. (1885), 2 R. P. C. 201; 3 R. P. C. 94	55, 162, 165, 198, 245, 280, 336, 554
Edelston v. Edelston (1863), 1 De G. J. & S. 203.....	392
Edge v. Harrison (1891), 8 R. P. C. 74	487
Edge v. Johnson (1892), 9 R. P. C. 142	555
Edge's Patent (1890), W. N. 149.....	304
Edgebury v. Stephens (1691), 2 Salk. 447; 1 W. P. C. 35; Dav. P. C. 36	23
Edie's Patent (1885), Griff. P. C. 279.....	ii. 46
Edison Electric Co. v. Shippey (1887), 4 R. P. C. 471.....	424, 494
Edison Telephone Co. v. Indiarubber Co. (1881), L. R. 17 Ch. D. 137..	425, 431
Edison United Phonograph v. Young (1894), 11 R. P. C. 489	492
Edison and Swan Co. v. Holland (1886-89), 3 R. P. C. 395; 5 R. P. C. 213, 459; 6 R. P. C. 243; 55 L. J. Ch. 943; L. R. 33 Ch. D. 497; L. R. 41 Ch. D. 28	74, 119, 147, 159, 160, 163, 208, 212, 213, 214, 216, 218, 219, 263, 270, 288, 307, 398, 415, 445, 459, 477, 478, 479, 481, 489, 525, 528, 536, 547, 554
Edison and Swan Co. v. Woodhouse (1886-87), 3 R. P. C. 167, 183; 4 R. P. C. 79, 99; L. R. 32 Ch. D. 520	74, 212, 217, 235, 245, 261, 274, 277, 281, 287, 483
Edison-Bell Consolidated Phonograph Co., Ltd. v. Columbia Co. (1900), 18 R. P. C. 4	430
Edison-Bell Consolidated Phonograph Co., Ltd. v. Rosenberg (1899), 16 R. P. C. 608	483
Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation v. Bernstein (1897), 14 R. P. C. 153	444
Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation v. Edison Phonograph Co. (1893), 11 R. P. C. 33	546, 547
Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation v. Hough (1894), 11 R. P. C. 594	438
Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation v. London Phonograph Corporation (1894), 11 R. P. C. 193, 471	447, 501
Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation v. Smith (1894), 11 R. P. C. 148, 164, 389	41, 54, 93, 244, 245, 269, 274, 428, 493, 503, 504, 554
Edisonia, Ltd. v. Forsa (1908), 25 R. P. C. 546	22
Edison's Patent (1877), No. 2909.....	ii. 123
Edlin v. Pneumatic Tyre and Brooks' Cycling Agency (1893), 10 R. P. C. 311	314, 322, 328, 506
Edmonds' Patent (1888-89), 6 R. P. C. 355; W. N. (1888) 234	304, 307
Edmunds' Patent (1886), Griff. P. C. 281	24: 43, 46
Edwards & Co. v. Picard, [1909] 2 K. B. 903	ii. 175
Edwards' Patent (1894), 11 R. P. C. 461	ii. 70
Ehrlich v. Ihlee (1887-88), 4 R. P. C. 115; 5 R. P. C. 37, 198, 437	41, 143, 159, 160, 161, 167, 254, 339, 343, 354, 360, 361, 371, 425, 450, 451, 476, 477, 478
Elder v. Victoria Press Manufacturing Co. (1910), 27 R. P. C. 114..	463: ii. 175
Electric Construction Co., Ltd. v. Imperial Tramways Co., Ltd. (1899), 16 R. P. C. 631; 17 R. P. C. 537	151, 259, 266, 285
Electric Telegraph Co. v. Brett (1851), 10 C. B. 838; 29 L. J. C. P. 123..	53, 66, 84, 175, 393
Electric Telegraph Co. v. Nott (1847), 4 C. B. 462; 11 Jur. 273; 2 Coop. C. C. 41; 16 L. J. C. P. 174.....	405, 437, 440, 441, 445

	PAGE
Electrolytic Plating Apparatus Co. v. Holland (1901), 18 R. P. C. 521.	125
Elias v. Grovesend Tinplate Co. (1890), 7 R. P. C. 455	36, 40, 41, 42
Ellam v. Martyn (1898), 16 R. P. C. 28	330
Ellington v. Clark (1888), 5 R. P. C. 135, 319; 58 L. T. N. S. 818....	218, 284, 339, 554
Elliot v. Turner (1845), 2 C. B. 446; 15 L. J. C. P. 49	205, 262, 280
Ellwood v. Christy (1864), 17 C. B. N. S. 754; 18 C. B. N. S. 495; 34 L. J. C. P. 130	511, 513, 552: ii. 177
Elmer v. Creasy (1873), L. R. 9 Ch. App. 69; 43 L. J. Ch. 166	453
Elmore v. Pirrie (1887), 57 L. T. N. S. 333	510
Elmslie v. Boursier (1869), L. R. 9 Eq. 217; 39 L. J. Ch. 328.....	379
Elsas v. Williams (1884), 1 Times R. 144	499
Elsey v. Butler (1884), 1 R. P. C. 189.....	404
Elwes v. Payne (1879), L. R. 12 Ch. D. 468	446
Embossed Metal Plate Co. v. Saupe (1891), 8 R. P. C. 355.....	81, 94
Emperor of Austria v. Day (1861), 3 De G. F. & J. 217.....	525
Engels v. Hubert Unchangeable Eylet Syndicate (1902), W. N. 48; (1904), 19 R. P. C. 201.....	314, 320, 326, 330
English and American Machinery Co. v. Gare Machine Co. (1894); 11 R. P. C. 627	311, 322, 325
English and American Machinery Co. v. Union Boot and Shoe Machine Co. (1894), 11 R. P. C. 137, 367.....	152, 349, 431, 523, 556
Errard's Patent (1835), 1 W. P. C. 557.....	ii. 218, 226, 228, 229
European Eibel Co., Ltd. v. Lloyd (Edward), Ltd. (1911), 28 R. P. C. 349	223
Evans, <i>Re</i> , 9 T. R. 109	503
Evans and Otway's Patent (1884), Griff. P. C. 279	ii. 47
Evans and Taunton, Ltd. v. Hoskine and Sewell, Ltd. (1904), 21 R. P. C. 675; 24 R. P. C. 517.....	80, 276, 556
Everitt's Patent (1887), Griff. L. O. C. 28	179: ii. 17, 50
FABRIQUES de Produits Chimiques de Thann v. Caspers (1897), 15 R. P. C. 94	373
Fabriques de Produits Chimiques de Thann et Mulhouse v. Lafitte (1899), 16 R. P. C. 61	45, 339, 550
Fairburn v. Household (1885), 2 R. P. C. 195; 3 R. P. C. 128, 263 ..	223, 246, 280, 490
Fairfax v. Lyons (1891), 8 R. P. C. 401	110
Farbenfabriken vorm. F. Bayer v. Bowker (1891), 8 R. P. C. 389	45, 434, 482, 491, 554: ii. 108, 141
Farbenfabriken vormals Friedrich Bayer & Co. v. Chemische Fabrik von Heyden (1905), 22 R. P. C. 501	72, 552
Farbenfabriken vorm. F. Bayer v. Laporte (1894), 11 R. P. C. 190	503
Fawcett v. Homan (1896), 13 R. P. C. 268, 398 ..	41, 43, 77, 137, 153, 160, 161, 162, 163, 198, 255
Feather v. The Queen (1865), 6 B. & S. 257; 35 L. J. Q. B. 200 ..	332: ii. 194
Fellows v. Brookes (1910), 27 R. P. C. 89	45
Felton v. Greaves (1829), 2 Stark. R. 249; 3 Car. & P. 611	174, 199
Fenner v. Wilson (1893), 10 R. P. C. 283	315, 316

TABLE OF CASES.

XXXV

	PAGE
Fennessey v. Clarke (1888), L. R. 37 Ch. D. 184	452, 453, 507
Fernie v. Young (1866), L. R. 1 H. L. 63	491
Ferranti v. British Thomson Houston Co., Ltd. (1902), 19 R. P. C. 147 ; 20 R. P. C. 145	346
Ferranti's Patent (1901), 18 R. P. C. 518	ii. 213
Fiat Motors Ltd.'s Application	409, 767 : ii. 91, 93
Fiechter, <i>Re</i> (1882), Griff. P. C. 284	ii. 46
Finch's Patent (1898), 15 R. P. C. 674	ii. 216, 217
Finnegan v. James (1874), L. R. 19 Eq. 72	450
Fisher v. Dewick (1838), 1 W. P. C. 264, 551 n. ; 4 Bing. N. C. 706 ; 7 L. J. C. P. 279	175, 427, 430, 435
Fleet v. The Managers of the Metropolitan Asylums District (1886) ..	469
Fletcher v. Arden (1888), 5 R. P. C. 46	81
Fletcher v. Glasgow Gas Commissioners (1887), 4 R. P. C. 386.....	385, 392, 530
Fletcher, <i>Re</i> (1886), Griff. L. O. C. 30	ii. 42, 51
Fletcher's Patent (1893), 10 R. P. C. 252	ii. 80
Flour Oxidizing Co., Ltd. v. Carr & Co., Ltd. (1908), 25 R. P. C. 428 ..	137, 142, 147, 148
Flour Oxidizing Co., Ltd. v. Hutchinson (1909), 26 R. P. C. 597	167
Flower v. Lloyd (1876-77), W. N. (1876) 169 ; 45 L. J. Ch. 746 ; 20 S. J. 860 ; Seton, 4th ed. 351	405, 423, 463, 464, 494
Foard's Patent (1855), 9 Moo. P. C. 376	ii. 228, 233
Foden v. Wallis and Stevens, Ltd. (1908), 15 R. P. C. 501, 783.....	280, 532 : ii. 118
Ford v. Foster (1872), L. R. 7 Ch. App. Cas. 611	334, 509
Forsyth v. Riviere (1819), 1 Camp. Rep. 401 ; 1 W. P. C. 97	66
Fountain Livet's Patent (1892), 9 R. P. C. 327	ii. 226, 230
Fowler v. Down (1797), 1 B. & P. 44	ii. 173
Fowler v. Gaul (1886), 3 R. P. C. 247	427, 430
Fox v. Astrachans, Ltd. (1910), 27 R. P. C. 377, 769	100, 140, 505
Fox v. Dellestable (1866), 15 W. R. 195	83, 510
Fox, <i>Ex parte</i> (1812), 1 V. & B. 67 ; 1 W. P. C. 431 n.	ii. 8
Fox's Patent (1878), No. 3988	ii. 123
Foxwell v. Bostock (1863-64), 12 W. R. 723 ; 4 De G. J. & S. 298 ; 10 L. T. N. S. 144	73, 79, 182, 237, 239, 242, 353 : ii. 103
Foxwell v. Webster (1863), 3 N. R. 103 ; 9 Jur. N. S. 1189 ; 2 Drew. & Sm. 250 ; 9 L. T. N. S. 362, 528	453, 493
Fradella v. Weller (1831), 2 Russ. & My. 247	392, 529
Francis' Application (1910), 27 R. P. C. 86	ii. 43, 69
Franklin Hocking & Co. v. Franklin Hocking (1886-89), 3 R. P. C. 291 ; 4 R. P. C. 255, 434 ; 6 R. P. C. 69. <i>See</i> Hocking Co. v. Hocking	ii. 162
Franklin Hocking & Co. v. Fraser (1885), 3 R. P. C. 7. <i>See</i> Hocking v. Fraser	502
Fraser v. Province of Brescia Steam Tramways Co. (1887), 56 L. T. N. S. 771 ; 3 Times R. 587	553
Frearson v. Loe (1878), 26 W. R. 13 ^a ; L. R. 9 Ch. D. 48 ..	142, 249, 377, 390, 407, 423, 462, 499, 502, 525
Frentzell v. Dougill (1904), 21 R. P. C. 641	ii. 179
Friese-Greene's Patent, [1907] A. C. 460 ; 24 R. P. C. 464	ii. 219, 223
Fryer's Patent, 47 Eng. 49	ii. 241

	PAGE
Fuller v. Handy (1903), 21 R. P. C. 6	42
Fullwood v. Fullwood (1878), L. R. 9 Ch. D. 176	500
Furnes's Patent (1885), 2 R. P. C. 175	ii. 243, 246
Fusee Vesta Co. v. Bryant and May (1887-88), 4 R. P. C. 71, 191; L. R. 34 Ch. D. 458; L. R. 37 Ch. D. 120; 56 L. J. Ch. 187 ..	312, 323: ii. 125
GADD v. Mayor of Manchester (1892), 9 R. P. C. 259, 516	89, 135, 147, 184, 187, 190
Gale's Patent (1891), 8 R. P. C. 438	290, 303
Gall v. O'Neill and Brown (1910), 27 R. P. C. 18	546
Galloway v. Bleden (1839), 1 W. P. C. 268 n., 521	118, 119, 121, 148, 201, 472, 473
Galloway's Patent (1843), 1 W. P. C. 724; 7 Jur. 453	160: ii. 229, 230
Gamble v. Kurtz (1846), 3 C. B. 425	339
Gammons v. Battersby (1903), 20 R. P. C. 540; 21 R. P. C. 322 ..	41, 248, 415
Gammons v. Singer Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (1901), 22 R. P. C. 129, 452	415, 416, 495, 496, 552
Gandy v. Reddaway (1885), 2 R. P. C. 49	217, 247, 277, 287
Gardner v. Broadbent (1856), 2 Jur. N. S. 1041; 4 W. R. 767	439, 442, 449
Garo's Patent (1884), L. R. 26 Ch. D. 105	ii. 120
Garnett's Patent (1899), 16 R. P. C. 154	ii. 22
Garrard v. Edge (1889-90), 6 R. P. C. 372, 563; 7 R. P. C. 139; L. R. 44 Ch. D. 224; 58 L. J. Ch. 397; 59 L. J. Ch. 379; 60 L. T. N. S. 557; 62 L. T. N. S. 510; 37 W. R. 501; 38 W. R. 455; W. N. (1890) 43, 68	339, 354, 462, 495, 534, 541
Garthwaite's Patent (1886), Griff. P. C. 284	ii. 47
Gascoine's Patent (1910), 27 R. P. C. 78	ii. 85
Gaulard v. Lindsay (1888), 4 R. P. C. 189; 5 R. P. C. 192; L. R. 38 Ch. D. 38; 56 L. T. N. S. 506; 57 L. J. Ch. 687	315; ii. 126, 142, 143
Gaulard and Gibbs's Patent (1887-89), 5 R. P. C. 189, 525; 6 R. P. C. 215; L. R. 34 Ch. D. 396; 50 L. J. Ch. 606; 57 L. J. Ch. 209; Griff. P. C. 320; W. N. (1887) 211; W. N. (1888) 168; W. N. (1889) 60	137, 151, 184, 186, 190, 219, 294, 303: ii, 108, 109, 127, 142
Gaunt's Patent (1897), 14 R. P. C. 388	ii. 60
Gavioli v. Shephard (1899), 17 R. P. C. 107	520
Gawthorp v. Mason (1906), 23 R. P. C. 401	335
Geary v. Norton (1846), 1 De G. & S. 9	338, 392, 499, 529
Geipel v. Lord Mayor, &c. of Manchester (1903), 21 R. P. C. 48	98
Geipel's Patent, [1903] 2 Ch. 715; [1904] 1 Ch. 239; 20 R. P. C. 545; 21 R. P. C. 379	183, 184: ii. 129, 142
General Electric Co. (1900), Ltd. v. Safety Lift and Elevator Co., Ltd. (1903), 21 R. P. C. 109	450
Germ Milling Co. v. Robinson (1884-86), 1 R. P. C. 217; 3 R. P. C. 11, 254, 399; 55 L. J. Ch. 287; 53 L. T. N. S. 696; 34 W. R. 194	128, 129, 460, 461, 463, 464, 539, 540: ii. 204
Gibson v. Brand (1841-42), 1 W. P. C. 627; 4 M. & G. 179; 11 L. J. C. P. 177	16, 59, 110, 175, 193, 211, 220, 223, 374, 484

TABLE OF CASES.

xxxvii

	PAGE
Gillett Safety Razor Co., <i>Ld. v. Gamago (A. W.), Ld.</i> (1907), 24 R. P. C. 1; 25 R. P. C. 492; 26 R. P. C. 745.....	438, 449
Gillett Safety Razor Co., <i>Ld. v. Luna Safety Razor Co., Ld.</i> , [1910] 2 Ch. 373; 27 R. P. C. 527	ii. 127
Gillett <i>v. Wiltby</i> (1839), 9 <i>Car. & P.</i> 334; 1 <i>W. P. C.</i> 270	409, 546
Glossop, <i>Re</i> (1884), <i>Griff. P. C.</i> 285.....	ii. 48, 50
Glover (W. T.) & Co., <i>Ld. v. American Steel and Wire Co.</i> (1902), 19 R. P. C. 102	280
Goerz and Hough's Patent (1895), 12 R. P. C. 370.....	301
Goltstern's Application (1910), 27 R. P. C. 289.....	ii. 42, 114, 132
Gonville <i>v. Hay</i> (1903), 21 R. P. C. 49.....	418: ii. 202
Gordon <i>v. Rolte</i> (1849), 4 <i>Exch.</i> 365	395
Gormully and Jeffery Manufacturing Co., <i>Ld. v. North British Rubber Co., Ld.</i> (<i>See North British Rubber Co., Ld. v. Gormully and Jeffery Manufacturing Co., Ld.</i>)	279, 370
Gormully and Jeffery Manufacturing Co.'s Petition (1899), 16 R. P. C. 641	ii. 187
Gosnell <i>v. Bishop</i> (1888), 5 R. P. C. 41, 151	41, 67, 357, 358, 360
Goucher <i>v. Clayton</i> (1865), 11 <i>Jur. N. S.</i> 107, 462; 34 <i>L. J. Ch.</i> 239; 13 <i>L. T. N. S.</i> 115	375, 419, 420: ii. 205
Goucher's Patent (1865), 2 <i>Moo. P. C. N. S.</i> 532.....	ii. 246
Gozney's Patent (1888), 5 R. P. C. 597	ii. 57, 58
Grafton <i>v. Watson</i> (1854), 51 <i>L. T. N. S.</i> 141	554
Graham <i>v. Campbell</i> (1877), <i>L. R.</i> 7 <i>Ch. D.</i> 490	447
Graham <i>v. Eli</i> (1898), 15 R. P. C. 259	ii. 3
Graham <i>v. Fanta</i> (1872), 9 R. P. C. 164.....	ii. 3
Gramophone Co., <i>Ld. v. Ruhl</i> (1910), 27 R. P. C. 629; 28 R. P. C. 20..	481
Gramophone and Typewriter, <i>Ld. v. Ullmann</i> (1906), 23 R. P. C. 260, 752	37, 39
Graphic Acts Co. <i>v. Hunters, Ld.</i> (1910), 27 R. P. C. 677	470
Greaves <i>v. The Eastern Counties Ry. Co.</i> (1859), 1 <i>E. & E.</i> 961; 28 <i>L. J. Q. B.</i> 290	520
Green, <i>Re</i> (1857), 24 <i>Beav.</i> 145.....	ii. 82
Green's Application, [1911] 1 <i>Ch.</i> 754; 27 R. P. C. 540	ii. 94
Green's Patent (1887), <i>Griff. P. C.</i> 286	ii. 51, 53, 70
Greenfell and McEvoy's Patent (1890), 7 R. P. C. 151	ii. 14
Greenhalgh's Patent (1897), 14 R. P. C. 388	ii. 44
Greenwell <i>v. Howell</i> , [1900] 1 <i>Q. B.</i> 535	551
Greer <i>v. Bristol Tanning Co.</i> (1885), 2 R. P. C. 268	438
Gregory <i>v. Piper</i> (1829), 9 <i>B. & C.</i> 591	395
Griffin <i>v. Feaver</i> (1889), 6 R. P. C. 396	540
Griffin's Patent (1888), 6 R. P. C. 296	ii. 43, 44
Griffith <i>v. Blake</i> (1884), <i>L. R.</i> 27 <i>Ch. D.</i> 474	447
Griffiths <i>v. The Birmingham Stopper and Cycle Components Co.</i> (1899), 16 R. P. C. 383	352
Grover and Baker Sewing Machine Co. <i>v. Millard</i> (1862), 8 <i>Jur. N. S.</i> 713	ii. 206
Grover and Baker Sewing Machine Co. <i>v. Wilson</i> (1870), <i>W. N.</i> (1870) 78	423, 430
Guest and Barrow's Patent (1888), 5 R. P. C. 312	ii. 56, 57, 58, 61
Guilbert-Martin <i>v. Kerr</i> (1887), 4 R. P. C. 18	536

	PAGE
Guyot v. Thompson (1891), 11 R. P. C. 541; 71 L. T. N. S. 416; 64 L. J. Ch. 32; [1894] 3 Ch. 388; 8 R. 174, n.....	409: ii. 188, 191, 192
Gwynne v. Drysdale (1885-86), 2 R. P. C. 160; 3 R. P. C. 65	354, 390
HADDAN'S Patent, <i>Re</i> (1884), 51 L. T. N. S. 190; 54 L. J. Ch. 126; W. N. (1884) 192.....	303, 450
Haddan's Patent, <i>Re</i> (1885), Griff. L. O. C. 12	ii. 124, 137
Haddon's Patent, <i>Re</i> (1885), 2 R. P. C. 218	299, 300, 307
Haggenmacher v. Watson (1897), 14 R. P. C. 349, 631	119, 494, 497, 498
Halden v. Hall (1904), 21 R. P. C. 609	99
Hall v. Conder (1857), 2 C. B. N. S. 22; 26 L. J. C. P. 138, 288..	417: ii. 166, 201, 207
Hall v. Jarvis (1822), 1 W. P. C. 100; 1 C. P. C. 423	59, 92, 483, 484
Hall v. Stepney Spare Motor Wheel, Ltd. (1910), 27 R. P. C. 233	320
Hall v. Trigg, [1897] 2 Ch. 222	- 503
Hall v. Truman (1885), L. R. 29 Ch. D. 307.....	459
Hall's Patent (1817), 1 W. P. C. 97	74
Hall's Patent (1883), L. R. 23 Ch. D. 644.....	447
Hall's Patent (1895), 12 R. P. C. 401	ii. 231
Hall and Hall's Patent (1888), 5 R. P. C. 283; L. R. 21 Q. B. D. 137; 57 L. J. Q. B. 494; 59 L. T. N. S. 37; 36 W. R. 892	ii. 57, 66
Hall and others (1888), 5 R. P. C. 306	ii. 112, 143
Hulsey v. Brotherhood (1880-81), L. R. 15 Ch. D. 514; L. R. 19 Ch. D. 386; 49 L. J. Ch. 514, 786; 51 L. J. Ch. 233; 45 L. T. N. S. 640	309, 310, 311
Hamilton's Patent (1901), 19 R. P. C. 33	ii. 55, 66
Hampton and Facer's Patent (1887), Griff. L. O. C. 13	ii. 40, 106, 136
Hancock v. Bewley (1860), 1 Johns. 601.....	ii. 179
Hancock v. Moulton (1852), Johns. Pat. 6th ed. 254	354, 374
Hancock v. Somervell (1851), 39 Newton, L. J. 158	122, 124, 127, 128, 132
Hardmuth v. Baker (1904), 21 R. P. C. 504; 22 R. P. C. 66-	352, 357
Hardy's Patent (1849), 6 Moo. P. C. 441	ii. 240, 245
Harmer v. Plane (1807-9), 14 Ves. 130; 11 East, 101; Dav. P. C. 311..	83, 102, 103, 154, 215, 225, 440, 443, 446
Harrild and Parkin's Patent (1900), 17 R. P. C. 617	ii. 22, 53, 67
Harris v. Rothwell (1886-88), 3 R. P. C. 243, 383; 4 R. P. C. 225; L. R. 35 Ch. D. 416; 56 L. J. Ch. 459	136, 137, 138, 139, 427, 430, 471, 473
Harrison v. Anderston Foundry Co. (1876), L. R. 1 App. Cas. 574....	78, 79, 237, 240, 241, 242, 245, 246, 262, 265, 270, 336
Harrison v. Taylor (1865), 11 Jur. N. S. 408.....	509
Harrison's Patents Co. v. Nicholson (W. N.) & Sons, Ltd. (1907), 24 R. P. C. 722; 25 R. P. C. 393	251, 336
Harrison's Patent (1853), Macr. P. C. 31	ii. 123
Harrop v. Mayor of Ossett, [1898] 1 Ch. 525	550
Hartley's Patent (1777), 1 W. P. C. 54; 2 H. Bl. 493	66
Hart's Patent (1908), 25 R. P. C. 299.....	ii. 245, 246

TABLE OF CASES.

xxxix

	PAGE
Harwood v. Great Northern Ry. Co. (1860-65), 11 H. L. C. 654; 29 L. J. Q. B. 193; 31 L. J. Q. B. 198; 35 L. J. Q. B. 27; 6 L. T. N. S. 90; 12 L. T. N. S. 771; 10 W. R. 422; 14 W. R. 1; 2 B. & S. 194	33, 34, 35, 93, 100, 474
Haskell Golf Ball Co., Ltd. v. Hutchinson (1904), 21 R. P. C. 497; 22 R. P. C. 205, 477; 23 R. P. C. 125; 25 R. P. C. 194; [1906] 1 Ch. 518.....	55, 57, 77, 78, 119, 121, 131, 218, 316, 321, 473, 531, 532, 536, 537, 552, 554
Haslam v. Hall (1887-88), 4 R. P. C. 203; 5 R. P. C. 1, 144; L. R. 20 Q. B. D. 491	143, 402, 404, 405, 458, 536, 545: ii. 139
Haslam Foundry and Engineering Co. v. Goodfellow (1888), 5 R. P. C. 28; L. R. 37 Ch. D. 118; 57 L. J. Ch. 245	ii. 125
Haslett v. Hutchinson (1891), 8 R. P. C. 457	ii. 80, 168
Hassall v. Wright (1870), L. R. 10 Eq. 509; 40 L. J. Ch. 145.....	ii. 170, 177
Hasting's Case (1561), Noy, R. 182; 1 W. P. C. 6	2, 103, 526
Hastings v. Brown (1853), 1 E. & B. 450; 22 L. J. Q. B. 161	220
Hatschek's Patent (1909), 26 R. P. C. 1, 228	ii. 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 97
Hattersley v. Hodgson (1903), 20 R. P. C. 501; 21 R. P. C. 517; 22 R. P. C. 229; 23 R. P. C. 192	202, 247, 266, 278, 285, 286, 487, 505, 506: ii. 115, 118
Hattersley and Jackson's Patent (1901), 21 R. P. C. 233	ii. 114, 116
Haworth v. Hardcastle (1834), 1 W. P. C. 485; 1 Bing. N. C. 122; 1 M. & Sc. 732; 3 L. J. C. P. 311	166, 202, 247, 266, 273
Haws v. Harding (1897), 14 R. P. C. 641, 930.....	33
Haydock v. Bradbury (1887), 4 R. P. C. 74	546, 547
Hayne v. Maltby (1789), 3 T. R. 439; 1 W. P. C. 291	ii. 162, 204
Haythornthwaite's Application (1890), 7 R. P. C. 70	53, 54, 70
Hayward v. Hamilton (1879-81), Griff. P. C. 115	37, 43, 75
Hayward v. Pavement Light Co. (1884), 1 R. P. C. 207.....	339, 444
Hazeland's Patent (1894), 11 R. P. C. 467	ii. 230, 243, 246
Hazelhurst v. Rylands (1892), 9 R. P. C. 1	ii. 149, 167
Heald v. Incandescent Gas Light Co. (1893), 10 R. P. C. 165	408
Heald's Patent (1891), 8 R. P. C. 429	21: ii. 44
Healey's Application, Johns. Pat. 6th ed. 165	18
Heap v. Hartley (1838), 5 R. P. C. 603; 6 R. P. C. 495; L. R. 42 Ch. D. 461; 58 L. J. Ch. 790; 41 L. T. N. S. 538; 38 W. R. 136; 5 T. R. 710.....	381: ii. 81, 181, 191, 209, 210
Hearson's Patent (1884), 1 R. P. C. 213; Griff. P. C. 266.....	ii. 9, 121
Heath v. Smith (1854), 2 W. P. C. 268; 23 L. J. Q. B. 166; 3 E. & B. 256	122, 123, 124, 129
Heath v. Unwin (1842-55), 10 M. & W. 684; 13 M. & W. 583; 1 W. P. C. 551; 2 W. P. C. 216, 236; 2 D. N. S. 482; 12 L. J. Ex. 46; 14 L. J. Ex. 153; 16 L. J. Ch. 283; 22 L. J. C. P. 7; 12 C. B. 522; 15 S. M. 55, n.; 5 H. L. C. 505; 16 C. B. 713; 25 L. J. C. P. 8.....	116, 130, 227, 228, 337, 338, 355, 373, 434, 435
Heath and Frost's Patent (1886), Griff. P. C. 288, 310	ii. 48, 49, 50, 51, 51, 109, 135
Heath's Patent (1853), 2 W. P. C. 247; 8 Moo. P. C. 217	ii. 226, 230, 235, 241, 243
Heathfield v. Braby, Seton, 6th ed. 684	463
Heathfield v. Greenway (1894), 11 R. P. C. 17.....	427, 434

	PAGE
Hedge's Patent (1895), 12 R. P. C. 136	ii. 54
Heine v. Conico Incandescent Light Co. (1904), 21 R. P. C. 202	99
Heine v. Norden (1904), 21 R. P. C. 513	444
Heine v. Spong (1904), 22 R. P. C. 110.....	ii. 166
Henderson v. The Runcorn Soap and Alkali Co. (1868), W. N. (1868) 250; 19 L. T. N. S. 459.....	487
Henderson v. Shiels (1907), 24 R. P. C. 108	ii. 167, 202
Henderson's Patent, [1901] A. C. 616; 18 R. P. C. 449 ..	ii. 216, 236, 237, 240
Hennebique v. Cowlin (1909), 26 R. P. C. 280	44
Hennebique's Patent (1910), 28 R. P. C. 41	ii. 106
Henry's Patent (1872), L. R. 8 Ch. 167; 38 Eng. 343, 352	ii. 45, 73, 243
Hensee v. Hardie (1894), 11 R. P. C. 421	402, 409
Herbert v. Sayer (1844), 5 Q. B. 965	ii. 173
Herberts' Patent (1867), L. R. 1 P. C. 399; 4 Moo. P. C. (N. S.) 300.....	ii. 171, 232, 233, 244
Herrberger v. Squire (1888-89), 5 R. P. C. 581; 6 R. P. C. 194	80, 151, 311, 322, 323, 324, 329, 331
Hess v. Stevenson (1808), 3 Bos. & P. 505	ii. 173
Hetherington's Patent (1889), 7 R. P. C. 419	ii. 58
Hough v. Chamberlain (1877), 25 W. R. 742	418, 420
Heurteloup's Patent (1836), 1 W. P. C. 533	136
Hewett v. Nurse (1900), 17 R. P. C. 264	335
Heys v. Hallmark (1891), 9 R. P. C. 25.....	46, 541
Hicks v. Simmons (1904), 21 R. P. C. 413, 632.....	357
Hickton's Patent Syndicate v. Patents and Machine Improvements Co., Ld. (1908), 26 R. P. C. 61, 339	43, 100
Higgin's Patent (1891), 9 R. P. C. 74	24: 2, 46
Higginson and Dean, <i>In re</i> , [1899] 1 Q. B. 325	ii. 174
Higgs v. Goodwin (1858), E. B. & E. 529; 27 L. J. Q. B. 421	61, 377, 384
Hill v. Adams (1893), 10 R. P. C. 102	466
Hill v. Evans (1862), 4 De G. F. & J. 288; 31 L. J. Ch. 457; 8 Jur. N. S. 525; 6 L. T. N. S. 90	107, 137, 145, 261, 263, 264, 499, 515
Hill v. Thomas (1906), 23 R. P. C. 375; 24 R. P. C. 415.....	38, 220, 335
Hill v. Thompson (1817-18), 1 W. P. C. 229; 3 Mer. 622; 2 B. Moo. 424; 8 Taunt. 375; 1 Carp. P. C. 377	15, 17, 59, 73, 77, 82, 110, 112, 114, 131, 156, 164, 238, 247, 248, 261, 439, 440, 442, 443, 448, 449, 477, 480
Hill v. Tombs (1881), 51 Eng. 274	110
Hill v. Touts	464
Hilleary v. Taylor (1887), L. R. 36 Ch. D. 262	552
Hills v. Laming (1853), 9 Exch. 256; 23 L. J. Ex. 60	ii. 201
Hills v. London Gas Light Co. (1857-60), 27 L. J. Ex. 60; 29 L. J. Ex. 409; 5 H. & N. 312	45, 118, 120, 150, 175, 202, 216, 264, 280
Hill's Application (1888), 5 R. P. C. 599	ii. 56, 57, 58
Hill's Patent (1863), 1 Moo. P. C. N. S. 258; 9 L. T. N. S. 101; 9 Jur. N. S. 1209; 18 Newton, L. J. N. S. 109	74: ii. 218, 230, 231, 235, 239, 241, 242, 474
Hind v. Osborne (1884-85), 1 R. P. C. 221; 2 R. P. C. 45, 64	426, 496, 497
Hinks v. Safety Lighting Co. (1876), L. R. 4 Ch. D. 607; 46 L. J. Ch. 185; 36 L. T. N. S. 391	42, 74, 217, 218, 230, 245, 246, 266, 271, 280, 285, 287, 470

TABLE OF CASES.

xli

	PAGE
Hirschfeld's Patent (1894), 11 R. P. C. 514	302, 305
Hitchcock's Patent (1903), 20 R. P. C. 767	304
Hooking v. Fraser (1886), 3 R. P. C. 3	473, 512, 527, 555
Hocking v. Hocking (1886-89), 3 R. P. C. 291; 4 R. P. C. 255, 434; 6 R. P. C. 69	57, 418, 432: ii. 163
Hodgkin's Application (1906), 23 R. P. C. 527	ii. 54
Hoe v. Foster (1898), 15 R. P. C. 573; 16 R. P. C. 33	104, 121
Hoffman Manufacturing Co. v. Auto Machinery Co., Ld. (1910), 28 R. P. C. 141	341
Hoffman v. Postill (1869), L. R. 4 Ch. App. Cas. 673	550, 552
Hoffman's Patent (1890), 7 R. P. C. 92	ii. 57, 58, 59
Hoffnung v. Salsbury (1899), 16 R. P. C. 375	313, 314, 324, 328
Hogg v. Kirby, 8 Ves. 215	ii. 146
Holland v. Fox (1853-54), 1 W. R. 448; 23 L. J. Q. B. 211, 357; 3 E. & B. 977	507
Holliday v. Heppenstall (1889), 6 R. P. C. 320; L. R. 41 Ch. D. 109; 58 L. J. Ch. 829	424, 427, 431, 432, 480
Hollins v. Capper (1886), 5 R. P. C. 289	128
Holmes v. Associated Newspapers, Ld. (1910), 27 R. P. C. 1, 136	246
Holmes v. London & North-Western Ry. Co. (1852), Macr. P. C. 4; 12 C. B. 831; 22 L. J. C. P. 57	216, 238: ii. 122
Holophane, Ld. v. Berend (1897), 15 R. P. C. 18	441
Holste v. Robertson (1876), L. R. 4 Ch. D. 9; 46 L. J. Ch. 1; 33 L. T. N. S. 457; 25 W. R. 35	414, 424, 425
Holstrom, <i>Re</i> (1904), 22 R. P. C. 213	ii. 82
Holt, <i>Re</i> (1879), L. R. 11 Ch. D. 168	503, 504
Homan's Case (1889), 6 R. P. C. 104; G. P. C. 33	21: ii. 45
Honiball v. Bloomer (1854), 2 W. P. C. 199; 10 Exch. 538; 24 L. J. Ex. 11	122, 123, 124, 128
Honiball's Patent (1855), 2 W. P. C. 201; 9 Moo. P. C. 378; 25 L. T. 1; L. R. 3 Eq. 225	122, 123: ii. 227, 247
Hookham v. Johnson (1897), 14 R. P. C. 525	554
Hookham's Patent (1886), Griff. L. O. C. 32	ii. 48, 49, 50, 58, 135
Hopkin's Patent (1909), 27 R. P. C. 72	ii. 60
Hopkinson v. St. James's Electric Light Co. (1893), 10 R. P. C. 46 .. 217, 287, 511, 554: ii. 107	109,
Hopkinson's Patent (1896), 13 R. P. C. 114; 14 R. P. C. 5; 66 L. J. P. C. 38; [1897] A. C. 249; 75 L. T. N. S. 462	ii. 215, 216, 217, 225
Horace, <i>The</i> (1884), L. R. 9 P. D. 86	554
Hornblower v. Boulton (1799), Dav. P. C. 221; 8 T. R. 95; 1 Carp. P. C. 156	29, 47, 214, 470
Hornby's Patent (1853), 7 Moo. P. C. 503	ii. 247
Horne v. Ivy, 1 Sid. 441; 1 Vent. 47	526
Horrocks v. Stubbs (1886, 1896), 3 R. P. C. 221; 12 R. P. C. 540; 74 L. T. N. S. 58	184, 189, 190, 415, 416, 551
Horsey's Patent (1884), 1 R. P. C. 225	ii. 218, 219
Horsley and Knighton's Patent (1869), L. R. 8 Eq. 475; L. R. 4 Ch. 784; 39 L. J. Ch. 157	ii. 82, 158
Horton v. Mabon (1862-64), 12 C. B. N. S. 437; 16 C. B. N. S. 141; 31 L. J. C. P. 255	33, 81

	PAGE
Hoskin's Patent (1884), Griff. P. C. 291	ii. 47, 56, 64
Houghton's Patent (1871), L. R. 3 P. C. 461; 7 Moo. P. C. N. S. 309..	ii. 216, 226
Househill Co. v. Neilson, 1 W. P. C. 676; 9 C. & F. 788	15, 29, 49, 50, 55, 67, 104, 116, 117, 119, 121, 136, 138, 173, 228, 411, 428, 514
Household v. Fairburn (1884), 1 R. P. C. 109; 2 R. P. C. 142	320
How v. MacKernan (1862), 30 Beav. 547	457
Howard v. Tweedales (1895-96), 12 R. P. C. 519; 13 R. P. C. 211 ..	395, 509: ii. 155
Howes v. Webber (1894-95), 11 R. P. C. 586; 12 R. P. C. 465; 13 R. P. C. 39	352, 443, 556
Huddart v. Grimshaw (1803), 1 W. P. C. 85; Dav. P. C. 265; 2 B. & Ald. 377	31, 73, 136, 156, 199, 214, 264, 483, 484
Hudson v. Bennett (1886), 14 W. R. 911	392
Hudson v. Osgerby (1884), 32 W. R. 566; W. N. (1884) 83.....	554
Hudson, Scott & Sons, Ltd. v. Berringer, Wallis and Manners, Ltd. (1905), 23 R. P. C. 75, 502.....	46, 105
Hudson's Patent (1904), 22 R. P. C. 218	ii. 70
Hugh v. Magill (1897), W. N. (1897) 62	442
Hughes and Kennaugh's Application (1910), 27 R. P. C. 281	ii. 50
Hughes's Patent (1879), L. R. 4 App. Cas. 174; 48 L. J. C. P. 20..	ii. 232, 233
Hughes's Patent (1898), 15 R. P. C. 371	ii. 237, 238
Hull v. Bolland (1856), 1 H. & N. 134; 25 L. J. Ex. 304.....	423, 466
Hullett v. Hague (1831), 9 L. J. (O. S.) K. B. 242; 2 B. & Ad. 370; 1 Carp. P. C. 501.....	118
Hulton and Blackley's Petition (1898), 15 R. P. C. 749	ii. 187
Humpherson v. Syer (1887), 4 R. P. C. 184, 407....	21, 105, 119, 123, 125, 143, 537, 514, 555
Humphreys' Patent, 1 W. P. C. 7; Noy, R. 183.....	103
Hunt v. Chambers (1882), L. R. 20 Ch. 365	488
Hunt v. City of London Real Property Co. (1877), L. R. 3 Q. B. D. 19..	494
Hunt v. Hunt (1884), 54 L. J. Ch. 289	447
Hutchinson v. Patullo (1887-88), 4 R. P. C. 329; 5 R. P. C. 351..	179, 189, 218
Hutchinson's Patent (1861), 14 M. P. C. 222, 364	ii. 219, 236
Huth's Patent (1884), Griff. P. C. 292	ii. 51
Hyam v. Terry (1880), 29 W. R. 32	556
In the Matter of an Application for a Patent under sect. 103 of the Patents, &c. Act, 1903 (1906), 23 R. P. C. 788.....	ii. 33
Incandescent Gas Light Co. v. Brogden (1899), 16 R. P. C. 179.....	379, 383: ii. 190
Incandescent Gas Light Co. v. Cantelo (1895), 12 R. P. C. 262	382: ii. 190
Incandescent Gas Light Co. v. De Mare Incandescent Gas Light System (1896), 13 R. P. C. 301, 559	67, 144, 204, 205, 268, 278, 340, 343, 344, 346, 347, 369, 373, 552
Incandescent Gas Light Co. v. Keegan (1899), 17 R. P. C. 44	503
Incandescent Gas Light Co. v. New Incandescent Mantle Co. (1897), 15 R. P. C. 81; 76 L. T. N. S. 47	375, 376, 492

TABLE OF CASES.

xliii

	PAGE
Incandescent Gas Light Co. v. Riemer (1900), 17 R. P. C. 378.....	503
Incandescent Gas Light Co. v. Sluce (1900), 17 R. P. C. 173	503, 504
Incandescent Gas Light Co. v. Sunlight Incandescent Gas Lamp Co. (1896), 13 R. P. C. 333; 14 R. P. C. 180	316, 346, 347, 390, 552
Ingersoll Sergeant Drill Co. v. Consolidated Pneumatic Tool Co., Ltd. (1907), 25 R. P. C. 61	274
Ingram's Patent (1896), 13 R. P. C. 446	305
Innes v. Short (1898), 15 R. P. C. 449	376
International Harvester Co. of America v. Peacock (1908), 25 R. P. C. 765	44
J. and J.'s Patent (1902), 19 R. P. C. 555.....	ii. 48
J. Y. J.'s Application (1911), 28 R. P. C. 625	ii. 15
Jablochkoff's Patent (1891), 8 R. P. C. 281; [1831] A. C. 293; 60 L. J. P. C. 61	ii. 220, 223
Jackson v. Needle (1884), 1 R. P. C. 174; 2 R. P. C. 191....	440, 441, 448, 449
Jackson v. Wolstenholms (1884), 1 R. P. C. 105	246, 336
Jackson's Patent (1905), 22 R. P. C. 384	298
Jahncke v. Bell (1892), 9 R. P. C. 94	358
Jameson's Patent (1902), 19 R. P. C. 246.....	25, 295, 299
Jandus Arc Lamp and Electric Co., Ltd. v. Arc Lamp Co. (1903), 21 R. P. C. 115; 22 R. P. C. 384	33, 34, 45, 95, 502: ii. 118, 127
Jandus Arc Lamp and Electric Co., Ltd. v. Johnson (1900), 17 R. P. C. 361	281, 284: ii. 207
Jardine v. King, Mendham & Co. (1896), 13 R. P. C. 411	358, 513
Jenkins v. Hope (1895), 13 R. P. C. 57	499, 501, 529
Jensen v. Smith (1885), 2 R. P. C. 249	82, 131
Johnson v. Edge (1892), 9 R. P. C. 142; [1892] 2 Ch. 1; 61 L. J. Ch. 262	317, 318, 321, 323
Johnson v. Wyatt (1863), 2 De G. J. & S. 18, 25.....	500
Johnson and Atkinson's Patent (1873), L. R. 5 P. C. 87	ii. 217, 243, 244
Johnson's Patent (1871), L. R. 4 P. C. 75; 8 Moo. P. C. N. S. 282 ..	ii. 218, 240, 242
Johnson's Patent (1877), L. R. 5 Ch. D. 503	ii. 119
Johnson's Patent (1878), L. R. 13 Ch. D. 398, n.	ii. 72
Johnson's Patent (1896), 13 R. P. C. 659....	ii. 109, 114, 116, 118, 121
Johnson's Patent (1901), 19 R. P. C. 56.....	31: ii. 7
Johnson's Patent (1907), 24 R. P. C. 694	ii. 50
Johnson's Patent, [1908] 2 Ch. 487; [1909] 1 Ch. 144; 25 R. P. C. 542, 709	ii. 224, 228, 229, 234
Johnson's Patent (1909), 26 R. P. C. 52.....	ii. 92
Johnson's Patent (1909), 26 R. P. C. 780	ii. 119
Jones v. Berger (1813), 3 M. & G. 208; 1 W. P. C. 544, 178, n... 136, 409, 433, 435	
Jones v. Heaton, 1 W. P. C. 404, n.	234
Jones v. Lee (1856), 25 L. J. Ex. 241; 26 L. J. Ex. 9; 1 H. & N. 189.	405
Jones v. Monte Video Gas Co. (1880), L. R. 5 Q. B. D. 556	458
Jones v. Pearce (1832), 1 W. P. C. 121, 122; 5 M. & G. 208..	15, 117, 118, 119, 169, 377, 480
Jones's Patent (1840), 1 W. P. C. 577	ii. 227, 232, 233
Jones's Patent (1887), Griff. L. O. C. 33	ii. 10, 21, 22, 55, 57

	PAGE
Jones's Patent, Griff. P. C. 313	ii. 103
Jonkergouw and Destrez's Patent (1910), 27 R. P. C. 510	ii. 94, 101
Jordan v. Moore (1866), L. R. 1 C. P. 624; 35 L. J. C. P. 268	247, 277
Joy's Patent (1893), 10 R. P. C. 89.....	ii. 225, 243
Jupe v. Pratt (1837), 1 W. P. C. 144, 145	55, 56, 57, 67, 264, 342, 411
Justice's Patent (1900), 18 R. P. C. 240.....	306
KANE v. Boyle (J.) & Co. (1901), 18 R. P. C. 325	501
Kane v. Guest (1899), 16 R. P. C. 433	536, 538
Kay v. Marshall (1836-41), 1 My. & Cr. 373; 1 Keen, 190; 5 Bing. N. C. 492; 7 Scott, 548; 8 L. J. C. P. 261; 2 W. P. C. 71, 79; 8 Cl. & F. 245; 5 Jur. 1028	91, 95, 110, 238, 245, 274, 399
Kay's Patent (1839), 1 W. P. C. 568; 3 Moo. P. C. 21.....	ii. 226, 229, 230, 241
Kay's Patent (1894), 11 R. P. C. 279	32
Kaye v. Chubb (1888), 4 R. P. C. 23, 289; 5 W. P. C. 641 ..	237, 282, 354, 471, 474, 535, 536, 554
Keely v. Heathman (1890), 7 R. P. C. 343.....	242
Kelley's Patent (1900), 17 R. P. C. 476	ii. 229
Kelly v. Batchelor (1893), 10 R. P. C. 289.....	375, 482
Kelly v. Byles (1879), L. R. 13 Ch. D. 682	552
Kelvin v. White, Thomson & Co. (1907), 25 R. P. C. 177; 26 R. P. C. 734	160, 543
Kempton and Mollan's Patent (1905), 22 R. P. C. 373	ii. 40
Kenny's Patent Button-holing Co. v. Somervell (1878), 26 W. R. 787; 33 L. J. N. S. 870	ii. 171, 172, 187
Kensington and Knightsbridge Electric Light Co. v. Lane-Fox Electrical Co. (1891), 8 R. P. C. 277; [1891] 2 Ch. 573.....	312, 313, 318, 323, 447
Kent's Patent (1909), 26 R. P. C. 666	ii. 91, 96, 97
Kerr and Hoeggen v. Crompton and Horrocks (1901), 19 R. P. C. 9 ..	530
Kerrison v. Smith, [1897] 2 Q. B. 445	ii. 189
Kilner's Patent (1889), 8 R. P. C. 35.....	ii. 61, 62
King Brown v. Anglo-American Brush Corporation (1889-92), 6 R. P. C. 414; 7 R. P. C. 436; 9 R. P. C. 313	145, 184, 189, 190, 215, 281
King & Co.'s Trade Mark (1892), 9 R. P. C. 350; [1892] 2 Ch. 462; 62 L. J. Ch. 153	301, 302
Klaber's Patent (1902), 19 R. P. C. 174	105
Klaber's Patent (1904), 22 R. P. C. 1, 205; 23 R. P. C. 461	73, 201, 306
Klaber's Patent, [1908] 1 Ch. 845; 25 R. P. C. 334.....	ii. 129
Knight, <i>Re</i> (1886), Griff. L. O. C. 35	ii. 8
Knott v. Morgan, 2 Keen, 213	334
Kollman's Patent (1839), 1 W. P. C. 564	ii. 234
Kopp v. Rosenwald (1902), 19 R. P. C. 205; 20 R. P. C. 154.....	70, 222, 324
Krupp (Fried.) Aktiengesellschaft Germaniawerft's Application (1908), 25 R. P. C. 809.....	ii. 54
Kurtz v. Spenco (1886-88), 3 R. P. C. 368; 4 R. P. C. 427; 5 R. P. C. 161; L. R. 33 Ch. D. 579; L. R. 36 Ch. D. 770; 55 L. J. Ch. 919; 57 L. J. Ch. 238 ..	18, 21, 123, 161, 197, 202, 311, 314, 315, 317, 323, 329, 409, 478, 488
Kynoch & Co., Ltd. v. Webb (1899), 15 R. P. C. 269; 17 R. P. C. 100 84, 240, 241, 247, 285	

TABLE OF CASES.

xlv

	PAGE
La Société Anonyme Trade Mark (1893), 10 R. P. C. 290	302
Lacy's Patent (1890), 7 R. P. C. 469	ii. 112, 121
Lainson v. Tremere, 1 A. & E. 792	ii. 162
Lake and Elliot v. Rotax Motor Accessories Co. (1911), 28 R. P. C. 277	ii. 118
Lake's Patent (1887), Griff. L. O. C. 16	ii. 106, 109, 114, 137
Lake's Patent (1887), Griff. L. O. C. 35	ii. 37, 49
Lake's Patent (1888), 5 R. P. C. 415	ii. 43, 46
Lake's Patent (1889), 6 R. P. C. 548	ii. 41
Lake's Patent (1891), 8 R. P. C. 228	ii. 238
Lake's Patent (1909), 26 R. P. C. 443	ii. 91, 92
Lamb v. Evans, [1893] 1 Ch. 218	22
Lamb v. Nottingham Manufacturing Co., cited L. R. 19 Eq. 230	405
Lambert Co. v. International Phonograph Indestructible Record Co., Ld. (1903), 20 R. P. C. 705; 21 R. P. C. 247	340, 369
Lancashire Explosives Co. v. Roburite Explosives Co. (1895-97), 12 R. P. C. 393, 470; 13 R. P. C. 429; 14 R. P. C. 303..43, 45, 70, 151, 336, 337, 346, 496, 505, 500, 555.	
Lancaster's Patent (1864), 2 Moo. P. C. N. S. 189	ii. 245
Lancaster's Patent (1884), Griff. P. C. 293	ii. 41, 48, 51, 55
Lancaster's Patent (1902), 20 R. P. C. 366	ii. 67
Land's Patent, [1910] 2 Ch. 236; 27 R. P. C. 481	ii. 75
Lane v. Herold (1892), 9 R. P. C. 447	349
Lane-Fox v. Kensington and Knightsbridge Electric Lighting Co. (1892), 9 R. P. C. 221, 413; [1892] 3 Ch. 424; 67 L. T. N. S. 440..33,163, 186, 189: ii. 108.	
Lane-Fox's Patent (1892), 9 R. P. C. 411	ii. 226, 230, 239
Lang v. Gisborne (1862), 31 Beav. 133; 31 L. J. Ch. 769; 6 L. T. N. S. 771	15, 137, 138.
Lang v. Whitecross Co. (1889), 6 R. P. C. 570; 7 R. P. C. 389	ii. 126, 142
Lang's Patent (1890), 7 R. P. C. 469	ii. 112, 121
Law v. Ashworth (1890), 7 R. P. C. 86	324, 325
Lawes v. Purser (1856), 6 E. & B. 930; 26 L. J. Q. B. 25	ii. 201, 207
Lawrence v. Perry (1885), 2 R. P. C. 179	136, 161, 280, 360, 535: ii. 139
Lawrence and Kennedy's Patent (1910), 27 R. P. C. 252	ii. 214, 236
Lawrence's Patent (1892), 9 R. P. C. 85	ii. 231, 237
Lawrie v. Baker (1885), 2 R. P. C. 213	535
Lawson v. Donald Macpherson & Co. (1897), 14 R. P. C. 696	ii. 193
Leadbeater v. Kitchin (1890), 7 R. P. C. 235	247
Leaf v. Topham (1845), 14 M. & W. 146; 14 L. J. Ex. 231	434
Leather-Cloth Co. v. Hirschfeld (1863-66), 1 H. & M. 295; L. R. 1 Eq. 299	512
Ledgard v. Bull (1886), L. R. 11 App. Cas. 648. <i>See also</i> 3 R. P. C. 390	403
Ledsam v. Russell (1847), 1 H. L. C. 687. <i>See Russell v. Ledsam</i> ..	ii. 220, 227
Leeds Forge Co. v. Clayton (1905), 22 R. P. C. 325	298
Leeds Forge Co. v. Deighton's Patent Flue and Tube Co. (1901), 18 R. P. C. 233; 19 R. P. C. 285; 20 R. P. C. 185; 21 R. P. C. 487; 25 R. P. C. 209	262, 280, 214, 289, 496, 523, 547, 555.
Lee's Patent (1856), 10 Moo. P. C. 226	ii. 229
Lee's Patent (1906), 23 R. P. C. 233	305.

	PAGE
Lees v. West London Cycle Works (1892), 9 R. P. C. 300	335, 541
Legge v. Wakeham (1893), 10 R. P. C. 379	490
Leggott v. McGeogh (1893), 10 R. P. C. 429	84, 238
Leonardt v. Kallé (1894-95), 11 R. P. C. 534; 12 R. P. C. 103, 306 ..	209,
276, 436, 437, 438, 551, 552, 554	
Levenstein's Patent (1894), 11 R. P. C. 349	ii. 64
Levinstein's Petition (1898), 15 R. P. C. 732	ii. 187
Lewis v. Davis (1829), 3 Car. & P. 502; 1 W. P. C. 488; 1 Carp. P. C.	
471	73, 82, 168
Lewis v. Marling (1829), 10 B. & C. 22; 4 Car. & P. 52; 1 W. P. C.	
290	121, 128, 167, 196, 197, 222, 230
Lewis and Stinckler's Patent (1897), 14 R. P. C. 24	151, 198
Liardet v. Electric Lighting Co. (1883), W. N. (1883) 96	ii. 201
Liardet v. Johnson (1778), 1 W. P. C. 53; 1 Carp. P. C. 35	39, 218, 230
Lifeboat Co. v. Chambers (1891), 8 R. P. C. 418	128, 219
Lindon's Patent (1897), 14 R. P. C. 643	ii. 219, 223
Lines v. Usher (1896), 13 R. P. C. 685; 14 R. P. C. 206	ii. 208
Linoleum Co. v. Nairn (1877), L. R. 7 Ch. D. 834	ii. 13
Linotype and Machinery Co., Ltd. v. Hopkins (1908), 25 R. P. C. 349,	
665; 27 R. P. C. 252	200: ii. 161
Lister v. Dix (1898), 16 R. P. C. 89	280
Lister v. Eastwood (1855-64), 3 C. L. R. 1249; 26 L. T. 4; 9 L. T.	
N. S. 766	384, 445
Lister v. Leather (1857-58), 3 Jur. N. S. 433, 811; 5 W. R. 603; 8 E.	
& B. 1004, 1031; 27 L. J. Q. B. 295; 4 K. & J. 425	57, 73, 78, 79,
83, 238, 239, 244, 353, 467	
Lister v. Norton (1884-86), 1 R. P. C. 114; 2 R. P. C. 68, 135; 3	
R. C. P. 199	124, 125, 128, 142, 436, 437, 441, 448, 449, 452, 453,
456, 535	
Lister v. Wood, Seton, 3rd ed. p. 909	397
Lodge's Patent (1911), 28 R. P. C. 365	ii. 229, 245, 246
L'Oiseau and Pierrard's Application (1887), Griff. L. O. C. 36	ii. 34, 41, 50
London, Chatham and Dover Ry. Co. v. South Eastern Ry. Co. (1893),	
[1893] A. C. 429	ii. 208
London and Leicester Hosiery Co. v. Griswold (1886), 3 R. P. C. 250 ..	418:
ii. 161, 164	
London and South-Western Ry. Co. v. Groom (1881), L. R. 20 Ch. D.	
589	552
Longbottom v. Shaw (1888-91), 5 R. P. C. 497; 6 R. P. C. 143, 510;	
8 R. P. C. 333; L. R. 43 Ch. D. 46; 58 L. J. Ch. 734; 61 L. T.	
N. S. 325; 37 W. R. 792	37, 41, 42, 86, 94, 105, 331, 427, 539, 541
Longmaid's Patent, 1 Eng. 347	ii. 230
Loog v. Bean (1884), L. R. 26 Ch. D. 306	309
Lorrain's Patent (1888), 5 R. P. C. 142	ii. 40, 51, 56, 57, 64
Losh v. Hague (1837-39), 1 W. P. C. 200; 8 L. J. Ex. 251; 5 M. &	
W. 387	15, 37, 59, 92, 392, 439, 442
Lovell v. Hicks (1836), 2 Y. & C. 46; 5 L. J. Ex. 101; 6 L. J. Ex. 85 ..	ii. 162
Lowe's Patent (1846), 2 W. P. C. 158	ii. 234
Lowe's Patent (1852), 10 Jur. 363	ii. 236
Lowndes v. Davies (1834), 6 Sim. 468	452
Lucas v. Miller (1885), 2 R. P. C. 155	163, 176, 184, 190, 245, 336, 476

TABLE OF CASES.

xlvii

	PAGE
Lucas (Joseph), <i>Ld. v. Miller (H.) & Co.</i> (1899), 17 R. P. C. 165..	486, 487, 490
Lucas' Patent (1854), <i>Maor. P. C.</i> 235	ii. 109, 123, 124, 130
Ludington Cigarette Machine Co. <i>v. Baron Cigarette Machine Co.</i> ,	
[1900] 1 Ch. 508; 17 R. P. C. 25, 214, 745	ii. 127, 128, 129, 142
Luke's Patent (1886), <i>Griff P. C.</i> 294.....	ii. 39, 46, 47
Lumley <i>v. Gye</i> (1853), 2 E. & B. 216.....	376
Lupton and Place's Patent (1897), 14 R. P. C. 261	ii. 67
Lycett Saddle and Motor Accessories Co., <i>Ld. v. Brook (T. B.) & Co.</i> ,	
<i>Ld.</i> (1904), 21 R. P. C. 656	319, 320
Lynch and Henry Wilson & Co., <i>Ld. v. Phillips (John) & Co.</i> (1908),	
25 R. P. C. 694; 26 R. P. C. 389.....	241, 255, 280
Lynde's Patent (1888), 5 R. P. C. 663	ii. 57, 64, 66
Lyon <i>v. Goddard</i> (1893-94), 10 R. P. C. 121, 334, 348; 11 R. P. C.	
113, 354	38, 45, 63, 75, 110, 118, 222, 228, 237, 343, 379, 476, 499, 502, 503, 511
Lyon <i>v. Mayor and Corporation of Newcastle-upon-Tyne</i> (1895), 11	
R. P. C. 218	449
Lyons <i>v. Martin</i> (1838), 8 A. & E. 512; 3 N. & P. 509	395
Lyon's Patent (1894), 11 R. P. C. 537	ii. 230, 246
MACDONALD <i>v. Fraser</i> (1895), 10 R. P. C. 386; 11 R. P. C. 169	352
MacDougall <i>v. General Sewage and Manure Co.</i> (1875), W. N. (1875)	
64	491
Macevoy's Patent (1888), 5 R. P. C. 285	ii. 48, 49, 50, 135
Macfarlane <i>v. Price</i> (1818), 1 Stark. N. P. 199; 1 W. P. C. 74, n..	193, 220, 239
MacIntosh <i>v. Everington</i> , 2 Carp. R. 180, 191.....	205
Macintosh's Patent (1837), 1 W. P. C. 739, n.....	ii. 222, 427
Mackelcan <i>v. Rennie</i> (1862), 13 C. B. N. S. 52	180, 231, 239, 281, 287
Mackie <i>v. Salvo Laundry Co.</i> (1892), 9 R. P. C. 465	325
Macnamara <i>v. Hulse</i> (1842), Car. & M. 471; 2 W. P. C. 128, n. .	208, 232, 409
Magee <i>v. Tangyes</i> (1897), 14 R. P. C. 255.....	189
Main's Patent (1890), 7 R. P. C. 13	ii. 29, 34
Makepeace <i>v. Jackson</i> , 4 Taunt. 770	19
Mallet's Patent (1866), L. R. 1 C. P. 308; 4 Moo. P. C. N. S. 175..	ii. 234, 245
Mandelberg <i>v. Morley</i> (1893-95), 10 R. P. C. 256; 11 R. P. C. 1;	
12 R. P. C. 35; 65 L. J. Ch. 245; 72 L. T. N. S. 106; 43 W. R.	
266; 13 R. 322	402, 403, 404, 539, 541
Manning's Patent (1902), 20 R. P. C. 74	ii. 82
Mansell's Patent (1624), 1 W. P. C. 19	131
Manton <i>v. Manton</i> (1815), Dav. P. C. 333; 1 Carp. P. C. 278; 1	
W. P. C. 192, n.	156, 159, 472, 473
Manton <i>v. Parker</i> (1815), Dav. P. C. 327; 1 W. P. C. 484, n.	110, 156, 159, 164
Marconi <i>v. British Radio Telegraph and Telegram Co., Ld.</i> (1911), 28	
R. P. C. 181	344, 356, 552, 554
Mark's Patent (1908), 25 R. P. C. 553	25, 131, 299
Markwick's Patent (1860), 13 Moo. P. C. 310; 8 W. R. 333 ..	ii. 171, 236, 244

	PAGE
Marsden <i>v.</i> Albrecht (1910), 27 R. P. C. 785	404
Marsden <i>v.</i> Saville Street Foundry and Engineering Co. (1878), L. R. 3 Ex. D. 203	24, 25
Marsden's Patent (1896), 12 R. P. C. 87	ii. 51, 57
Marsden's Patent (1897), 14 R. P. C. 174	ii. 63
Marsh <i>v.</i> Wolf (1906), 23 R. P. C. 265	46
Marshall and Naylor's Patent (1900), 17 R. P. C. 553	22, 298, 299
Marshall's Application (1888), 5 R. P. C. 661	ii. 43, 45
Marshall's, <i>Ld. v.</i> Chameleon Patents Manufacturing Co. (1901), 18 R. P. C. 400	280
Martin <i>v.</i> Consett Iron Co., <i>Ld.</i> (1906), 24 R. P. C. 7; 25 R. P. C. 27	236, 258
Martin's, <i>Ld. v.</i> Metropolitan Gas Meters, <i>Ld.</i> (1910), 27 R. P. C. 721; 28 R. P. C. 157	518
Martin's Patent, Griff. P. C. 320	294, 295
Massam <i>v.</i> T. W. Thorley's Cattle Food Co. (1877-80), L. R. 6 Ch. D. 574; L. R. 14 Ch. D. 748	335
Massey <i>v.</i> Haynes (1888), L. R. 21 Q. B. D. 330	397
Mathers <i>v.</i> Green (1865), L. R. 1 Ch. 29; 34 L. J. Ch. 298; 34 Beav. 170; 35 L. J. Ch. 1	ii. 157, 179
Mathews <i>v.</i> Parmentier (1896), 13 R. P. C. 514	114, 119
Muthews and Strange's Application (1910), 27 R. P. C. 288	ii. 73
Mathias <i>v.</i> Yates (1882), 46 L. T. N. S. 497	395
Maxim and Silverman's Patent (1894), 11 R. P. C. 314	ii. 51, 65
Maxim-Nordenfelt Guns and Ammunition Co. <i>v.</i> Anderson (1897), 14 R. P. C. 371, 671; 14 R. P. C. 421	206, 266, 374: ii. 195
May <i>v.</i> Yuill & Co. (1910), 27 R. P. C. 525	542
Mayer <i>v.</i> Spence (1860), 1 J. & H. 87	439
McAlpine <i>v.</i> Mangnall (1846), 15 L. J. C. P. 298	ii. 173
McCormick <i>v.</i> Gray (1861), 7 H. & N. 25; 31 L. J. Ex. 42	337, 375
McCulloch's Patent (1908), 25 R. P. C. 207, 684	ii. 214, 228, 229, 245, 246
McDougal's Patent (1884), 2 R. P. C. 11	ii. 231
McDougall <i>v.</i> Partington (1890), 7 R. P. C. 216	ii. 148
McDougall's Patent (1867), L. R. 2 P. C. 1; 37 L. J. P. C. 17; 5 Moo. P. C. N. S. 1	ii. 228, 229
McGruther <i>v.</i> Pitcher, [1904] 2 Ch. 307	384
McHardy's Patent (1891), 8 R. P. C. 432	ii. 57
McInnes' Patent (1868), L. R. P. C. 54; 37 L. J. P. C. 23; 5 Moo. P. C. N. S. 72	ii. 230, 231, 242
McLay <i>v.</i> Lawes & Co., <i>Ld.</i> (1905), 22 R. P. C. 199	44
McNaught <i>v.</i> Dawson (1905), 22 R. P. C. 389; 23 R. P. C. 219	42
McNeil's Patent (1907), 2 R. P. C. 680	46
Meadows <i>v.</i> Kirkman (1860), 29 L. J. Ex. 205	460, 461
Mears-Gerkin's Application (1910), 27 R. P. C. 565	ii. 46
Medlock's Patent (1865), Newton, Lond. Jour. (N. S.) vol. xxii. p. 69	ii. 122, 123
Merchant Shipping Co. <i>v.</i> Armitage (1873), L. R. 9 Q. B. 99	ii. 208
Merry <i>v.</i> Nickalls (1873), L. R. 8 Ch. App. Cas. 205	556
Meters, <i>Ld. v.</i> Metropolitan Gas Meters, <i>Ld.</i> (1907), 24 R. P. C. 506; (1910), 27 R. P. C. 21; 28 R. P. C. 157	505, 522
Meyenburg and The Clayton Anilin Co.'s Application <i>v.</i> Meyer's Patent (1899), 16 R. P. C. 526	ii. 62

TABLE OF CASES.

xlix

	PAGE
Meyer's Patent (1899), 16 R. P. C. 526	ii. 48, 50, 136
Mica Insulator Co. v. Bruce Peebles & Co., Ld. (1905), 22 R. P. C. 363, 527	402, 537
Mica Insulator Co. v. Electrical Co. (1898), 15 R. P. C. 489	428
Middleton v. Bradley (1895), 12 R. P. C. 390; [1895] 2 Ch. 716; 64 L. J. Ch. 888; 73 L. T. N. S. 81; 43 W. R. 684; 13 R. 737..	538, 539
Millar v. Taylor, 4 Burr. 2303	ii. 144
Miller v. Barker (1893), 10 R. P. C. 106.....	163
Miller v. Clyde Bridge Street Co. (1891), 8 R. P. C. 198; 9 R. P. C. 470	360
Miller v. Searle (1893), 10 R. P. C. 106....162, 184, 190, 217, 285, 287, 411, 490	
Miller's Patent (1894), 11 R. P. C. 55	302, 303, 306
Miller's Patent (1898), 15 R. P. C. 205, 718	129, 131: ii. 70
Milligan v. Marsh (1856), 2 Jur. N. S. 1083.....	24: ii. 34
Mills v. Carson (1892), 9 R. P. C. 338; 10 R. P. C. 9.....	ii. 208
Mills's Patent (1901), 18 R. P. C. 322.....	ii. 22, 67
Milner's Patent (1854), 9 Moo. P. C. 39	ii. 247
Milner's Patent (1898), 15 R. P. C. 205	117
Minerals Separation, Ld. v. Ore Concentration Co. (1903) Ld., [1909] 1 Ch. 744; 26 R. P. C. 413	429
Minter v. Mower (1835), 1 W. P. C. 140; 4 L. J. Ex. 72; 6 A. & E. 735.....	79, 216, 218
Minter v. Wells (1834), 1 W. P. C. 127; 1 C. M. & R. 505; 4 A. & E. 251; 4 L. J. Ex. 2	14, 18, 52, 55, 156, 471, 473
Minter v. Williams (1835), 4 A. & E. 251; 5 L. K. J. B. 60; 1 W. P. C. 135	38
Mitchell v. Reynolds (1713), 1 P. Wms. 181; 10 Moo. 130	2
Mitchell's Patent (1847), 30 Newton, L. J. O. S. 356	ii. 246
Molassine Co., Ld. v. Townsend (R.) & Co., Ld. (1905), 23 R. P. C. 27..	41
Moncrieff's Patent, 22 Iron, 35.....	ii. 246
Monforts v. Marsden (1895), 12 R. P. C. 266.....	ii. 168
Monnet v. Beck (1897), 14 R. P. C. 777	63, 142, 196, 197, 247
Monopolies, Case of, Noy, 182. <i>See</i> Darcy v. Allin.	
Mountain v. Parker (1903), 20 R. P. C. 769.....	330
Montgomerie v. Paterson (1894), 11 R. P. C. 221, 633.....	275, 309, 375
Moore v. Bennett (1884), 2 R. P. C. 129	237, 238, 240, 241, 476, 489, 534
Moore v. Craven (1874), L. R. 7 Ch. App. 94	452
Moore v. Thomson (1890), 7 R. P. C. 325. <i>See</i> Thomson v. Moore	68, 279, 342, 358, 417
Moorewood v. Tupper (1885), 3 C. L. R. 718	384
Morey's Patent (1858), 25 Beav. 581; 6 W. R. 612.....	ii. 82
Morgan v. Fuller (1866), L. R. 2 Eq. 297	414, 433
Morgan v. Seaward (1835-37), 1 W. P. C. 167, 187; 2 Carp. P. C. 37, 96, 104; 2 M. & W. 544; 6 L. J. Ex. 153; 1 Jur. 527; M. & H. 55	59, 87, 110, 111, 121, 123, 128, 129, 130, 156, 157, 161, 162, 164, 166, 167, 175, 198, 208, 211, 215, 217, 223, 227, 228, 229, 287, 346, 354, 411, 437, 446, 448, 465, 477, 480, 483
Morgan v. Windover (1887-90), 4 R. P. C. 422; 5 R. P. C. 295; 7 R. P. C. 139, 446	40, 42, 76, 94, 100, 117, 119, 121, 169, 176, 184, 477
Morgan's Patent (1843), 1 W. P. C. 737	ii. 215, 227, 228
Morgan's Patent (1876), 24 W. R. 245	ii. 83, 120

	PAGE
Morgan's Patent (1886), Griff. L. O. C. 17	ii. 114, 119, 137
Morgan's Patent (1887), 5 R. P. C. 186	292, 293
Morgan-Brown's Patent (1886), 3 R. P. C. 212	ii. 247
Morrell v. Pearson (1849), 12 Beav. 284	499
Morris v. Branson (1776), Bull N. P. 76; 1 Carp. P. C. 30; 1 W. P. C. 51	79, 83
Morris v. Young (1895), 12 R. P. C. 455	78, 142, 273, 337, 343, 358, 497, 538, 544, 547
Morrison v. Asplen (1904), 21 R. P. C. 557	547
Morris Wilson & Co. v. Coventry Machinists Co., [1891] 3 Ch. 419; 8 R. P. C. 353	425
Morton v. Middleton (1863), 1 Ct. of Sess., 3rd series, 721	73
Moseley v. Victoria Rubber Co. (1886-87), 3 R. P. C. 351; 4 R. P. C. 241; 55 L. T. N. S. 482	73, 79, 119, 143, 176, 184, 190, 212, 234, 403, 455, 456
Moser v. Jones (1893), 10 R. P. C. 368	440, 444, 447
Moser v. Marsden (1892-96), 10 R. P. C. 205, 350; 13 R. P. C. 24; 73 L. T. N. S. 667	72, 79, 82, 186, 396: ii. 5, 34, 107, 108, 118
Moser v. Sewell (1893), 10 R. P. C. 365	444, 447
Moss v. Malins (1886), 3 R. P. C. 373; L. R. 33 Ch. D. 603; 56 L. J. Ch. 126	74, 128, 424, 466, 475, 553
Mouchel v. Coignet (1906), 23 R. P. C. 649; 24 R. P. C. 229; 26 R. P. C. 280	44
Mouchel v. Cubitt (1907), 24 R. P. C. 194	ii. 202
Muirhead v. Commercial Cable Co. (1894-95), 11 R. P. C. 317; 12 R. P. C. 39, 258, 370	80, 280, 488: ii. 202, 208, 209
Müller's Patent (1907), 24 R. P. C. 465	292, 428
Müller's Patent (1909), 26 R. P. C. 209	ii. 100
Mullins v. Hart (1852), 3 Car. & K. 297	128
Muntz v. Foster (1843-44), 2 W. P. C. 93	63, 96, 148, 202, 205, 208, 287, 339, 374, 377, 442
Muntz v. Grenfell (1842), 2 W. P. C. 91; 2 Coop. Ch. Cas. 59	419, 447
Muntz v. Vivian (1840), 2 W. P. C. 87	437
Muntz's Patent (1846), 2 W. P. C. 113	ii. 242
Murchland v. Nicholson (1893), 10 R. P. C. 417	259
Murray v. Clayton (1872), L. R. 15 Eq. 115; L. R. 7 Ch. 570; L. R. 10 Ch. 675, n.; 42 L. J. Ch. 191; 21 W. R. 498	38, 60, 73, 75, 77, 87, 117, 149, 168, 243, 354, 512
Musgrave v. Hicks (1886), 3 R. P. C. 49	551
Myddleton v. Lord Kenyon, 2 Ves. Jr. 408	103
Myers's Patent (1882), W. N. (1882) 53, 76	ii. 83
NADEL v. Martin (1902), 20 R. P. C. 129, 721, 723; 23 R. P. C. 41..496: ii. 167	
Nähmaschinen Fabrik v. Singer Manufacturing Co. (1893), 10 R. P. C. 310	316
Nairn's Patent (1891), 8 R. P. C. 444	ii. 119
Nahnsen's Patent (1900), 17 R. P. C. 203	ii. 51, 52
Napier's Patent (1861), 13 Moo. P. C. 543; 9 W. R. 390	ii. 170, 216, 233

TABLE OF CASES.

li

	PAGE
Napier's Patent (1881), L. R. 6 App. Cas. 174; 50 L. J. C. P. 40; 29 W. R. 745.....	ii. 229
National Company for the Distribution of Electricity by Secondary Generators, Ld. v. Gibbs, [1899] 2 Ch. 289; [1900] 2 Ch. 280; 16 R. P. C. 339; 17 R. P. C. 302	ii. 156
National Opalite Glazed Brick and Tile Co., Ld. v. Grand Hotel (Birmingham), Ld. (1902), 18 R. P. C. 249	481
National Opalite Glazed Brick and Tile Syndicate v. Ceralite Syndicate (1896), 13 R. P. C. 658	502
National Phonograph Co. of Australia v. Menck, [1911] A. C. 336; 28 R. P. C. 229	383: ii. 174, 181, 190
Needham v. Johnson (1884), 1 R. P. C. 49.....	57, 269, 270, 273, 354, 533
Needham v. Oxley (1863), 8 L. T. N. S. 604; 11 W. R. 852; Pemberton, 4th ed. 485; Seton, 4th ed. 352, 353; 1 H. & M. 248; 2 N. R. 232, 267, 388	403, 512, 527, 553
Neil v. Macdonald (1902), 20 R. P. C. 213.....	ii. 161
Neilson v. Betts (1868-71), L. R. 3 Ch. D. 429; L. R. 5 H. L. 1; 34 L. J. Ch. 537; 40 L. J. Ch. 317; 3 De G. J. & S. 22; 6 N. R. 221; 18 L. T. N. S. 159; 13 W. R. 804; 11 Jur. N. S. 679 ..	205, 254, 507, 512, 515
Neilson v. Fothergill (1841), 1 W. P. C. 287.....	ii. 205
Neilson v. Harford (1841), 1 W. P. C. 295, 324 n., 331, 373; 10 L. J. Ex. 493; 11 L. J. Ex. 20; 2 Coop. Ch. Ca. 61, n.; 8 M. & W. 806	37,
49, 50, 156, 175, 197, 199, 208, 211, 213, 218, 228, 231, 249, 261, 262, 264, 266, 409, 414, 434, 435, 466, 477	
Neilson v. Thompson (1841), 1 W. P. C. 278; 2 Coop. Ch. Ca. 61, n. ..	216,
437, 440, 443, 445, 446, 448	
Nettlefolds v. Reynolds (1891-92), 8 R. P. C. 410; 9 R. P. C. 270.....	358,
424, 427, 471	
New Conveyor Co., Ld. v. Edinburgh and Leith Gas Commissioners (1903), 21 R. P. C. 1, 147	ii. 99
New Inverted Incandescent Gas Lamp Co., Ld. v. Cope and Timmins, Ld. (1905), 23 R. P. C. 103	545
New Inverted Incandescent Gas Lamp Co., Ld. v. General Incandescent Co., Ld. (1905), 22 R. P. C. 614	539
New Inverted Incandescent Gas Lamp Co., Ld. v. Globe Light, Ld., (1905), 22 R. P. C. 431; 23 R. P. C. 157	532, 543
New Ixion Tyre and Cycle Co. v. Spilsbury (1898), 15 R. P. C. 380; [1898] 2 Ch. 484	ii. 168, 206
Newall v. Elliott (1858), 4 C. B. N. S. 269; 27 L. J. C. P. 337; 4 Jur. N. S. 562	66, 121, 176, 184, 189, 190
Newall v. Elliott (1863), 9 Jur. N. S. 359; 10 Jur. N. S. 954; 7 L. T. N. S. 753; 10 L. T. N. S. 792; 32 L. J. Ex. 120; 11 W. R. 438; 13 W. R. 11	177, 182, 338, 377, 387, 420
Newall v. Wilson (1852), 2 De G. M. & G. 282; 19 L. T. 161	437,
444, 447	
Newbury v. James, 2 Mer. 446; 1 Carp. P. C. 367	216: ii. 147
Newby v. Harrison (1861), 3 De G. F. & J. 287; 2 H. & M. 628; 1 J. & H. 393	447: ii. 209
Newcomen v. Coulson (1877), L. R. 7 Ch. D. 764	447
Newelite Glass Tile Co., Ld. v. Lawson's Non-Conducting Composition, Ld. (1907), 24 R. P. C. 101, 305.....	470

	PAGE
Newman's Patent (1888), 5 R. P. C. 271, 279; Griff. L. O. C. 40.....	ii. 47, 51, 53, 56, 57, 59, 62, 64
Newsom v. Mann (1890), 7 R. P. C. 307	40, 42
Newton v. Grand Junction Ry. Co. (1846), 5 Exch. 331; 20 L. J. Ex. 427, n.	107, 149, 349, 353
Newton v. Vaucher (1851), 6 Exch. 859; 21 L. J. Ex. 306	63, 97, 275
Newton's Patent (1861), 14 Moo. P. C. 156	ii. 214, 234, 247
Newton's Patent (1862), 15 Moo. P. C. 176; 9 Jur. N. S. 109.....	ii. 234
Newton's Patent (1881), 51 Eng. 208; 17 Iron, 155, 171	ii. 242
Newton's Patent (1884), L. R. 9 App. Cas. 592; 1 R. P. C. 177; 52 L. T. 329	ii. 236, 240, 243
Newton's Patent (1899), 17 R. P. C. 123	63, 65.
Nickels v. Haalam (1844), 7 M. & G. 378; 8 Scott, N. R. 97; 13 L. J. C. P. 146	175
Nickels v. Ross (1849), 8 C. B. 679.....	23, 24, 471: ii. 46
Nickels's Patent (1841), 1 W. P. O. 650; 4 Beav. 563	ii. 120.
Nicoll v. Swears (1893), 10 R. P. C. 240	81, 94
Nicholls v. Kershaw (1910), 27 R. P. C. 237.....	336
Nicols v. Pitman (1884), L. R. 26 Ch. D. 374	392
Nobel's Explosives Co. v. Anderson (1894-95), 11 R. P. C. 128; 12 R. P. C. 164.....	57, 67, 70, 141, 281, 337, 340, 356, 373, 481, 534, 543, 552: ii. 195
Nobel's Explosives Co. v. Jones (1880), L. R. 17 Ch. D. 721; L. R. 8 App. Cas. 5; 50 L. J. Ch. 339; 48 L. T. 490; 30 W. R. 294; 31 W. R. 388	338, 395.
Noble's Patent (1850), 7 Moo. P. C. 191.....	ii. 222
Nordenfelt v. Gardner (1884), 1 R. P. C. 10, 61 ..57, 78, 339, 351, 496, 497, 533.	
Nordenfelt v. Maxim-Nordenfelt Guns and Ammunition Co., [1894] A. C. 535	ii. 155.
Nordenfelt's Patent (1887), Griff. L. O. C. 18	ii. 113, 114, 119.
Normand's Patent (1870), L. R. 3 P. C. 193; 6 Moo. P. C. N. S. 477.: ii. 215, 216.	
North British Rubber Co. v. Gormully and Jeffery Manufacturing Co. (1894-98), 12 R. P. C. 17; 13 R. P. C. 691; 14 R. P. C. 283; 15 R. P. C. 245.....	348, 391, 438, 446, 450, 555.
North British Rubber Co. v. Macintosh (1894), 11 R. P. C. 477 ..	347, 489, 502
North Eastern Marine Engineering Co., Ltd. v. Leeds Forge Co., Ltd. (1905), 23 R. P. C. 96, 529; [1906] 1 Ch. 324; 2 Ch. 498.....	289.
North Metropolitan Tramways Co., Ltd. v. London County Council, [1898] 2 Ch. 145	550.
Northern Press Engineering Co., Ltd. v. Hoe (R.) & Co. (1906), 23 R. P. C. 417, 613.....	40, 42.
Norton v. Brooks (1861), 7 H. & N. 499.....	ii. 201
Norton's Patent (1863), 1 Moo. P. C. N. S. 339; 9 Jur. N. S. 419; 11 W. R. 720; G. P. C. 553	ii. 171, 215, 216, 217, 228, 232
Norwood's Patent (1895), 12 R. P. C. 214.....	298, 304
Norwood's Patent (1898), 15 R. P. C. 99	299
Nunn v. D'Albuquerque (1865), 34 Beav. 595	392, 529, 530
Nussey and Leachman's Patent (1890), 7 R. P. C. 22	ii. 234
Nuttall v. Hargreaves (1891), 8 R. P. C. 273, 450	82, 177, 186, 189.

TABLE OF CASES.

lii

	PAGE
<i>ODDY v. Smith</i> (1888), 5 R. P. O. 503.....	540
<i>Oldham v. Longmead</i> (1789), 1 W. P. C. 291, 294, 439, n., 441418: ii.	163
<i>Ormson v. Clarke</i> (1862), 13 C. B. N. S. 337; 14 C. B. N. S. 475, 490; 32 L. J. C. P. 8, 291	40, 42
<i>Orr v. Diaper</i> (1876), L. R. 4 Ch. D. 92.....	452
<i>Orr-Ewing v. Johnson</i> (1879-82), L. R. 13 Ch. D. 434; L. R. 7 App. Cas. 219.....	334
<i>Osborne v. Board</i> (1896), 13 R. P. C. 740	417
<i>Osborn's Patent</i> (1909), 26 R. P. C. 820.....	ii. 96, 97
<i>Osmond v. Hirst</i> (1885), 2 R. P. C. 265	437, 443
<i>Osmond v. Mutual Cycle and Manufacturing Co., Ltd.</i> , [1899] 2 Q. B. 488. <i>See Addenda.</i>	
<i>Osmonds, Ltd. v. Balmoral Cycle Co., Ltd.</i> (1898), 15 R. P. C. 505	189, 543
<i>Otto v. Linford</i> (1881), 46 L. T. N. S. 35 ..48, 55, 118, 137, 147, 152, 153, 159, 160, 161, 207, 208, 213, 217, 232, 269, 271, 273, 286, 287, 477, 544, 555	
<i>Otto v. Singer</i> (1889), 7 R. P. C. 7	ii. 181
<i>Otto v. Steel</i> (1885-86), 2 R. P. C. 139; 3 R. P. C. 109; L. R. 31 Ch. D. 241; 55 L. J. Ch. 196	137, 139, 424, 524, 527, 549, 554, 555
<i>Overton v. Burns</i> (1896), 13 R. P. C. 455	326
<i>Owen's Patent</i> (1898), 15 R. P. C. 755; 43 S. J. 43	ii. 104, 112, 139
<i>Owen's Patent</i> , [1899] 1 Ch. 157; 17 R. P. C. 68, 637.....	166, 196, 198, 305, 306, 495
<i>Oxley v. Holden</i> (1860), 8 C. B. N. S. 666; 30 L. J. C. P. 68; 2 L. T. N. S. 464; 8 W. R. 626	126, 128, 142, 175, 267, 380
<i>P.'s APPLICATION</i> (1906), 23 R. P. C. 644	ii. 64
<i>Palmer v. Cooper</i> (1853), 9 Exch. 532; 23 L. J. Ex. 82.....	427
<i>Palmer v. Edwards</i> , 1 Doug. 187, n.	ii. 191
<i>Palmer v. Wagstaffe</i> (1853-54), 8 Exch. 840; 9 Exch. 449; 22 L. T. N. S. Ex. 295; 23 L. J. Ex. 217; Newton, L. J. vol. xliii. p. 131..	155, 157, 196, 269, 433, 484
<i>Palmer Tyre Co., Ltd. v. Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ltd.</i> (1899), 16 R. P. C. 451	552
<i>Parker v. Maignen's Filtre Rapide Co.</i> (1888), 5 R. P. C. 207	426
<i>Parker v. Satchwell</i> (1901), 18 R. P. C. 299.....	41, 254, 335
<i>Parker v. Wells</i> (1880), L. R. 18 Ch. D. 477.....	452, 453
<i>Parkes v. Stevens</i> (1869), L. R. 8 Eq. 358; L. R. 5 Ch. App. Cas. 36; 38 L. J. Ch. 627	81, 237, 241, 243, 261, 353
<i>Parkinson v. Simon</i> (1895), 11 R. P. C. 238, 493; 12 R. P. C. 403	246, 270, 274, 277, 280, 281, 358, 498
<i>Parkinson's Patent</i> (1896), 13 R. P. C. 509	ii. 109, 110
<i>Parmenter v. Webber</i> , 8 Taunt. 593; 2 B. Mo. 656; Shep. Touch. 266	ii. 191
<i>Parnell's Patent</i> (1888), 5 R. P. C. 126.....	ii. 81, 176
<i>Parrott v. Palmer</i> (1834), 3 M. & K. 632	509, 510
<i>Parson's Patent</i> (1898), 15 R. P. C. 349; [1898] A. C. 673	ii. 235, 239
<i>Parsons and Stoney's Application</i> (1910), 27 R. P. C. 491	140: ii. 17
<i>Partington v. Hartlepoons Pulp and Paper Co.</i> (1895), 12 R. P. C. 295..	61
<i>Partridge's Patent</i> (1903), 20 R. P. C. 459	305

	PAGE
Pascall <i>v.</i> Toope (1890), 7 R. P. C. 125	434
Pashley <i>v.</i> Linotype Co., Ld. (1903), 20 R. P. C. 633.....	20
Patent Exploitation, Ld. <i>v.</i> American Novelty and Manufacturing Co., Ld. (1903), 20 R. P. C. 689; 22 R. P. C. 16	77, 80, 280, 445, 481, 552
Patent Exploitation, Ld. <i>v.</i> Siemens Brothers & Co., Ld. (1902), 19 R. P. C. 113; 20 R. P. C. 225; 21 R. P. C. 541	4, 37, 74, 77, 80, 237, 242, 270, 280, 472
Patent Marine Inventions Co. <i>v.</i> Chadburn (1873), L. R. 16 Eq. 447 ..	486
Patent Type Foundry Co. <i>v.</i> Richards (1860), 6 Jur. N. S. 39; 1 Johns. 381; 2 L. T. N. S. 359	205, 206, 404
Patent Type Foundry Co. <i>v.</i> Walter (1860), 1 Johns. 727	460, 463, 464
Paterson's Patents (1884), Griff. P. C. 295	ii. 44, 55, 64
Patterson <i>v.</i> Gas Light and Coke Co. (1875), L. R. 2 Ch. D. 812; L. R. 3 App. Cas. 239; 45 L. J. Ch. 843; 47 L. J. Ch. 402....	27, 49, 51, 62, 63, 85, 105, 141, 143, 247, 248, 249
Patterson <i>v.</i> Holland, Hindmarch, p. 293; Higgins's Digest, 354	304
Patterson's Patent (1845), 6 Moo. P. C. 469; 13 Jur. 593	ii. 234, 235
Peach's Patent (1901), 19 R. P. C. 65; [1902] A. C. 414 ..	ii. 217, 218, 236, 240
Peck <i>v.</i> Hindes (1898), 14 Times R. 164; 15 R. P. C. 113.....	526
Peckover <i>v.</i> Rowland (1893), 10 R. P. C. 118, 234	242, 358, 431, 466
Pegamoid, Ld. <i>v.</i> British Leather Cloth Manufacturing Co., Ld. (1901), 18 R. P. C. 317	540, 541
Penn <i>v.</i> Bibby, <i>v.</i> Jack, <i>v.</i> Fernie (1866), L. R. 1 Eq. 548; L. R. 2 Eq. 314; L. R. 3 Eq. 308; L. R. 5 Eq. 81; L. R. 2 Ch. App. 127; 36 L. J. Ch. 277, 455; 37 L. J. Ch. 136; 14 L. T. N. S. 495; 15 L. T. N. S. 385, 399; 17 L. T. N. S. 407; 14 W. R. 760; 16 W. R. 243..	36, 96, 176, 177, 178, 179, 184, 190, 396, 414, 423, 426, 433, 473, 474, 475, 507, 508, 518, 522, 523, 524, 548
Perkin's Patent (1845), 2 W. P. C. 6; 47 Eng. 105	ii. 222, 227, 239, 243
Perks <i>v.</i> Deeley (1896), 14 R. P. C. 3	ii. 138
Peroni <i>v.</i> Hudson (1884), 1 R. P. C. 261	465, 473, 546, 554
Perry <i>v.</i> Mitchell (1840), 1 W. P. C. 269	403, 404
Perry <i>v.</i> Skinner, 2 M. & W. 471	ii. 130
Perry <i>v.</i> Société de Lunetiers (1896), 13 R. P. C. 664	ii. 108
Peters <i>v.</i> Owen (1899), 16 R. P. C. 83.....	336
Pether <i>v.</i> Shaw (1893), 10 R. P. C. 293	197
Petitt-Smith's Patent (1850), 7 Moo. P. C. 133	ii. 214, 216, 235, 245
Potman <i>v.</i> Bull (1886), 3 R. P. C. 390. <i>See also</i> L. R. 11 App. Cas. 648	403
Phillips <i>v.</i> Ivel Cycle Co. (1890), 7 R. P. C. 77; 62 L. T. N. S. 392 ..	432
Philpot <i>v.</i> Hanbury (1885), 2 R. P. C. 33, 153.....	161, 207, 223, 237
Pickard <i>v.</i> Prescott (1892), 9 R. P. C. 195; [1892] A. C. 263	135, 139
Pickard <i>v.</i> Sears (1837), 6 A. & E. 469	ii. 162
Pidding <i>v.</i> Franks (1849), 1 Mac. & G. 56; 18 L. J. Ch. 295	ii. 204
Pieper's Patent (1895), 12 R. P. C. 293; 72 L. T. N. S. 782; 11 R. 581	ii. 240
Pietschmann's Patent (1834), Griff. P. C. 314	ii. 121
Piggott <i>v.</i> Anglo-American Telegraph Co. (1868), 19 L. T. N. S. 46 ..	460, 461, 463
Piggott & Co., Ld. <i>v.</i> Corporation of Hanley (1906), 23 R. P. C. 639 ..	537
Pilkington <i>v.</i> Massey (1904), 21 R. P. C. 421, 696	337, 385
Pilkington <i>v.</i> Yeatley Vacuum Hammer Co. (1901), 18 R. P. C. 459 ..	25, 135
Pinkus's Patent (1848), 12 Jur. N. S. 433	ii. 230

TABLE OF CASES.

lv

	PAGE
Pirrie v. York Street Flax Spinning Co. (1892-94), 10 R. P. C. 34; 11 R. P. C. 429	98, 161, 174
Pitman's Patent (1871), L. R. 4 P. C. 84; 8 Moo. P. C. N. S. 293	ii. 171, 218, 231
Pitt's Patent (1888), 5 R. P. C. 343	ii. 41, 51
Pitt's Patent (1899). See Ludington Cigarette Machine Co., Ltd. v. Baron Cigarette Machine Co.	
Pitt's Patent (1901), 18 R. P. C. 478	ii. 122
Plating Co. v. Farquharson (1879-83), Griff. P. C. 187; L. R. 17 Ch. D. 49	280, 464, 506
Plimpton v. Malcolmson (1875-76), L. R. 20 Eq. 37; L. R. 3 Ch. D. 531; 44 L. J. Ch. 257; 45 L. J. Ch. 505; 34 L. T. N. S. 430; Seton, 4th ed. 354	15, 23, 26, 106, 136, 138, 139, 161, 198, 212, 219, 227, 229, 234, 411, 436, 441, 442, 443, 445, 449, 470, 473, 474, 476, 526; ii. 210
Plimpton v. Spiller (1877), L. R. 4 Ch. D. 286; L. R. 6 Ch. D. 412, 425; L. R. 5 H. L. 433; 35 L. T. N. S. 656; 37 L. T. N. S. 56; 47 L. J. Ch. 211; 25 W. R. 152; 26 W. R. 285; 20 S. J. 859; Higgins's Digest, p. 288	15, 113, 136, 138, 139, 140, 244, 245, 254, 258, 266, 269, 271, 273, 338, 430, 436, 446, 447, 449, 473, 503, 505, 506
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Cash Cycle Co. (1897), 14 R. P. C. 177, 326	492
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Casswell (1896), 13 R. P. C. 164, 375	153, 255, 268, 348, 498
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Chisholm & Co. (1896), 13 R. P. C. 488 ..	492, 542, 548
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Dunlop (1896), 13 R. P. C. 553	ii. 162
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. East London Rubber Co. (1896), 14 R. P. C. 77, 573	149, 150, 176, 179, 184, 190, 191, 348, 555
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. English Cycle and Tyre Co. (1897), 14 R. P. C. 851	142
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Ferguson (1894), 11 R. P. C. 459	ii. 208
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Friswell (1895), 13 R. P. C. 15	449
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Goodman (1896), 13 R. P. C. 723	439
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Ixion Patent Pneumatic Tyre Co. (1897), 14 R. P. C. 853	184, 190, 191, 348, 552
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Leicester Pneumatic Tyre and Automatic Valve Co. (1898), 15 R. P. C. 159; 16 R. P. C. 50, 531	176, 186, 190, 191, 281, 481, 482
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Marwood (1896), 13 R. P. C. 347; 14 R. P. C. 240	444, 473
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. New Ixion Tyre and Cycle Co. (1898), 15 R. P. C. 389; 16 R. P. C. 16	176, 191
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Parr (J.) & Co., W. N. (1896) 88	542
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Puncture Proof Pneumatic Tyre Co. (1898), 15 R. P. C. 405; 16 R. P. C. 209	518, 519, 520, 523
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Tubeless Tyre and Capon Heaton, Ltd. (1897-98), 15 R. P. C. 74, 237; 16 R. P. C. 77	79, 346, 348, 352, 370
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Warrillow (1896), 13 R. P. C. 284	439, 445
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. West London Rubber Co. (1898), 15 R. P. C. 129	550
Poole's Patent (1867), L. R. 1 P. C. 514; 4 Moo. P. C. N. S. 452; 36 L. J. P. C. 76	ii. 241

	PAGE
Pooley v. Pointon (1885), 2 R. P. C. 167	218, 535
Porter's Patent, 1 Newton, L. J. N. S. 179	ii. 227
Postcard Automatic Supply Co. v. Samuel (1889), 6 R. P. C. 560	ii. 180, 202, 205
Potter v. Parr, 2 B. & S. 216, n.	78, 237, 238
Poulton v. Adjustable Cover and Boiler Block Co. (1908), 25 R. P. C. 529, 661; [1908] 2 Ch. 430	416
Poulton v. Kelley (1904), 21 R. P. C. 392	335
Poulton's Patent (1906), 23 R. P. C. 183, 506	122, 307
Powell v. Birmingham Vinegar Brewery Co. (1896), 14 R. P. C. 1....	512
Powell v. Head (1879), L. R. 12 Ch. D. 686.....	ii. 179
Power v. Walker (1814), 3 M. & S. 7	ii. 149
Poyser's Patent (1907), 24 R. P. C. 157.....	223
Presto Coat Collar Co. v. Levy Bros. (1911), 28 R. P. C. 362	ii. 223
Presto Gear Case and Components, Ld. v. Orme, Evans & Co., Ld. (1900), 17 R. P. C. 218; 18 R. P. C. 17	358
Presto Gear Case and Components Co., Ld. v. Simplex Gear Case Co., Ld. (1898), 15 R. P. C. 638	358
Preston v. Black (1894), 11 R. P. C. 299, 574	385
Price's Patent Candle Co. v. Bauwen's Patent Candle Co. (1858), 4 K. & J. 727	501, 510
Printing and Numerical Registering Co. v. Sampson (1875), L. R. 19 Eq. 462	ii. 160
Procter v. Bayley (1889), 6 R. P. C. 106, 538; 59 L. J. Ch. 12; 38 W. R. 100	377, 378, 385, 392, 393, 499, 510, 530
Procter v. Bennis (1887), 4 R. P. C. 333; L. R. 36 Ch. D. 740; 57 L. J. Ch. 11; 57 L. T. N. S. 622; 36 W. R. 456	57, 67, 73, 237, 238, 241, 242, 278, 339, 345, 353, 354, 357, 358, 360, 361, 367, 369, 370, 396, 500, 509, 555
Proctor v. Sutton Lodge Chemical Co. (1888), 5 R. P. C. 184	291, 544, 549
Prynne's Patent (1885), 54 L. J. Ch. 289	447
Punchard v. Dale (1894), 11 R. P. C. 257	ii. 148
QUINN v. Leathem, [1901] A. C. 495	376
R. v. Arkwright (1785), Dav. P. C. 61; 1 W. P. C. 64	20, 21, 82, 114, 136, 155, 196, 207, 208, 214, 218, 220, 227, 232, 396, 413
R. v. Betts (1850), 15 Q. B. 540; 19 L. J. Q. B. 531.....	300
R. v. Comptroller-General of Patents, <i>Ex parte</i> Tomlinson, [1899] 1 Q. B. 909; 16 R. P. C. 233	ii. 48, 135, 136
R. v. Crampton (1886), 3 R. P. C. 367	125: ii. 13
R. v. Cutler (1816, 1847), 4 Q. B. 372, n.; 3 Car. & K. 215; Macr. P. C. 124; 1 W. P. C. 76	37, 197, 296, 302
R. v. Eastern Archipelago Co. (1853), 4 De G. M. & G. 199; 21 L. T. 35	360

TABLE OF CASES.

lvii

	PAGE
<i>R. v. Else</i> (1785), 1 W. P. C. 76	237
<i>R. v. Judge of County Court of Halifax</i> (1891), 8 R. P. C. 338; [1891] 1 Q. B. 793; 2 Q. B. 263; 60 L. J. Q.-B. 550	485
<i>R. v. Metcalf</i> (1817), 1 W. P. C. 141, n.; 3 Car. & P. 611; 2 Stark. R. 249	175, 199, 216
<i>R. v. Mill</i> (1850-51), 10 C. B. 379; 14 Beav. 312; 20 L. J. C. P. 16; 1 L. M. & P. 695	175: ii. 117, 130
<i>R. v. Mussary</i> (1738), 1 W. P. C. 41	14
<i>R. v. Neilson</i> (1842), 1 W. P. C. 673	300
<i>R. v. Newton</i> , Hindmarch on Patents, p. 427	306
<i>R. v. Prosser</i> (1848), 11 Beav. 306; 18 L. J. N. S. Ch. 35; 13 Jur. 71..	294
<i>R. v. Seine</i> , 40 Newton, Lond. Jour. 71	137
<i>R. v. Townsend</i> (1896), 13 R. P. C. 265	125: ii. 13
<i>R. v. Wallis</i> (1886), 3 R. P. C. 1	ii. 13
<i>R. v. Wheeler</i> (1819, 1850), 2 B. & Ald. 345; 10 C. B. 395	29, 31, 203, 261
<i>Railway and Electrical Appliances, In re</i> (1888), L. R. 38 Ch. D. 597..	ii. 150
<i>Ralston v. Smith</i> (1860-65), 9 C. B. N. S. 471; 11 C. B. N. S. 117; 35 L. J. C. P. 49; 4 L. T. N. S. 549; 11 H. L. C. 223.....	66, 70, 82, 86, 105, 159, 202, 247: ii. 104, 108, 109, 113, 115, 116
<i>Ralston's Patent</i> (1909), 26 R. P. C. 313	297, 298, 299, 306
<i>Ransone v. Bontall</i> , 3 L. J. N. S. 161	334
<i>Rawes v. Chance</i> (1890), 7 R. P. C. 275	454, 457, 459
<i>Read v. Andrew</i> (1885), 2 R. P. C. 119	442, 443
<i>Reason Manufacturing Co., Ltd. v. Moy</i> (Ernest F.), Ltd. (1902), 19 R. P. C. 409; 20 R. P. C. 205	80: ii. 118
<i>Reddaway v. Banham</i> , [1896] A. C. 199	334
<i>Redges v. Mullinar</i> (1892), 10 R. P. C. 21	ii. 188, 203, 208
<i>Redmond's Patent</i> (1828), 1 W. P. C. 642, n.; 5 Russ. 44	ii. 119
<i>Reece's Patent</i> (1881), 17 Iron, 155; 51 Eng. 207	ii. 216, 219
<i>Renard v. Levinstein</i> (1864-65), 3 N. R. 665; 5 N. R. 301; 10 L. T. N. S. 94, 117; 11 L. T. N. S. 505, 766; 13 W. R. 229, 362; 2 H. & N. 62	24, 424, 441, 443, 455, 456, 463, 466: ii. 5, 31, 209, 210
<i>Rendell's Patent</i> (1894), 11 R. P. C. 277; 70 L. T. N. S. 756	304, 307
<i>Republic of Bolivia v. The National Bolivian Navigation Co.</i> (1876), 24 W. R. 361	488
<i>Reynolds v. Amos</i> (1886), 3 R. P. C. 215	97, 477
<i>Reynolds v. Smith</i> (Herbert) & Co., Ltd. (1902), 20 R. P. C. 123, 410..	33
<i>Rhodes and Edmonson v. British Cotton and Wool Dyers' Association</i> , Ltd. (1910), 28 R. P. C. 67	486
<i>Ricci's Patent</i> (1906), 23 R. P. C. 269	ii. 231
<i>Richardson v. Castry</i> (1887), 4 R. P. C. 265	339, 388
<i>Richmond & Co., Ltd. v. Wrightson</i> (1904), 22 R. P. C. 25	22
<i>Rickerby v. Duncan</i> (1908), 25 R. P. C. 248	280
<i>Rickman v. Thierry</i> (1896), 14 R. P. C. 105. <i>See Thierry v. Rick-</i> <i>man</i>	37, 41, 42, 70, 94, 105, 159, 309, 497
<i>Riding v. Smith</i> (1877), L. R. 1 Ex. D. 91	309
<i>Robb v. Green</i> , [1895] 2 Q. B. 315	22
<i>Roberts v. Graydon</i> (1903), 20 R. P. C. 578; 21 R. P. C. 194	436
<i>Roberts v. Heywood</i> (1879), 27 W. R. 454	110
<i>Robertson v. French</i> (1803), 4 East, 135	264
<i>Robertson v. Purdy</i> (1906), 23 R. P. C. 779; 24 R. P. C. 273	130, 530

	PAGE
Robertson <i>v.</i> Standard Piston Ring and Engineering Co., Ld. (1910), 27 R. P. C. 267	547
Robinson's Patent, Griff. 267	ii. 10
Rockliffe <i>v.</i> Priestman (1898), 15 R. P. C. 155.....	74, 105
Rogers <i>v.</i> Cochrane (J. P.) & Co., [1909] A. C. 284 ; 25 R. P. C. 757 ; 26 R. P. C. 591	262
Rollins <i>v.</i> Hinks (1872), L. R. 13 Eq. 355 ; 41 L. J. Ch. 358	308
Rolls <i>v.</i> Isaacs (1878), L. R. 19 Ch. D. 268 ; 51 L. J. Ch. 170 ; W. N. (1878) 37	128, 452, 453, 507
Roper's Patent (1887), 4 R. P. C. 201.....	ii. 232, 234
Ross's Patent (1891), 8 R. P. C. 477	ii. 51
Rothwell <i>v.</i> King (1886-87), 3 R. P. C. 379 ; 4 R. P. C. 76, 397	443, 447
Rothwell <i>v.</i> Mackintosh (1894), 11 R. P. C. 274	428
Rothwell's Patent, Griff. P. C. 320.....	294
Rowcliffe <i>v.</i> Longford Wire, Iron and Steel Co. (1887), 4 R. P. C. 281 .	541
Rowcliffe <i>v.</i> Morris (1886), 3 R. P. C. 17, 145	223, 243, 537, 545
Rubery's Patent (1837), 1 W. P. C. 649, n.	ii. 119
Rushton <i>v.</i> Crawley (1870), L. R. 10 Eq. 522	60, 81
Russel <i>v.</i> Crichton (1837), 15 Decisions of Ct. of Sess. 1st series, 1270..	460, 463, 464
Russell <i>v.</i> Barnsley (1834), 1 W. P. C. 472 ; 2 Coop. Ch. Cas. 58	445
Russell <i>v.</i> Cowley (1832-35), 1 W. P. C. 457 ; 1 C. P. C. 532 ; 2 Coop. Ch. Cas. 59, n. ; 1 C. M. & R. 864	79, 82, 156, 224, 245, 266, 269, 449, 460, 463, 464
Russell <i>v.</i> Hatfield (1886), 2 R. P. C. 144	402
Russell <i>v.</i> Ledsam (1843-47), 11 M. & W. 647 ; 14 M. & W. 574 ; 16 M. & W. 633 ; 7 Jur. 585 ; 9 Jur. 557 ; 12 L. J. Ex. 439 ; 14 L. J. Ex. . 353 ; 16 L. J. Ex. 145 ; 1 H. L. C. 687	428 : ii. 14, 170, 171, 244
Russell's Patent (1857), 2 De G. & J. 130 ; 30 L. T. 178 ; 6 W. R. 95 ; 2 Moo. P. C. 496	ii. 46, 244
Ruston <i>v.</i> Tobin (1878), 49 L. J. Ch. 262 ; L. R. 10 Ch. D. 558	395, 488
Rylands <i>v.</i> Ashley's Patent (Machine made) Bottle Co. (1890), 7 R. P. C. 175	463, 464
Ryland's Patent (1888), 5 R. P. C. 665	ii. 113, 114, 116, 134
SACCHARIN Corporation, Ld. <i>v.</i> Alliance Chemical Co., Ld. (1905), 22 R. P. C. 175.....	400
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. <i>v.</i> Anglo-Continental Chemical Works, Ld., [1901] 1 Ch. 414 ; 17 R. P. C. 307.....	379, 548
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. <i>v.</i> Chemical and Drugs Co., Ld. (1899), 17 R. P. C. 28, 612, 743 ; [1900] 2 Ch. 556.....	63, 162, 196, 446, 512
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. <i>v.</i> Dawson (1902), 19 R. P. C. 169	500, 550
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. <i>v.</i> Hay (1905), 22 R. P. C. 212	542
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. <i>v.</i> Hopkinson (1904), 21 R. P. C. 272	401
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. <i>v.</i> Jackson (1903), 20 R. P. C. 611.....	401
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. <i>v.</i> Jones (1906), 23 R. P. C. 275.....	500
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. <i>v.</i> Lockwood (1906), 23 R. P. C. 271.....	500
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. <i>v.</i> Lyle (D. T. J.) & Son, Ld. (1904), 21 R. C. P. 604.....	335

TABLE OF CASES.

lix

	PAGE
Saccharin Corporation, <i>Ld. v. Mack</i> (1905), 23 R. P. C. 25	500
Saccharin Corporation, <i>Ld. v. National Saccharin Co., Ld.</i> (1909), 26 R. P. C. 654, 737; 27 R. P. C. 354; 28 R. P. C. 287....	414, 436, 436, 479
Saccharin Corporation, <i>Ld. v. Quincey</i> , [1900] 2 Ch. 246; 17 R. P. C. 337	481, 500, 510
Saccharin Corporation, <i>Ld. v. Reitmeyer</i> , [1900] 2 Ch. 659; 17 R. P. C. 606.....	338, 379, 380
Saccharin Corporation, <i>Ld. v. Ross</i> (1905), 22 R. P. C. 246	500
Saccharin Corporation, <i>Ld. v. Scott</i> (1906), 23 R. P. C. 276.....	500
Saccharin Corporation, <i>Ld. v. Skidmore</i> (1903), 21 R. P. C. 31	542
Saccharin Corporation, <i>Ld. v. White (R.) & Sons, Ld.</i> (1903), 20 R. P. C. 454; (1903) W. N. 120	400
Saccharin Corporation, <i>Ld. v. Wild</i> (1902), 20 R. P. C. 243; (1903) 1 Ch. 410	400
Sachse's Patent (1900), 18 R. P. C. 221	ii. 62
Sadow <i>v. Szalay</i> (1903), 21 R. P. C. 33, 333; 23 R. P. C. 6..	55, 57, 179, 340
Sanitas Co. <i>v. Condy</i> (1887), 4 R. P. C. 530.....	514, 518
Saull <i>v. Browne</i> (1874), L. R. 9 Ch. App. 364	453
Saunders <i>v. Aston</i> (1832), 3 B. & Ald. 881; 1 L. J. K. B. 265; 1 Carp. P. C. 510; 1 W. P. C. 75, n.....	73, 202, 239, 247
Saunders <i>v. Jones</i> (1877), L. R. 7 Ch. D. 449	450
Savage & Co., <i>Ld. v. Brindle</i> (1896), 13 R. P. C. 267.....	375
Savage Bros., <i>Ld. v. Brindle</i> (1900), 17 R. P. C. 228	189
Savage <i>v. Harris</i> (1896), 13 R. P. C. 90, 364	46, 80, 145, 393
Savory <i>v. Price</i> (1823), 1 W. P. C. 83; 1 Ry. & M. 1	197, 227, 228, 230
Saxby <i>v. Clums</i> (1877), 43 L. J. Ex. 228	57
Saxby <i>v. Easterbrook</i> (1872), L. R. 7 Ex. 207; L. R. 3 C. P. D. 339; 41 L. T. Ex. 113	309, 514
Saxby <i>v. Gloucester Waggon Co.</i> (1880-83), L. R. 7 Q. B. D. 305; 50 L. J. Q. B. 577; Griff. L. O. C. 54; W. N. (1880) 28; W. N. (1882) 102; G. P. C. 417	20, 21, 22, 23, 42, 79, 488: ii. 45
Saxby <i>v. Hennett</i> (1873), L. R. 8 Ex. 210	338: ii. 73
Saxby's Patent (1870), L. R. 3 P. C. 292; 7 Moo. P. C. N. S. 82; 19 W. R. 513	ii. 230, 236, 239, 242
Saxby's Patent (1886), 3 R. P. C. 294.....	ii. 231
Sayers <i>v. Collyer</i> (1885), L. R. 28 Ch. D. 103	437, 500, 509, 510
Schelfer <i>v. City of London Electric Lighting Co., Ld.</i> , [1895] 1 Ch. 287	499
Schermuly <i>v. Pain</i> (1901), 18 R. P. C. 529	506
Schlumberger's Patent (1853), 9 Moo. P. C. 1	ii. 245
Scott <i>v. Hamling</i> (1897), 14 R. P. C. 123	161, 340, 358
Scott <i>v. Hull Steam Fishing and Ice Co.</i> (1896-97), 13 R. P. C. 286; 14 R. P. C. 143	340, 358, 499, 501
Scott <i>v. Young</i> (1871), L. R. 6 Ch. 274	ii. 73
Scott's Application (1910), 27 R. P. C. 298	ii. 29
Scott's Patent (1902), 19 R. P. C. 273; 20 R. P. C. 257.....	215, 303, 306
Scott's Patent (1906), 23 R. P. C. 478	ii. 232
Seed <i>v. Higgins</i> (1858-62), 8 E. & B. 765, 771; 8 H. L. C. 550; 27 L. J. Q. B. 148, 411; 30 L. J. Q. B. 314; 3 L. T. N. S. 101; 4 Jur. N. S. 258; 5 Jur. N. S. 540; 6 Jur. N. S. 1264	238, 261, 337, 340, 357, 358, 476, 480: ii. 116
Seixo <i>v. Provezende</i> (1865), L. R. 1 Ch. 192.....	334

	PAGE
Sellers <i>v.</i> Dickinson (1850), 5 Exch. 312; 20 L. J. N. S. Ex. 417	342, 353, 354
Semet and Solway's Patent (1894), 12 R. P. C. 10; [1894] A. C. 78; 64 L. J. Ch. 41; 71 L. T. N. S. 674; 11 R. 362ii.	232, 233, 240
Serrell's Patent (1889), 6 R. P. C. 101	ii. 110
Shallenberger's Application (1889), 6 R. P. C. 550	ii. 30
Sharp <i>v.</i> Bauer (1886), 3 R. P. C. 193	309
Sharp's Patent (1840), 1 W. P. C. 641; 10 L. J. Ch. 86; 3 Beav. 245	ii. 119, 120
Sharrod <i>v.</i> London and North-Western Ry. Co. (1849), 4 Exch. 580 ..	395
Shaw <i>v.</i> Bank of England (1852), 22 L. J. N. S. Ex. 26	460, 461
Shaw <i>v.</i> Barton (1895), 12 R. P. C. 282	81
Shaw <i>v.</i> Day (1894), 11 R. P. C. 185	415
Shaw <i>v.</i> Jones (1889), 6 R. P. C. 328	117, 143, 169, 339, 479
Shedden <i>v.</i> A.-G. (1860), 30 L. J. N. S. Pr. & Mat. 217	415
Sheehan <i>v.</i> Great Eastern Ry. Co. (1880), L. R. 16 Ch. D. 59; 50 L. J. Ch. 68	393: ii. 158, 159
Shillito <i>v.</i> Larmuth (1884), 2 R. P. C. 1	436, 442, 443, 446
Shoe-Machinery Co. <i>v.</i> Cutlan (1895-96), 12 R. P. C. 342, 530; 13 R. P. C. 141, 395; [1896] 1 Ch. 108, 667; 65 L. J. Ch. 44, 314; 73 L. T. N. S. 419; 74 L. T. N. S. 166; 44 W. R. 92	294, 305, 358, 390, 402, 406, 415, 416, 423, 426, 493, 499, 503
Shone's Patent (1892), 9 R. P. C. 438	ii. 217, 228
Shrewsbury and Talbot Cab Co. <i>v.</i> Morgan (1896), 13 R. P. C. 75	415
Shrewsbury and Talbot Cab Co. <i>v.</i> Sterekx (1895-96), 12 R. P. C. 336; 13 R. P. C. 44	147, 149
Siddell and Hilton, Ld. <i>v.</i> Wood (1904), 21 R. P. C. 230	540
Siddell <i>v.</i> Vickers (1887-89), 5 R. P. C. 81, 416; 6 R. P. C. 464; 7 R. P. C. 292; 9 R. P. C. 152; L. R. 36 Ch. D. 92; 61 L. T. N. S. 233. <i>See</i> Vickers <i>v.</i> Siddell	21, 57, 177, 182, 183, 234, 244, 507, 508, 513, 515: ii. 77
Siddell's Patent, Griff. P. C. 320	294
Sidebottom <i>v.</i> Fielden (1891), 8 R. P. C. 266	430, 460, 462
Siegert <i>v.</i> Findlater (1878), L. R. 7 Ch. D. 801	334
Siclaff's Application (1888), 5 R. P. C. 484	ii. 51, 57, 62
Siemens <i>v.</i> Karo (1891), 8 R. P. C. 376	430
Siemens <i>v.</i> Taylor (1892), 9 R. P. C. 393	ii. 203, 207
Sillar's Patent (1882), G. P. C. 581	ii. 216, 228, 231
Simister's Patent (1842), 1 W. P. C. 721; 7 Jur. 451; 4 Moo. P. C. 161; 21 Newton, Lond. Jour. 465	477: ii. 230, 232, 233, 235
Simon, <i>Ex parte</i> , 4 Times Reports, 54	ii. 105
Simmond's Patent (1895), 12 R. P. C. 446	305
Simmonds <i>v.</i> Hitchman (1885), L. R. 29 Ch. D. 417	532
Simpson <i>v.</i> Charlesworth (1886), W. N. (1886) 255	452
Simpson <i>v.</i> Holliday (1864-66), 20 Newton, Lond. Journ. N. S. 105; 13 W. R. 577; 12 L. T. N. S. 99; 5 N. R. 340; L. R. 1 H. L. 315; 35 L. J. Ch. 811	164, 205, 217, 219, 263, 270, 280, 287, 474
Simpson and Isaac's Patent, 21 L. T. N. S. 81	ii. 47
Singer <i>v.</i> Rudge Cycle Co. (1894), 11 R. P. C. 463, 585	433, 541
Singer <i>v.</i> Stassen (1884), 1 R. P. C. 121; 50 L. T. N. S. 326; W. N. (1884) 83	ii. 124

TABLE OF CASES.

lxi

	PAGE
Singer Manufacturing Co. v. Loog (1886), L. R. 18 Ch. D. 395	334
Singer Manufacturing Co. v. Wilson (1865), 13 W. R. 560; 5 N. R. 505; 12 L. T. N. S. 140	460, 461
Sinnott's Patent (1898), 15 R. P. C. 761.....	123
Sirdar Rubber Co., Ltd. v. Wallington, Weston & Co., [1905] 1 Ch. 451; [1906] 1 Ch. 252; 22 R. P. C. 257; 23 R. P. C. 132; 24 R. P. C. 539	222
Skinner v. Perry (Shew) (1892-94), 10 R. P. C. 1; 11 R. P. C. 406; [1893] 1 Ch. 413; [1894] 2 Ch. 581; 62 L. J. Ch. 196; 64 L. J. Ch. 826; 67 L. T. N. S. 696	309, 310, 311, 313, 314, 315, 320, 328
Slazenger v. Feltham (1889), 6 R. P. C. 130.....	415, 445, 472, 540
Sleight's Patent (1893), 10 R. P. C. 447	304
Small Patents (1606), 1 W. P. C. 9	131
Smelting Company of Australia, Ltd. v. Commissioners of Inland Revenue, [1896] 2 Q. B. 179; [1897] 1 Q. B. 175	ii. 149, 181
Smith v. Buchanan (1822), 26 S. J. 347	379, 381
Smith v. Buckingham (1870), 21 L. T. N. S. 819.....	ii. 166
Smith v. Buller (1874), L. R. 19 Eq. 473	551
Smith v. Davidson (1857), 19 Ct. of Sess. 2nd series, 696	123
Smith v. Dickinson (1804), 3 Bos. & Pul. 630	ii. 147
Smith v. Great Western Ry. Co. (1854), 3 W. R. 69; Macr. P. C. 221; 6 E. & B. 405	456, 465, 570
Smith v. Laing (1890), 7 R. P. C. 148	325
Smith v. London and North Western Ry. Co. (1853), 2 E. & B. 69; Macr. P. C. 188	353: ii. 157, 158
Smith v. London and South Western Ry. Co. (1854), Macr. P. C. 209; 23 L. J. Ch. 562; Kay, 408	501
Smith v. Neal (1857), 2 C. B. N. S. 67	ii. 166
Smith v. Roberts (1888), 5 R. P. C. 61	392
Smith v. Scott (1859), 28 L. J. C. P. 325; 6 C. B. N. S. 771; 5 Jur. N. S. 1358	417: ii. 201, 207
Smith and Robertson's Patent (1847), 30 Newton, Lond. Jour. O. S. 451	ii. 227
Smith's Patent (1855), Macr. P. C. 232	ii. 122, 123
Smith's Patent (1884), Griff. P. C. 268	ii. 66
Smith's Patent (1885), 2 R. P. C. 14	ii. 244
Smith's Patent (1896), 13 R. P. C. 200	ii. 51, 54
Smith's Patent (1904), 22 R. P. C. 57.....	20, 21
Soame's Patent (1843), 1 W. P. C. 729; 23 Newton, Lond. Jour. O. S. 462	ii. 217, 227, 228, 229, 230
Société Anonyme du Générateur du Temple's Patent (1896), 13 R. P. C. 54	23, 26: ii. 5, 28
Société Anonyme pour le Fabrication d'Appareils d'Eclairage v. Mid- land Lighting Co. (1897), 14 R. P. C. 419.	ii. 190
Société Anonyme de Manufactures de Glaces v. Tilghman's Patent Sand Blast Co. (1883), L. R. 25 Ch. D. 1; 53 L. J. Ch. 1 ..	326, 379, 381, 484: ii. 181, 190, 196
Solvo Laundry Supply Co. v. Mackie (1893), 10 R. P. C. 68	425, 431, 466
Somerset and Walker's Patent (1879), L. R. 13 Ch. D. 397	ii. 72
Southby's Patent (1891), 8 R. P. C. 433; [1891] A. C. 432	ii. 232

	PAGE
Southwark and Vauxhall Water Co. v. Quick (1878), L. R. 3 Q. B. D. 315	458
Southwell's Patent (1899), 16 R. P. C. 361	ii. 51, 61, 62
Southworth's Patent (1837), 1 W. P. C. 486	ii. 214, 232, 233, 234, 244
Spaul v. Monopole Cycle and Carriage Co., Ld. (1906), 23 R. P. C. 647	392, 499
Speckhart v. Campbell (1884), Times, Mar. 13, 1884; W. N. (1884) 24	ii. 160
Spencer v. Holt (1902), 20 R. P. C. 142	441
Spencer v. Ancoats Vale Rubber Co. (1889), 6 R. P. C. 46 ..	396, 505, 507, 548
Spencer v. Jack (1862-64), 3 De G. J. & S. 346; 11 L. T. N. S. 242 ..	73, ii. 411, 412
Spennymoor Foundry, Ld. v. Catherall and Gildard (1909), 26 R. P. C. 822	394: ii. 169
Spettigue's Trusts (1884), 32 W. R. 385	554
Spiel's Patent (1887), 5 R. P. C. 281	ii. 43, 46
Spilsbury v. Clough (1842), 1 W. P. C. 255; 2 G. & D. 17; 11 L. J. Q. B. 109; L. R. 2 Q. B. 466	412: ii. 131
Standfield's Patent (1897), 15 R. P. C. 17	ii. 218
Stark v. Midland Ry. Co. (1881), L. R. 16 Ch. D. 81	553
Stavert v. Passberg Grain Syndicate (1891), 8 R. P. C. 400	ii. 168
Stead v. Anderson (1846), 2 W. P. C. 147, 151; 16 L. J. C. P. 250; 4 C. B. 834	124, 138, 337, 338
Stead v. Williams (1843-44), 2 W. P. C. 126, 137; 7 M. & G. 818; 8 Scott, N. R. 449; 13 L. J. C. P. 218; 8 Jur. 930 ..	117, 118, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 138, 143
Steadman v. Marsh (1856), 2 Jur. N. S. 391	24
Stearn's Patent (1911), 28 R. P. C. 663	ii. 225
Steel Railway Journal Box Co., Ld. v. Hurst, Nelson & Co., Ld. (1909), 26 R. P. C. 493	75
Steers v. Rogers (1892), 9 R. P. C. 77; 10 R. P. C. 245; [1893] A. C. 232; 62 L. J. Ch. 671; 63 L. T. N. S. 726	ii. 157, 158, 175, 179
Steiner v. Heald (1851), 6 Exch. 607; 20 L. J. Ex. 416; 17 Jur. N. S. 875	61, 97, 264
Stell's Patent (1891), 8 R. P. C. 235	ii. 57, 58, 61, 63
Stepney Spare Motor Wheel Co., Ld. v. Hall, [1911] 1 Ch. 514; 28 R. P. C. 381	ii. 130
Stevens v. Keating (1847), 2 W. P. C. 175; 2 Exch. 772; 19 L. J. Ex. 57; 1 M. & G. 659	29, 65, 202, 205, 265, 373, 374, 440, 441, 443, 445, 446, 449
Stewart v. Casey (1892), 9 R. P. C. 9; [1892] 1 Ch. 104; 61 L. J. Ch. 61	393: ii. 80, 149, 150, 175
Stewart's Patent (1886), 3 R. P. C. 7	ii. 230, 231, 234
Stewart's Patent (1892), 9 R. P. C. 452	ii. 29
Stewart's Patent (1896), 13 R. P. C. 627	ii. 48, 50, 51, 135
Stocker v. Rodgers (1843), 1 Car. & K. 99	545, 546
Stocker v. Warmer (1845), 1 C. B. 148; 9 Jur. 136	ii. 106
Stone & Co., Ld. v. Broadfoot & Sons, Ld. (1907), 25 R. P. C. 313; 26 R. P. C. 361; 27 R. P. C. 701	160, 353
Stoner v. Todd (1876), L. R. 4 Ch. D. 58; 46 L. J. Ch. 32; 35 L. T. N. S. 661; 25 W. R. 38	126, 143, 147, 177, 179

TABLE OF CASES.

lxiii

	PAGE
Stoney's Patent (1888), 5 R. P. C. 518	ii. 226, 231, 234
Storey v. Graham (1899), 16 R. P. C. 106	ii. 2
Stroud v. Humber, Ld. (1907), 24 R. P. C. 141	428
Stuart's Patent (1892), 9 R. P. C. 452	ii. 41, 42, 44
Stubb's Patent (1884), Griff. P. C. 298	ii. 40, 51
Sturtz v. De la Rue (1828), 5 Russ. 322; 1 W. P. C. 83	175, 195, 205, 211, 228, 439
Sugg v. Bray (1884-85), 1 R. P. C. 45; 2 R. P. C. 223; 54 L. J. Ch. 132	310, 339, 360, 475
Sugg v. Silber (1874-77), L. R. 1 Q. B. D. 362; L. R. 2 Q. B. D. 493, 495; 45 L. J. Q. B. 460	423, 424, 467, 486
Sunlight Incandescent Gas Lamp Co. v. Incandescent Gas Light Co. (1897), 14 R. P. C. 757	133, 337, 517, 532, 534, 541, 543
Sutcliffe v. Abott (1902), 20 R. P. C. 50	432
Swabey v. Sutton (1863), 1 H. & N. 514	452
Swain v. Edlin-Sinclair Tyre Co. (1903), 20 R. P. C. 435	460, 464
Swinborne v. Nelson (1852-53), 16 Beav. 416; 22 L. J. Ch. 331	453, 457
Sykes v. Howarth (1879), L. R. 12 Ch. D. 826; 48 L. J. Ch. 769; 41 L. T. N. S. 79; 28 W. R. 215	87, 375, 395, 405, 467
Sykes v. Sykes (1824), 3 B. & C. 541	335
TADDY v. Sterious, [1904] 1 Ch. 358	383
Tadman v. Owens (1894), 11 R. P. C. 349	436
Talbot v. La Roche (1854), 15 C. B. 310	403, 404, 405
Tangye v. Stott (1865), 14 W. R. 128, 386; W. N. (1866) 68	117, 118, 486, 491, 525
Tatham v. Dania (1869), Griff. P. C. 213	91
Tattersall's Patent (1892), 9 R. P. C. 150	ii. 64
Taylor v. Annand (1899), 16 R. P. C. 126; 18 R. P. C. 53	40
Taylor v. Hare (1805), 1 B. & P. N. R. 260; 1 W. P. C. 292	ii. 207
Taylor v. Roe, 68 T. R. 213	503
Taylor's Agreement Trusts, <i>In re</i> , [1904] 2 Ch. 737; 21 R. P. C. 713..	ii. 174
Taylor's Patent (1896), 13 R. P. C. 482	119, 125
Taylor's Patent (1910), 26 R. P. C. 384	ii. 100
Teague's Patent (1884), Griff. P. C. 298	ii. 56, 58, 63
Temler v. Stevenson (1897), 15 R. P. C. 24	309, 313, 319, 322
Templeton v. Macfarlane (1848), 1 H. L. C. 595	164
Tennant's Case (1795), 1 W. P. C. 125, n.	15, 17, 114, 130
Tetley v. Easton (1852-57), Macr. P. C. 46, 82; 2 E. & B. 956; 18 C. B. 643; 2 C. B. N. S. 706; 23 L. J. Q. B. 77; 25 L. J. C. P. 293; 26 L. J. C. P. 269; 18 Jur. 350..	161, 168, 204, 218, 227, 228, 238, 247, 250, 287, 457, 474; ii. 118
Thermit, Ld. v. Weldite, Ld. (1907), 24 R. P. C. 441	373, 390, 424
Thermit, Ld. v. British Caloris Co. (1909), 26 R. P. C. 827	414
Thermit, Ld. v. Isola, Ld. (1910), 27 R. P. C. 195, 388	94, 414
Thierry v. Rickman (1895), 12 R. P. C. 412, 543; 14 R. P. C. 105. <i>See</i> Rickman v. Thierry	71, 84
Thomas v. Foxwell (1858-59), 5 Jur. N. S. 37; 6 Jur. N. S. 271..	247, 264, 270

	PAGE
Thomas v. Hunt (1864), 17 O. B. N. S. 183	381; ii. 183
Thomas v. Welch (1866), L. R. 1 C. P. 192; 35 L. J. C. P. 200	179, 245: ii. 104
Thomas v. Williams (1880), L. R. 14 Ch. D. 864.....	309
Thomas v. Winter (1867), 17 L. T. N. S. 148	493
Thomas and Prevost's Patent (1898), 15 R. P. C. 257	ii. 42
Thomas and Prevost's Patent (1898), 16 R. P. C. 69	ii. 22
Thomas's Patent (1892), 9 R. P. C. 367.....	ii. 226, 235, 239
Thompson's Patent (1902), 19 R. P. C. 565	ii. 228, 232
Thompson's Patent, [1909] 2 Ch. 447; 26 R. P. C. 673	ii. 246
Thomson v. American Braided Wire Co. (1889), 6 R. P. C. 518. <i>See</i> American Braided Wire Co. v. Thomson	36, 143, 255, 532
Thomson v. Batty (1889), 6 R. P. C. 84 .. 109, 148, 232, 235, 338, 427, 435, 477	
Thomson v. Hughes (1889-90), 7 R. P. C. 71, 187	446, 459
Thomson v. James (1863), 32 Beav. 570	81
Thomson v. Macdonald & Co. (1890), 8 R. P. C. 1	428
Thomson v. Moore (1889-90), 6 R. P. C. 426; 7 R. P. C. 325. <i>See</i> Moore v. Thomson	340, 341, 355, 360, 361, 370, 503
Thorley's Cattle Food Co. v. Massam (1877), L. R. 6 Ch. D. 582	309
Thorn v. Worthing Skating Rink Co. (1876), L. R. 6 Ch. D. 415, n. .. 354, 444, 445, 469	
Thornborough and Wilk's Patent (1896), 13 R. P. C. 115.....	ii. 53, 65
Thornton v. Baker (1886), 3 Times R. 715	392
Thornycroft's Patent, [1899] A. C. 415; 16 R. P. C. 202	ii. 231, 234, 239
Three Towns Banking Co. v. Maddever (1884), L. R. 27 Ch. D. 523 ..	500
Thwaite's Patent (1892), 9 R. P. C. 515	ii. 40, 44, 63
Tickelpenny v. Army and Navy Co-operative Society (1888), 5 R. P. C. 405	82, 106, 143
Ticket Punch Register v. Colley's Patents (1894), 12 R. P. C. 1, 171 ..	336, 337, 338, 358, 470, 555
Tilghman's Patent Sand Blast Co. v. Wright and Butler, Ld. (1884), 1 R. P. C. 103	405
Todd's Patent, 9 R. P. C. 487	ii. 51, 53, 57
Tolson v. Speight (1896), 13 R. P. C. 718	162, 247
Tomlinson, <i>Ex parte</i> (1899), 16 R. P. C. 233	ii. 48
Toni Tyres, Ld. v. Palmer Tyre, Ld. (1904), 22 R. P. C. 81, 369	396, 399
Tottrank's Patent (1909), 26 R. P. C. 850	ii. 97
Townsend v. Haworth (1875), L. R. 12 Ch. D. 831, n.; 48 L. J. N. S. 770; Higgins's Digest, 168	375, 379, 397
Toy's Patent (1893), 10 R. P. C. 89	ii. 225, 243, 246
Traction Corporation, Ld. v. Bennett (1908), 25 R. P. C. 819	289
Travell v. Carteret, 3 Lev. 135	198
Trotman v. Wood (1864), 16 C. B. N. S. 479	339: ii. 201
Trotman's Patent (1866), L. R. 1 P. C. 118; 3 Moo. P. C. N. S. 488..	ii. 226, 239, 242
True and Variable Electric Lamp Syndicate v. Bryant Trading Syndi- cate (1908), 25 R. P. C. 461	254, 287
Tubeless Pneumatic Tyre and Capon Heaton, Ld. v. Trench Tubeless Tyre Co. (1899), 16 R. P. C. 291	151, 162, 189
Tubes, Ld. v. Perfecta Seamless Steel Tube Co., Ld. (1900), 17 R. P. C. 569; 18 R. P. C. 339; 20 R. P. C. 77.....	103, 200, 201, 225, 243, 244, 261, 274, 332

TABLE OF CASES.

Lxv

	PAGE
<i>Tuck v. Silver, John</i> , 218	447
<i>Turner v. Winter</i> (1787), Dav. P. C. 145; 1 W. P. C. 77; 1 T. R. 602..	110,
156, 165, 196, 200, 216, 220, 227, 228, 472, 478	
<i>Turton v. Turton</i> (1889), L. R. 42 Ch. D. 128; 58 L. J. Ch. 677; 61	
L. T. N. S. 571, 575; 38 W. R. 22.....	335
<i>Tweedale v. Ashworth</i> (1890), 7 R. P. C. 426; 8 R. P. C. 49; 9 R. P. C.	
121	278, 340, 342, 357, 363, 364, 365, 482, 547, 554
<i>Tweedale v. Ashworth</i> (1899), 16 R. P. C. 142, 520; 17 R. P. C. 620..	365
<i>Tweedale v. Howard and Bullough</i> (1896), 13 R. P. C. 522.....	340, 366, 384:
	ii. 180
<i>UNGAR v. Sugg</i> (1889-94), 6 R. P. C. 337; 8 R. P. C. 386; 9 R. P. C.	
113	324, 328, 329, 518, 553
<i>Union Electrical Power and Light Co. v. Electrical Power Storage Co.</i>	
(1888), 5 R. P. C. 329	324, 325
<i>United Horseshoe and Nail Co. v. Stewart</i> (1885-88), 2 R. P. C. 122;	
3 R. P. C. 139; 4 R. P. C. 140; 5 R. P. C. 260; L. R. 13 App. Cas.	
401	136, 164, 167, 477, 511, 513, 514, 519, 520, 522, 524
<i>United Horseshoe and Nail Co. v. Swedish Horse Nail Co.</i> (1888), 6	
R. P. C. 1	80, 82, 164, 167
<i>United Telephone Co. v. Bassano</i> (1885-86), 2 R. P. C. 70; 3 R. P. C.	
295; L. R. 31 Ch. D. 630	159, 160, 280, 354, 478, 495
<i>United Telephone Co. v. Dale</i> (1883), L. R. 25 Ch. D. 778; 53 L. J. Ch.	
295	377
<i>United Telephone Co. v. Donohoe</i> (1886), L. R. 31 Ch. D. 399; 55 L. J.	
Ch. 480; 3 R. P. C. 45	491
<i>United Telephone Co. v. Equitable Telephone Co.</i> (1888), 5 R. P. C.	
233	436, 437, 439
<i>United Telephone Co. v. Faulkner</i> (1886), 3 R. P. C. 282, n.....	553
<i>United Telephone Co. v. Fleming</i> (1886), 3 R. P. C. 268, 282	512, 553
<i>United Telephone Co. v. Harrison</i> (1882-83), L. R. 21 Ch. D. 720; 51	
L. J. Ch. 705; 46 L. T. N. S. 620 ..	137, 138, 139, 151, 176, 177, 188, 217,
	245, 251, 254, 259, 287, 326, 354, 536
<i>United Telephone Co. v. Henry</i> (1884), 2 R. P. C. 11.....	381
<i>United Telephone Co. v. London and Globe Telephone and Mainten-</i>	
<i>ance Co.</i> (1884), 1 R. P. C. 117; L. R. 26 Ch. D. 766; 32 W. R.	
870	338, 385, 386, 527, 529: ii. 123
<i>United Telephone Co. v. Mottershead</i> (1886), 3 R. P. C. 213.....	488
<i>United Telephone Co. v. Neilson</i> (1887), W. N. (1887) 193	377: ii. 182
<i>United Telephone Co. v. Patterson</i> (1889), 6 R. P. C. 140	512, 549, 550
<i>United Telephone Co. v. Sharples</i> (1885), 2 R. P. C. 28; L. R. 29	
Ch. D. 164; 52 L. T. N. S. 384; 1 T. R. 259; 54 L. J. Ch. 633..	377,
	378, 379, 397, 446, 518
<i>United Telephone Co. v. St. George</i> (1886), 3 R. P. C. 33, 321	339, 354, 549
<i>United Telephone Co. v. Tasker</i> (1888-89), 5 R. P. C. 628; 6 R. P. C.	
38; W. N. (1888) 22	386, 400, 408, 447, 525
<i>United Telephone Co. v. Walker</i> (1887), 4 R. P. C. 63; 5 R. P. C.	
628; 56 L. T. N. S. 508	396, 507, 512, 514, 518, 523, 524, 528

	PAGE
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge <i>v.</i> Richardson (1806), 6 Ves. 689	299, 440, 442
Unwin <i>v.</i> Heath (1855), H. L. C. 505. <i>See</i> Heath <i>v.</i> Unwin	81
Upman <i>v.</i> Elkan (1871), L. R. 12 Eq. 145; L. R. 7 Ch. 130; 41 L. J. Ch. 246	334, 391, 392
Upman <i>v.</i> Forrester (1883), L. R. 24 Ch. D. 231; 52 L. J. Ch. 946..	338, 391, 392
Useful Patents Co. <i>v.</i> Rylands (1885), 2 R. P. C. 255	121: ii. 203
VAISEY'S Patent (1894), 11 R. P. C. 593	32, 305
Valveless Gas Engine Syndicate, Ld. <i>v.</i> Day (1898), 15 R. P. C. 233; 16 R. P. C. 97	ii. 161
Van Berkel <i>v.</i> Booth (1906), 23 R. P. C. 573	255, 369
Van Berkel <i>v.</i> Simpson (1906), 23 R. P. C. 237	255, 369
Van de Poele's Patent (1890), 7 R. P. C. 69	ii. 30
Van Gelder Apsimon & Co. <i>v.</i> Sowerby Bridge Flour Society (1890), 7 R. P. C. 41, 208; L. R. 44 Ch. D. 374; 59 L. J. Ch. 583	394: ii. 132, 159, 170
Van Gelder's Patent (1888), 6 R. P. C. 22; 4 Times R. 754	ii. 105, 108
Van Gelder's Patent (1892), 9 R. P. C. 325	ii. 64, 65
Van Gelder's Patent, [1907] A. C. 174; 24 R. P. C. 169	ii. 216, 231
Van Wye's Application (1909), 26 R. P. C. 490	ii. 51, 54
Vasey (John), Ld. <i>v.</i> Walker, Mitchell & Co. (1899), 16 R. P. C. 596..	490, 556
Vautin's Patent (1907), 25 R. P. C. 176	304
Vavasseur <i>v.</i> Krupp (1870), L. R. 9 Ch. D. 351..31, 388, 396, 397, 526:	ii. 175
Vickers <i>v.</i> Siddell (1890), L. R. 15 App. Cas. 496; 7 R. P. C. 292; 60 L. J. Ch. 105; 63 L. T. N. S. 599; 39 W. R. 365. <i>See</i> Siddell <i>v.</i> Vickers	37, 39, 79, 186
Vickers, Sons and Maxim, Ld. <i>v.</i> Coventry Ordnance Works, Ld. (1907), 25 R. P. C. 207	531
Vidal Dyes Syndicate, Ld. <i>v.</i> Levinstein, Ld. (1911), 28 R. P. C. 559..	215, 280
Vidal Dyes Syndicate, Ld. <i>v.</i> Read, Holliday & Sons, Ld. (1911), 28 R. P. C. 323	414, 479
Vidal's Patent (1898), 15 R. P. C. 721	66: ii. 109
Vidi <i>v.</i> Smith (1854), 23 L. J. Q. B. 342; 3 E. & B. 969	449, 465, 507
Vincent's Patent (1867), L. R. 2 Ch. D. 341	ii. 73
Viola <i>v.</i> Sharpe (1904), 22 R. P. C. 23	ii. 79
Voelker Incandescent Mantle, Ld. <i>v.</i> Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld. (1901), 18 R. P. C. 494	323
Von Buch, <i>Re</i> (1887), Griff. L. O. C. 40	ii. 51, 52
Von der Linde <i>v.</i> Brummerstaedt & Co. (1909), 26 R. P. C. 289	162
Von Heyden and Neustadt (1880), L. R. 14 Ch. D. 230; 50 L. J. Ch. 126	96, 134, 138, 143, 152, 379
Vorwerk <i>v.</i> Evans (1890), 7 R. P. C. 167, 265	70, 150, 269
WADHAM'S Application (1910), 27 R. P. C. 172	40: ii. 52, 56, 58, 69
Waite and Saville, Ld. <i>v.</i> Johnson Die Press Co. (1900), 18 R. P. C. 1..	319
Wakefield <i>v.</i> Duke of Buccleugh (1865), 11 Jur. N. S. 523	447

TABLE OF CASES.

lxvii

	PAGE
Walcott v. Lyons (1884), L. R. 29 Ch. D. 584	394
Walker v. Clarke (1887), 4 R. P. C. 111; 56 L. J. Ch. 239	314, 326
Walker v. Hydrocarbon Syndicate (1884), 2 R. P. C. 3; 3 R. P. C. 253	297, 339, 495, 496, 497
Walker's Application, Griff. L. O. C. 22	ii. 109
Walker's Application (1888), 5 R. P. C. 345	ii. 51, 53, 54
Wallace v. Jack (Alexander) & Sons, Ltd. (1904), 22 R. P. C. 681	369
Wallace's Patent (1889), 6 R. P. C. 134	ii. 57, 62, 64
Wallace's Patent (1895), 12 R. P. C. 444	305
Wallington v. Dale (1852), 7 Exch. 888; 23 L. J. Ex. 49, 67, 74, 82, 205, 213, 261: ii. 131	
Wallis and Ratcliff's Application (1888), 5 R. P. C. 347	ii. 51, 53, 54
Waltham v. Austin, 80 Co. Rep. 125 a, 127 b; 2 Int. 47	526
Walton v. Bateman (1842), 1 W. P. C. 613	120, 227, 228, 261, 409, 411
Walton v. Lavater (1860), 8 C. B. N. S. 162; 29 L. J. C. P. 275; 3 L. T. N. S. 272; 6 Jur. N. S. 1251; 1 W. P. C. 48, n.	338, 379, 380, 393, 418: ii. 154, 157, 162, 169, 179
Walton v. Potter (1841), 1 W. P. C. 585, 597; 11 L. J. C. P. 138	262, 264, 339, 411, 483
Wapshare Tube Co., Ltd. v. Hyde Imperial Rubber Co., Ltd. (1901), 18 R. P. C. 374	441
Ward v. Livesey (1888), 5 R. P. C. 102	ii. 188, 189
Ward Bros. v. Hill (1901), 18 R. P. C. 481; 20 R. P. C. 189	161, 177, 184, 234, 471
Wardroper v. Gibbs (George), Ltd. (1902), 19 R. P. C. 553; 20 R. P. C. 355	40
Warman, Re, Griff. L. O. C. 43	ii. 40
Warner v. Murdock (1877), L. R. 4 Ch. D. 750	487
Washburn and Moen Manufacturing Co. v. Cunard Steamship Co. (1889), 6 R. P. C. 398	397
Washburn and Moen Manufacturing Co. v. Patterson (1884), L. R. 29 Ch. D. 48; 1 R. P. C. 157, 191; 2 R. P. C. 27	495, 525, 527
Wastney Smith's Patent (1885), 2 R. P. C. 14	ii. 244
Waterhouse's Patent (1905), 23 R. P. C. 55, 470	44, 61
Watling v. Stevens (1886), 3 R. P. C. 37, 147	73, 182, 184, 190, 237, 242, 244, 554
Watling's Patent, Griff. P. C. 320	294
Watson v. Holliday (1882), 30 W. R. 747; 31 W. R. 536; 52 L. J. Ch. 543; L. R. 20 Ch. D. 780	507, 514
Watson, Laidlaw & Co., Ltd. v. Pott, Cassels and Williamson (1908), 25 R. P. C. 337; 26 R. P. C. 349; 27 R. P. C. 541; 28 R. P. C. 565	218, 285
Watts v. Everitt Press Manufacturing Co. (1910), 27 R. P. C. 400, 718	202
Webb v. Fox (1797), 7 T. R. 391	ii. 173
Webb v. Kynoch & Co. See Kynoch & Co. v. Webb.	
Webb v. Levinstein (1898), 15 R. P. C. 78	313
Webb Lamp Co., Ltd. v. Atkinson (1902), 19 R. P. C. 599	518, 546
Weber's Patent (1910), 27 R. P. C. 30	ii. 99
Webster's Patent (1888), 6 R. P. C. 163	ii. 51, 53, 66
Wegman v. Corcoran (1878-79), L. R. 13 Ch. D. 65; 27 W. R. 357 ..	26, 203, 229, 287, 535

	PAGE
Weir v. Denny (1894), 11 R. P. C. 657	246
Welch's Patent (1884), Griff. P. C. 300	ii. 61
Welch's Patent (1891), 8 R. P. C. 442	ii. 61
Wellman, Leaver and Head, Ld. v. Bustinghaus & Co., Ld. (1911), 28 R. P. C. 326	522
Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld. v. Daylight Incandescent Mantle Co., Ld. (1899), 16 R. P. C. 344; 17 R. P. C. 141...., 34, 205, 206, 336, 373, 396, 482, 550	
Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld. v. Dowle (1899), 16 R. P. C. 391	406, 407
Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld. v. General Incandescent Co., Ld. (1901), 18 R. P. C. 533	438
Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld. v. Keegan (1899), 17 R. P. C. 44	503
Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld. v. Krumm (1901), 18 R. P. C. 211.....	546
Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld. v. McGrady (John) & Co. (1901), 18 R. P. C. 51	546
Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld. v. New Incandescent (Sun- light Patent) Gas Lighting Co., Ld., [1900] 1 Ch. 843; 17 R. P. C. 237	160, 281, 396
Welsbach Incandescent Gas Lighting Co., Ld. v. Vulcan Incandescent Light Syndicate, Ld. (1901), 18 R. P. C. 279	448
Wenham v. Carpenter (1887), 5 R. P. C. 68	ii. 107
Wenham v. May (1887), 4 R. P. C. 303	339, 554
Wenham Gas Co. v. Champion Gas Lamp Co. (1890), 8 R. P. C. 22, 313; 9 R. P. C. 49.....	278, 343, 403, 456, 511, 554
Werdermann v. Société Générale d'Electricité (1881), L. R. 19 Ch. D. 246	ii. 168
West v. Keene's (James) & Sons, Ld. (1911), 28 R. P. C. 474	38
Westhead v. Keen (1839), 1 Beav. 287; 8 L. J. 89; 2 W. P. C. 36, n.	393, 399: ii. 159
Westinghouse v. Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Co. (1884), 1 R. P. C. 98, 229	79, 243, 273, 280, 283, 476, 480, 487, 512, 532, 554
Westinghouse v. Midland Ry. Co. (1883), 48 L. T. N. S. 98, 462	458
Westinghouse's Patent (1885), Griff. P. C. 315	ii. 123, 124
Westley v. Tolley (1894), 11 R. P. C. 602	114, 487, 490
Westley, Richards & Co. v. Perks (1893), 10 R. P. C. 181, 382....	474, 497, 536
Westrupp and Gibbin's Patent (1836), 1 W. P. C. 554	ii. 217
Wharton v. Boffin (1883), W. N. 96	488
Whateman v. Pearson (1868), L. R. 3 C. P. 422	395
Wheatstone v. Wild (1861), Griff. P. C. 247	443
White v. Bertrams (1897), 14 R. P. C. 601, 735	348
White v. Hartley (1902), 20 R. P. C. 265	534
White v. Toms (1867), 37 L. J. Ch. 204; 17 L. T. N. S. 348	84
Whitehouse's Patent (1838), 1 W. P. C. 473; Carp. P. C. 565; reported as Russell's Patent, 2 Moo. P. C. 496	ii. 171, 216, 228, 244, 246
Whittaker's Patent (1896), 13 R. P. C. 580.....	ii. 51, 54, 66
Whitton v. Jennings (1860), 1 Dr. & Sm. 110	439
Wield's Patent (1871), L. R. 4 P. C. 89; 8 Moo. P. C. N. S. 300 ..	ii. 226, 234, 236, 242, 247

TABLE OF CASES.

lxix

	PAGE
Wilcox and Gibbs' Sewing Machine Co. v. James (1897), 14 R. P. C. 523; 66 L. J. Ch. 525; [1897] 2 Ch. 71; 45 W. R. 474	530, 539
Wilfley Ore Concentrator Syndicate, Ltd. v. Guthridge (N.), Ltd. (1900), 23 R. P. C. 535	145
Wilkinson's Patent (1894), 11 R. P. C. 298	304
Williams v. Govan (1895), 12 R. P. C. 387	119
Williams v. Guest (1875), L. R. 10 Ch. App. Cas. 467	488
Williams v. Nash (1859), 28 Beav. 93; 28 L. J. Ch. 886	ii. 14
Williams v. Nye (1890), 7 R. P. C. 62	40, 42
Williams v. Williams, 3 Mer. 157	ii. 147
Williams and Robinson's Patent (1896), 13 R. P. C. 550	ii. 239
Willoughby v. Taylor (1894), 11 R. P. C. 45.....	312, 317, 324, 329
Wilson v. Barbour (1888), 5 R. P. C. 245, 675	ii. 161
Wilson v. Gann (1875), W. N. 78	426
Wilson v. Tindal (1841), 1 W. P. C. 730, n.	441, 443, 447
Wilson v. Union Oil Mills (1892), 9 R. P. C. 57	160, 162, 333: ii. 181, 201, 208
Wilson v. Wilson & Co. (Barnsley), Ltd. (1899), 16 R. P. C. 215	425, 465
Wilson & Co v. Church (Walter E.) Engineering Co. (1885), 2 R. P. C. 175	326
Wilson Brothers Bobbin Co., Ltd. v. Wilson & Co. (Barnsley), Ltd. (1900), 17 R. P. C. 177; 18 R. P. C. 139; 20 R. P. C. 1	160, 162
Wilson, Laidlaw & Co., Ltd. v. Cassels and Williamson (1909), 26 R. P. C. 360	467
Wilson's Patent (1892), 9 R. P. C. 512	ii. 70
Winby v. Manchester Steam Tramways Co. (1889-90), 6 R. P. C. 359; 7 R. P. C. 30; 8 R. P. C. 61	82, 119, 125, 143, 339, 476
Winter v. Baybut (1884), 1 R. P. C. 76	ii. 124, 141
Winter v. Turner (1787), 1 T. R. 602; 1 W. P. C. 77	209
Wirth's Patent (1879), L. R. 12 Ch. D. 303	25
Wittman v. Oppenheim (1884), L. R. 27 Ch. D. 260	338, 392
Wollaston and Knowles v. Chapman (1908), 25 R. P. C. 733.....	22
Wood v. Cockerill (1819), 2 Coop. Ch. Ca. 58	445
Wood v. Lambert (1886), 3 R. P. C. 84	500
Wood v. Leadbitter, 9 Jur. 187	ii. 188
Wood v. Raphael (1896-97), 13 R. P. C. 730; 14 R. P. C. 496.....	77, 79
Wood v. Zimmer (1815), Holt, N. P. 58; 1 W. P. C. 44, 82, n.; 1 Carp. P. C. 290	128, 129, 193, 227, 228, 230
Woodcroft's Patent (1841), 1 W. P. C. 740; 2 W. P. C. 18; 10 Jur. 363; 28 Newton, L. J. O. S. 196; 3 Moo. P. C. 171	143, 148: ii. 216, 225, 226, 228, 229, 230, 233
Woodhead, <i>Re</i> (1886), Griff. L. O. C. 44	ii. 42
Woodward v. Sansum (1886-87), 3 R. P. C. 357; 4 R. P. C. 166	177, 178, 183, 184, 234, 552, 555
Wool, Hide and Skin Syndicate v. Riches (1902), 19 R. P. C. 127	ii. 12
Woolfe v. Automatic Picture Gallery, Ltd. (1902), 19 R. P. C. 161; [1903] 1 Ch. 18	467: ii. 141
Woolley v. Broad (1892), 19 R. P. C. 429	425, 465
Worthington & Co.'s Trade Mark, <i>In re</i> (1897), L. R. 14 Ch. D. 8....	334
Worthington Pumping Engine Co. v. Moore (1902), 20 R. P. C. 41....	22
Wotherspoon v. Currie (1872), L. R. 5 H. L. 508	334

	PAGE
Wren <i>v.</i> Weild (1869), L. R. 4 Q. B. 213, 730; 38 L. J. Q. B. 327 ..	309, 324, 405
Wright <i>v.</i> Hitchcock (1870), L. R. 5 Ex. 37; 39 L. J. Ex. 97	73, 184, 190, 338, 353, 379
Wright's Patent (1839), 1 W. P. C. 575.....	ii. 232, 233
Wrightson <i>v.</i> Taylor, Maddox & Co. (1907), 24 R. P. C. 347	325
Wüterich's Patent, [1903] A. C. 206; 20 R. P. C. 285	ii. 236, 237
Wyeth <i>v.</i> Stone, 1 Story, 273	49, 249
Wylie and Morton's Patent (1897), 13 R. P. C. 97.....	45, 150: ii. 51, 53
YATES and Kellett's Patent (1887), 4 R. P. C. 150; L. R. 12 App. Cas. 147.....	ii. 219, 336, 237, 243
York <i>v.</i> Stowers (1883), W. N. (1883) 174.....	510
Youatt <i>v.</i> Winyard (1820), 1 J. & W. 394.....	ii. 145
Young <i>v.</i> Fernie (1864), 1 De G. J. & S. 353; 4 Giff. 577; L. R. 1 H. L. 63; 33 L. J. Ch. 192; 35 L. J. Ch. 523; 9 L. T. N. S. 861; 14 L. T. N. S. 637; Griff. P. C. 577; Pemberton, 4th ed. 484; Seton, 4th ed. 355	109, 122, 470, 486, 488, 512
Young <i>v.</i> Hermand Oil Co. (1891), 8 R. P. C. 285; 9 R. P. C. 373....	ii. 203
Young <i>v.</i> Morris (1894), 11 R. P. C. 617; 12 R. P. C. 455	338, 502
Young <i>v.</i> Rosenthal (1883), 1 R. P. C. 29	105, 124, 159, 193, 280, 337, 338, 353
Young <i>v.</i> White (1853), 17 Beav. 582; 23 L. J. Ch. 190	451, 471
Young Manufacturing Co., <i>Re</i> , [1900] 2 Ch. 753.....	447
Young's Patent, P. M. J., 2nd series, vol. 7, p. 44.....	294
"Z" Electric Lamp Manufacturing Co., Ld. <i>v.</i> Marples, Leach & Co., Ld. (1909), 26 R. P. C. 677, 762; 27 R. P. C. 305, 737.....	214, 434
"Z" Electric Lamp Manufacturing Co., Ld. <i>v.</i> Osram Lamp Works, Ld. (1911), 28 R. P. C. 179	321
Z.'s Application (1910), 27 R. P. C. 285.....	ii. 12

NOTES OF RULINGS

BY THE

COMPTROLLER-GENERAL.



	PAGE
1910 (A.), 27 R. P. C., App. i.	ii. 69
1910 (B.), 27 R. P. C., App. ii.	ii. 34, 49
1910 (C.), 27 R. P. C., App. iii.	ii. 37
1910 (D.), 27 R. P. C., App. iv.	ii. 55
1910 (E.), 27 R. P. C., App. v.	ii. 80
1910 (F.), 27 R. P. C., App. vii.	ii. 86
1910 (G.), 27 R. P. C., App. viii.	ii. 60
1910 (H.), 27 R. P. C., App. x.	ii. 37
1910 (I.), 27 R. P. C., App. xi.	75
1910 (J.), 27 R. P. C., App. xii.	ii. 24
1911 (A.), 28 R. P. C., App. i... ..	ii. 105, 122
1911 (B.), 28 R. P. C., App. iii.	ii. 49
1911 (C.), 28 R. P. C., App. viii....	ii. 62

LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS.

- ABBOTT, Sutcliffe *v.*
 Action Gesellschaft für Motor, & Co.,
 Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
 Adams, Hill *v.*
 Adie, Clark *v.*
 Adjustable Cover and Boiler Block
 Co., Poulton *v.*
 Aerators, Ld., Crocker *v.*
 Airey, Bailey *v.*
 Albion Clay Co., Ld., Doulton & Co.,
 Ld. *v.*
 Albrecht, Marsden *v.*
 Allecock & Co., Ld., Clay *v.*
 Alliance Chemical Co., Ld., Sac-
 charin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
 Allin, Darcy *v.*
 Allison, Collard *v.*
 Amatt, Cartwright *v.*
 American Braided Wire Co., Thom-
 son *v.*
 American Steel and Wire Co., Glover
 (W. T.) & Co., Ld. *v.*
 Amos, Reynolds *v.*
 Ancoats Vale Rubber Co., Spencer *v.*
 Anderson, Maxim-Nordenfelt Guns
 and Ammunition Co. *v.*
 Anderson, Nobel's Explosives Co. *v.*
 Anderson, Stead *v.*
 Anderston Foundry Co., Harrison *v.*
 André's Patent, Curtis *v.*
 Andrew, Read *v.*
 Andrews & Co. (T. E. H.), Ld.,
 British Motor Syndicate, Ld. *v.*
 Anglo-American Brush Corporation,
 Crompton *v.*
 Anglo-American Brush Corporation,
 King Brown *v.*
 Anglo-American Telegraph Co., Pig-
 gott *v.*
 Anglo-Continental Chemical Works,
 Ld., Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
 Annand, Taylor *v.*
 Arc Lamp Co., Jandus Arc Lamp
 and Electric Co., Ld. *v.*
 Arden, Fletcher *v.*
 Arkwright, R. *v.*
 Armitage, Merchant Shipping Co. *v.*
 Armstrong, Whitworth & Co., Ld.,
 Corrival *v.*
 Army and Navy Co-operative
 Society, Ticklepenny *v.*
 Ashburn, Calvert *v.*
 Ashley's Patent (Machine-made)
 Bottle Co., Rylands *v.*
 Ashworth, Law *v.*
 Ashworth, Tweedale *v.*
 Asplen, Morrison *v.*
 Associated Newspapers, Ld., Holmes
v.
 Aston, Brook *v.*
 Aston, Saunders *v.*
 Astrachans, Ld., Fox *v.*
 Attorney-General, Sheddan *v.*
 Austin, Waltham *v.*
 Auto-Machinery Co., Ld., Hoffmann
 Manufacturing Co. *v.*
 Automatic Weighing Machine Co.,
 Combined Weighing Machine Co. *v.*
 BADISCHE Anilin und Soda Fabrik,
 Chemische Fabrik vorm. Sandoz *v.*
 Baedeker, Cooper & Co. (Birming-
 ham), Ld. *v.*
 Baker, Hardmuth *v.*

lxxiv LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS.

- Baker, Lawrie *v.*
 Baker, Thornton *v.*
 Balmoral Cycle Co., Ltd., Osmonds,
 Ltd. *v.*
 Banham, Reddaway *v.*
 Bank of British Columbia, Ander-
 son *v.*
 Bank of England, Shaw *v.*
 Barbour, Wilson *v.*
 Barker, Miller *v.*
 Barnett's Screw Stopper Bottling
 Co., Ltd., Barnett *v.*
 Barnsley, Russell *v.*
 Baron Cigarette Machine Co., Lud-
 ington Cigarette Machine Co. *v.*
 Barton, Shaw *v.*
 Barwick, Cardiff Steamship Co. *v.*
 Basle Chemical Works, Badische
 Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.*
 Bassano, United Telephone Co. *v.*
 Batchelor, Kelly *v.*
 Bateman, Walton *v.*
 Battersby, Gammons *v.*
 Batty, Batty *v.*
 Bauer, Sharp *v.*
 Bauwen's Patent Candle Co., Price's
 Patent Candle Co. *v.*
 Baybut, Winton *v.*
 Bayley, Procter *v.*
 Baylis, Coles *v.*
 Bayliss, Barlow *v.*
 Beal, Innes *v.*
 Bean, Loog *v.*
 Bechmann, Kratz-Boussac *v.*
 Beck, Monnet *v.*
 Beddon, Beddon *v.*
 Bell, Jahneke *v.*
 Bell Bros., Ltd., Carnegie Steel Co. *v.*
 Benecke, Bridson *v.*
 Bennett, Hudson *v.*
 Bennett, Moore *v.*
 Bennett, Traction Corporation, Ltd.
v.
 Bennis, Procter *v.*
 Bentall, Ransone *v.*
 Benyon, Champion *v.*
 Berend, Holophane, Ltd. *v.*
 Berger, Jones *v.*
 Bernstein, Edison-Bell Phonograph
 Corporation *v.*
 Berringer, Wallis & Manners, Ltd.,
 Hudson *v.*
 Bertrams, White *v.*
 Betts, De Vitre *v.*
 Betts, Neilson *v.*
 Betts, R. *v.*
 Beverloy, Crossley *v.*
 Bewley, Hancock *v.*
 Bibby, Penn *v.*
 Billington, Dowling *v.*
 Bird, Badham *v.*
 Birmingham Stopper and Cycle
 Components Co., Griffiths *v.*
 Birmingham Vinogar Brewery Co.,
 Powell *v.*
 Bishop, Gosnell *v.*
 Black, Preston *v.*
 Blake, Griffith *v.*
 Blaud Light Syndicate, Ltd., Cass *v.*
 Bleaden, Galloway *v.*
 Bloomer, Honiball *v.*
 Booth, Van Berkel *v.*
 Blore, Denley *v.*
 Board, Osborne *v.*
 Boffin, Wharton *v.*
 Bolland, Hull *v.*
 Bostock, Foxwell *v.*
 Boulton, Hornblower *v.*
 Boursier, Elmslie *v.*
 Bower, Cutler *v.*
 Bowker, Farbenfabriken vorm. F.
 Bayer *v.*
 Bowman, Collinge *v.*
 Boyle, Kane *v.*
 Braby, Heathfield *v.*
 Braby, Rose's Patents Co. *v.*
 Bradbury, Arnold *v.*
 Bradbury, Haydock *v.*
 Bradley, Garnett *v.*
 Bradley, Middleton *v.*
 Braithwaite, Cochrane *v.*
 Brand, Gibson *v.*
 Branson, Morris *v.*
 Bratby, Codd *v.*
 Branlick, British Westinghouse Elec-
 tric and Manufacturing Co., Ltd. *v.*
 Bray, Sugg *v.*
 Brett, Electric Telegraph Co. *v.*
 Bridges, Bidder *v.*
 Brierly, Dutton *v.*
 Brimmerstaedt & Co., Von der Linde
v.
 Brindle, Savage *v.*
 Brindle, Savage Bros., Ltd. *v.*

LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS. lxxv

- Bristol Electric Equipments Co.,
 Ld., Cooper Patent Anchor Rail
 Co., Ld. *v.*
 Bristol Tanning Co., Greer *v.*
 British and Colonial Motor-Car Co.,
 Ld., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co.,
 Ld. *v.*
 British Caloris Co., Thermos, Ld. *v.*
 British Cotton and Wool Dyers Asso-
 ciation, Ld., Rhodes and Edmond-
 son *v.*
 British Leather Cloth Manufacturing
 Co., Ld., Pegamoid, Ld. *v.*
 British Oxygen Co., Ld., British
 Liquid Air Co., Ld. *v.*
 British Radio Telegraph and Tele-
 gram Co., Ld., Marconi *v.*
 British Thomson-Houston Co., Ld.,
 Ferranti *v.*
 Britton, Atkinson *v.*
 Broadbent, Gardner *v.*
 Broadfoot & Sons, Ld., Stone & Co.,
 Ld. *v.*
 Brodie, Williams *v.*
 Brodribb, Brodribb *v.*
 Brogden, Incandescent Gas Light
 Co. *v.*
 Brookes, Fellows *v.*
 Brooks, Dicks *v.*
 Brooks, Lycett Saddle and Motor
 Accessories Co., Ld. *v.*
 Brooks, Norton *v.*
 Brotherhood, Halsey *v.*
 Brown, Amory *v.*
 Brown, Hastings *v.*
 Browne, Saull *v.*
 Brunnerstaedt & Co., Von der Linde
v.
 Bryant and May, Fusee Vesta Co. *v.*
 Bryant Trading Syndicate, True
 and Variable Electric Lamp Syn-
 dicate *v.*
 Buccleugh (Duke), Wakefield *v.*
 Buchanan, Smith *v.*
 Buckingham and Adams Cycle and
 Motor Co., Ld., Dunlop Pneumatic
 Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
 Buckingham, Smith *v.*
 Bull, Boulton *v.*
 Bull, Ledgard *v.*
 Bull, Petman *v.*
 Buller, Elsey *v.*
 Buller, Smith *v.*
 Burns, Overton *v.*
 Bury, Bradford Dyers Association *v.*
 Bury (Lord), Bennett *v.*
 Bustinghaus & Co., Ld., Wellman,
 Leaver and Head, Ld. *v.*
 Butler, Butler *v.*
 Byles, Kelly *v.*
 CAMPBELL, Graham *v.*
 Came, Consolidated Car Heating
 Co. *v.*
 Campbell, Speckhart *v.*
 Cantelo, Incandescent Gas Light Co.
v.
 Capper, Hollins *v.*
 Carpenter, Wenham *v.*
 Carr & Co., Ld., Flour Oxidizing
 Co., Ld. *v.*
 Carson, Mills *v.*
 Carteret, Travell *v.*
 Cash Cycle Co., Pneumatic Tyre
 Co. *v.*
 Caspers, Fabriques de Produits
 Chimiques de Thann *v.*
 Casels and Williamson, Wilson,
 Laidlaw & Co. *v.*
 Cassey, Stewart *v.*
 Casswell, Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
 Castnor-Kellner Alkali Co., Atkins
 and Applegarth *v.*
 Castnor-Kellner Alkali Co., Com-
 mercial Development Corporation
v.
 Castry, Richardson *v.*
 Catherall and Gildard, Spennymoor
 Foundry, Ld. *v.*
 Centaur Cycle Co., Bown *v.*
 Ceralite Syndicate, National Opalite
 Glazed Brick and Tile Syndicate
v.
 Chadburn, Patent Marine Inventions
 Co. *v.*
 Chadburn's (Ship) Telegraph Co.,
 Robinson *v.*
 Chadwick, Amos *v.*
 Chamberlain, Heugh *v.*
 Chambers, Hunt *v.*
 Chambers, Lifeboat Co. *v.*

lxxvi LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS.

- Chameleon Patents Manufacturing Co., Marshalls, Ld. *v.*
 Champion Gas Lamp Co., Wenham Gas Co. *v.*
 Chance, Rawes *v.*
 Chapman, Wollerton and Knowles *v.*
 Charlesworth, Simpson *v.*
 Chemical and Drugs Co., Ld., Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
 Chemische Fabrik von Heyden, Farbenfabriken vormals Friedrich Bayer & Co. *v.*
 Chemische Fabrik vormals Sandoz in Basel, Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.*
 Chisholm, Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
 Christy, Ellwood *v.*
 Chubb, Kayo *v.*
 Church (Walter E.) Engineering Co., Wilson & Co. *v.*
 Churchill & Co., Consolidated Pneumatic Tool Co., Ld. *v.*
 Churchwardens of All Saints, Wigan, R. *v.*
 City of London Electric Lighting Co., Ld., Shelfer *v.*
 City of London Real Property Co., Hunt *v.*
 Clark, Consolidated Pneumatic Tool Co., Ld. *v.*
 Clark, Ellington *v.*
 Clarke, Adie *v.*
 Clarke, Fennessey *v.*
 Clarke, Ormson *v.*
 Clarke, Walker *v.*
 Claughton (Hugh), British United Shoe Machinery Co., Ld. *v.*
 Clayton, Goucher *v.*
 Clayton, Leeds Forge Co. *v.*
 Clayton, Murray *v.*
 Clifton Rubber Co., Ltd., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
 Clipper Pneumatic Tyre Co., Bagot Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
 Clough, Spilsbury *v.*
 Clums, Saxby *v.*
 Clyde Bridge Street Co., Miller *v.*
 Cochran, Boxwell *v.*
 Cockarine, Roger *v.*
 Cockerill, Wood *v.*
 Coignet, Mouchel *v.*
 Colley's Patents, Ticket Punch Register *v.*
 Collings, Cunningham *v.*
 Collyer, Sayers *v.*
 Columbia Co., Edison-Bell Consolidated Phonograph Co., Ld. *v.*
 Combe, Baxter *v.*
 Combined Weighing Machine Co., Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.*
 Commercial Cable Co., Muirhead *v.*
 Commercial Development Corporation, Castner-Kellner Alkali Co. *v.*
 Commissioners of Inland Revenue, Smelting Company of Australia, Ld. *v.*
 Comptroller-General of Patents, *Ex parte* Tomlinson, Queen *v.*
 Conder, Hall *v.*
 Condy, Sanitas Co. *v.*
 Congreve, Walker *v.*
 Conico Incandescent Light Co., Heine *v.*
 Conssett Iron Co., Ld., Martin *v.*
 Consolidated Pneumatic Tool Co., Ld., Ingersoll Sergeant Drill Co. *v.*
 Cooke, Alcock *v.*
 Cooper, Cooper *v.*
 Cooper, Palmer *v.*
 Cope and Timmins, Ld., New Inverted Incandescent Gas Lamp Co., Ld. *v.*
 Corcoran, Wegman *v.*
 Corporation of Hanley, Piggott Co., Ld. *v.*
 Corporation of Liverpool, Adamant Stone Paving Co. *v.*
 Coulson, Newcomen *v.*
 Coventry Machinists Co., Morris Wilson & Co. *v.*
 Coventry Ordnance Works, Ld., Vickers, Sons and Maxim, Ld. *v.*
 Cowan, Bovill *v.*
 Cowley, Russell *v.*
 Cowlin, Hennebique *v.*
 Crabb, Blackwell *v.*
 Crampton, R. *v.*
 Crate, Bovill *v.*
 Craven, Moore *v.*
 Crawley, Rushton *v.*
 Creasy, Elmer *v.*
 Cressey, Case *v.*
 Crosswell, Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*

LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS. lxxvii

- Crichley, Chambers *v.*
 Crichton, Russell *v.*
 Croll, Edge *v.*
 Crompton, Anglo-American Brush
 Electric Light Corporation *v.*
 Crompton and Horrocks, Kerr and
 Hoeggen *v.*
 Crossley, Andrew *v.*
 Crossley, Anti-Vibration Incan-
 descent Lighting Co. *v.*
 Crossley, Coates *v.*
 Cruikshank, Alexander Turnbull &
 Co., Ld. *v.*
 Cubitt & Co., Mouchel *v.*
 Cunard Steamship Co., Washburn
 and Moen Manufacturing Co. *v.*
 Currie, Wotherspoon *v.*
 Curtis and Harvey, Ld., Davies *v.*
 Cutlan, Shoe Machinery Co. *v.*
 Cutler, R. *v.*
 Cutts, Curtis *v.*
 Cyanide Gold Recovery Syndicate,
 Cassel Gold Extracting Co. *v.*
- DAIRY Outfit Co., Aktiebolaget
 Separator *v.*
 D'Albuquerque, Nunn *v.*
 Dale, Punchard *v.*
 Dale, United Telephone Co. *v.*
 Dale, Wallington *v.*
 Dania, Tatham *v.*
 David Moseley & Sons, Ld., Dunlop
 Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
 Davidson, Chappell *v.*
 Davidson, Smith *v.*
 Davies, Day *v.*
 Davies, Lowndes *v.*
 Davies Patent Boiler, Ld., Davies *v.*
 Dawding, Craig *v.*
 Dawson, Badische Anilin und Soda
 Fabrik *v.*
 Dawson, Cutlan *v.*
 Dawson, McNaught *v.*
 Dawson, Saccharin Corporation,
 Ld. *v.*
 Day, Emperor of Austria *v.*
 Day, Shaw *v.*
 Deeley, Perks *v.*
- Deighton's Patent Flue and Tube
 Co., Leeds Forge Co. *v.*
 De la Rue, Sturtz *v.*
 Dellestable, Fox *v.*
 De Mare Incandescent Gas Light
 System, Incandescent Gas Light
 Co. *v.*
 Denny, Weir *v.*
 Dent, Turpin *v.*
 Derby Gas Co., Crossley *v.*
 de Vitro, Betts *v.*
 Dewhurst, Charter *v.*
 Dewick, Fisher *v.*
 Diaper, Orr *v.*
 Dickinson, De la Rue *v.*
 Dickinson, Sellers *v.*
 Dickinson, Smith *v.*
 Dix, Lister *v.*
 Dixon and Mann, Ld., Blackett *v.*
 Dixon, Crossley *v.*
 Dobbie, Cera Light Co. *v.*
 Doig, Dilly *v.*
 Domeiere, Aluminium Co. *v.*
 Donald Macpherson & Co., Lawson *v.*
 Donohoe, United Telephone Co. *v.*
 Dougill, Frenzell *v.*
 Doulton, Allen *v.*
 Down, Fowler *v.*
 Drosophore Co., Dowson Taylor *v.*
 Drysdale, Gwynne *v.*
 Dublin Tramway Co., Ld., British
 Insulated Wire Co., Ld. *v.*
 Duckett, Allen *v.*
 Duerden, Bibby and Baron, Ld. *v.*
 Duncan, Rickerby *v.*
 Dunlop, Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
- EADIE (Albert) Chain, Ld.,
 Appleby's (Alfred) Twin Roller
 Chain, Ld. *v.*
 Eames, Cartwright *v.*
 East London Rubber Co., Pneumatic
 Tyre Co. *v.*
 Easterbrook, Saxby *v.*
 Eastern Archipelago Co., R. *v.*
 Eastern Counties Ry. Co., Greaves
v.
 Easton, Tetley *v.*
 Eastwood, Lister *v.*
 Edelston, Edelston *v.*

lxxviii LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS.

- Edge, Garrard *v.*
 Edge, Johnson *v.*
 Edinburgh and Leith Gas Commissioners, New Conveyor Co., Ld. *v.*
 Edison-Bell Consolidated Phonograph Co., Ld., Berliner *v.*
 Edison Phonograph Co., Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation *v.*
 Edlin-Sinclair Tyre Co., Swain *v.*
 Edwards, Palmer *v.*
 Egerton, Beard *v.*
 Electrical Company, Ld., British Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Co., Ld. *v.*
 Electric Construction Co., Ld., Donnersmarckhütte Oberschlesische Eisen und Kohlenwerke Actien Gesellschaft *v.*
 Electric Lighting Co., Liardet *v.*
 Electrical Co., Mica Insulator Co. *v.*
 Electrical Power Storage Co., Union Electrical Power and Light Co. *v.*
 Eley, Daw *v.*
 Eli, Graham *v.*
 Elkan, Upman *v.*
 Ellams Duplicator Co., Dick *v.*
 Elliott, Newall *v.*
 Else, R. *v.*
 Elsee, Bloxam *v.*
 Emerson, Attorney-General *v.*
 English Card Clothing Co., Ld., Ashworth *v.*
 English Cycle and Tyre Co., Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
 Equitable Telephone Co., United Telephone Co. *v.*
 Evans, Hill *v.*
 Evans, Lamb *v.*
 Evans, Vorwerk *v.*
 Evered, Brown *v.*
 Everington, MacIntosh *v.*
 Everitt Press Manufacturing Co., Watts *v.*
 Excelsior Tyre and Cement Co., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
 Exton Hotels Co., Ld., British Vacuum Co., Ld. *v.*
- FAIRBURN, Household *v.*
 Fairie, Derosne *v.*
- Falcon Works, Downes *v.*
 Fanta, Graham *v.*
 Farquharson, Plating Co. *v.*
 Farrar, Boyd *v.*
 Faulkner, United Telephone Co. *v.*
 Fearby, Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.*
 Feaver, Griffin *v.*
 Fell, Master Wardens and Society of Gunmakers *v.*
 Fellows, Duvergier *v.*
 Feltham, Slazenger *v.*
 Ferguson, Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
 Fernie, Young *v.*
 Fielden, Sidebottom *v.*
 Finch, Bovill *v.*
 Findlater, Siegert *v.*
 Fisher, Alma Veneer Felt Co. *v.*
 Fisher, Crossdale *v.*
 Fleming, United Telephone Co. *v.*
 Flemming, Bentley *v.*
 Fletcher, Dewrance *v.*
 Flour Oxidizing Co., Ld., In the Matter of Andrew's Patent, Alsop Flour Process, Ld. *v.*
 Footman, Blank *v.*
 Forrester, Upman *v.*
 Forsa, Edisonia, Ld. *v.*
 Foster, Claughton *v.*
 Foster, Day *v.*
 Foster, Ford *v.*
 Foster, Hoe *v.*
 Foster, Muntz *v.*
 Fothergill, Neilson *v.*
 Fox, Bush *v.*
 Fox, Holland *v.*
 Foxwell, Thomas *v.*
 Franklin, Hall *v.*
 Franklin Hocking, Franklin Hocking & Co. *v.*
 Franks, Pidding *v.*
 Fraser, Franklin Hocking & Co. *v.*
 Fraser, Hocking *v.*
 Fraser, Macdonald *v.*
 French, Robertson *v.*
 Friswell, British Motor Syndicate, Ld. *v.*
 Friswell, Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
 Fuller, Morgan *v.*
 Fullwood, Fullwood *v.*
 Fussell (A.) & Sons, Ld., British United Shoe Machinery Co., Ld. *v.*

LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS. lxxix

- GAGE, Bethell *v.*
 Gallairs, Betts *v.*
 Gamage (A. W.), *Ld.*, Gillette
 Safety Razor Co., *Ld. v.*
 Gann, Wilson *v.*
 Gardner, Bray *v.*
 Gardner, Nordenfelt *v.*
 Gare Machine Co., English and
 American Machinery Co. *v.*
 Garland, R. *v.*
 Gas Light and Coke Co., Patterson *v.*
 Gaul, Fowler *v.*
 General Incandescent Co., *Ld.*, New
 Inverted Incandescent Gas Lamp
 Co., *Ld. v.*
 General Sewage and Manure Co.,
 MacDougall *v.*
 Gibbs, National Company for the
 Distribution of Electricity by
 Secondary Generators, *Ld. v.*
 Gisborne, Lang *v.*
 Glace, Commissioners of Sewers *v.*
 Glasgow Gas Commissioners,
 Fletcher *v.*
 Globe Light, *Ld.*, New Inverted
 Incandescent Gas Lamp Co., *Ld. v.*
 Gloucester Waggon Co., Saxby *v.*
 Glover (T. W.) & Co., American
 Steel and Wire Co. *v.*
 Goddard, Lyon *v.*
 Goldberg, Davenport *v.*
 Goldstein, Dubowski *v.*
 Goodfellow, Haslam Foundry and
 Engineering Co. *v.*
 Goodier, Bovill *v.*
 Goodman, Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
 Goodwin, Higgs *v.*
 Gormully and Jeffery Manufacturing
 Co., North British Rubber Co. *v.*
 Govan, Williams *v.*
 Grace, Barber *v.*
 Graham, Starey *v.*
 Grand Hotel (Birmingham), *Ld.*,
 National Opalite Glazed Brick
 and Tile Co., *Ld. v.*
 Grand Junction Ry. Co., Newton *v.*
 Gray, Bateman *v.*
 Gray, McCormick *v.*
 Graydon, Bassett *v.*
 Graydon, Roberts *v.*
 Great Eastern Ry. Co., Sheehan *v.*
 Great Northern Ry. Co., Harwood *v.*
 Great Western Ry. Co., Easter-
 brook *v.*
 Great Western Ry. Co., Smith *v.*
 Greaves, Felton *v.*
 Green, Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co.,
Ld. v.
 Green, Mathers *v.*
 Green, Robb *v.*
 Greener, Couchman *v.*
 Greenway, Heathfield *v.*
 Grenfell, Muntz *v.*
 Grimshaw, Huddart *v.*
 Griswold, London and Leicester
 Hosiery Co. *v.*
 Grcom, London and South Western
 Ry. Co. *v.*
 Groth, British Tanning Co. *v.*
 Grovesend Tinsplate Co., Elias *v.*
 Guest, Kane *v.*
 Guest, Williams *v.*
 Gunn, Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
 Guthridge (N.), *Ld.*, Wilfley Ore
 Concentrator Syndicate, *Ld. v.*
- HADLEY, Bovill *v.*
 Hague, Hullett *v.*
 Hague, Losh *v.*
 Hall, Brooks *v.*
 Hall, Halden *v.*
 Hall, Haslam *v.*
 Hall, Stepney Spare Motor Wheel,
Ld. v.
 Hallmark, Heys *v.*
 Hamilton, Hayward *v.*
 Hamling, Scott *v.*
 Hanbury, Philpot *v.*
 Handy, Fuller *v.*
 Henley, Burgess *v.*
 Harcastle, Bramah *v.*
 Harcastle, Haworth *v.*
 Hardie, Hensee *v.*
 Harding, Haws *v.*
 Hare, Taylor *v.*
 Harford, Neilson *v.*
 Hargreaves, Nuttall *v.*
 Harley, Harley *v.*
 Harrap, Birch *v.*
 Harris, Savage *v.*
 Harrison, Edge *v.*

lxxx LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS.

- Harrison, Newby *v.*
 Harrison, United Telephone Co. *v.*
 Harrison Bros., Diamond Steel
 Manufacturing Co. *v.*
 Hart, Colley *v.*
 Hart, Mullins *v.*
 Hartlepoons Pulp and Paper Co.,
 Partington *v.*
 Hartley, Heap *v.*
 Haslam, Dick *v.*
 Haslam, Nickels *v.*
 Hastie, Brown *v.*
 Hatfield, Russell *v.*
 Hawkes, Brunton *v.*
 Haworth, Townsend *v.*
 Hay, Burdett *v.*
 Hay, Gonville *v.*
 Hay, Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
 Haynes, Massey *v.*
 Head, Powell *v.*
 Heald, Steiner *v.*
 Heath, Unwin *v.*
 Heathman, Keeley *v.*
 Heaton, Jones *v.*
 Henery, Alexander *v.*
 Hennett, Saxby *v.*
 Henry, United Telephone Co. *v.*
 Heppenstall, Holliday *v.*
 Hermand Oil Co., Young *v.*
 Herold, Lane *v.*
 Heywood, Roberts *v.*
 Hicks, Lovell *v.*
 Hicks, Musgrave *v.*
 Hickson, Badische Anilin und Soda
 Fabrik *v.*
 Higginbottom, Bunge *v.*
 Higgins, Seed *v.*
 Higham, London and Leicester
 Hosiery Co. *v.*
 Hill, Bennington *v.*
 Hills, Burgess *v.*
 Hindes, Peck *v.*
 Hinks, Rollins *v.*
 Hirsch, Britain *v.*
 Hirschfeld, Leather Cloth Co. *v.*
 Hirst, Osmond *v.*
 Hitchcock, Bovill *v.*
 Hitchcock, Wright *v.*
 Hitchman, Simmonds *v.*
 Hobson, Fritz *v.*
 Hocking, Hocking *v.*
 Hodgson, Hattersley *v.*
 Hoe, Northern Press and Engineer-
 ing Co., Ld. *v.*
 Hoffman, Chollet *v.*
 Holborn Tyre Co., Ld., Dunlop
 Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
 Holden, Oxley *v.*
 Holland, Edison and Swan Co. *v.*
 Holland, Electrolytic Plating Ap-
 paratus Co. *v.*
 Holland, Patterson *v.*
 Holliday, Simpson *v.*
 Holliday, Watson *v.*
 Holt, Spence *v.*
 Homan, Fawcett *v.*
 Homer, British Mutoscope and Bio-
 graph Co., Ld. *v.*
 Hope, Jenkins *v.*
 Hopkins, Linotype and Machinery
 Co., Ld. *v.*
 Hopkinson, Saccharin Corporation,
 Ld. *v.*
 Horrocks, Boyd *v.*
 Horsfall, Ashworth *v.*
 Horsfall, Latas *v.*
 Horton, Allen *v.*
 Hoskins and Sewell, Ld., Exons and
 Taunton, Ld. *v.*
 Hough, Edison-Bell Phonograph
 Corporation *v.*
 Household, Fairburn *v.*
 Howard and Bullough, Tweeddale *v.*
 Howarth, Sykes *v.*
 Howell, Grenwell *v.*
 Hubbard Patents and Tyre Syndi-
 cate, Ld., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre
 Co., Ld. *v.*
 Hubert Unchangeable Eylet Syndi-
 cate, Engels *v.*
 Hudson, Perrin *v.*
 Hughes & Co., Downes *v.*
 Hughes, Rann *v.*
 Hughes, Thomson *v.*
 Hull Steam Fishing and Ice Co.,
 Scott *v.*
 Hulse, Macnamara *v.*
 Humber, Bown *v.*
 Humber, Ld., Stroud *v.*
 Hunt, Hunt *v.*
 Hunt, Thomas *v.*
 Hunters, Ld., Graphic Arts Co. *v.*
 Hurst, Nelson & Co., Ld., Steel Rail-
 way Journal Box Co., Ld. *v.*

LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS. lxxxix

Hutchinson, Flour Oxidizing Co.,
Ld. v.
Hutchinson, Haskell Golf Ball Co.,
Ld. v.
Hutchinson, Haslett v.
Hyde Rubber Co., Ld., Dunlop
Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v.
Hydrocarbon Syndicate, Walker v.

IBBORSON, Crompton v.
Ihlee, Ehrlich v.
Imperial Tramways Co., Ld., Elec-
tric Construction Co., Ld. v.
Incandescent Gas Light Co.,
Heald v.
Incandescent Gas Light Co., Sun-
light Incandescent Gas Lamp
Co. v.
Indiarubber Co., Edison Telephone
Co. v.
Ingersoll Sergeant Drill Co., Con-
solidated Pneumatic Tool Co. v.
Inman, Bishop v.
International Hygienic Society, Au-
tomatic Weighing Machine Co. v.
International Phonograph Indestruc-
tible Record Co., Ld., Lambert
Co. v.
Isaacs, Collyer v.
Isaacs, Rolls v.
Isler, Badische Anilin und Soda
Fabrik v.
Isola, Ld., Thermos, Ld. v.
Ivel Cycle Co., Phillips v.
Ivy, Horne v.
Ixion Patent Pneumatic Tyre Co.,
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v.

JACK, Spencer v.
Jackson, Brown v.
Jackson, Makepeace v.
Jackson, Saccharin Corporation,
Ld. v.
James, Finnegan v.
James, Newburry v.
James, Thomson v.
James, Wilcox and Gibbs' Sewing
Machine Co. v.
Jarve, Dalglish v.

Jarvis, Hall v.
Jebson, Davenport v.
Jennings, Whitton v.
Johnson, Badische Anilin und Soda
Fabrik v.
Johnson, Charter v.
Johnson, Edge v.
Johnson, Hookham v.,
Johnson, Jandus Arc Lamp and
Electric Co., Ld. v.
Johnson, Liardet v.
Johnson, Needham v.
Johnson, Orr-Ewing v.
Jones, Bacon v.
Jones, Canham v.
Jones, Dangerfield v.
Jones, Moser v.
Jones, Nobel's Explosives Co. v.
Jones, Saccharin Corporation, Ld. v.
Jones, Saunders v.
Jones, Shaw v.
Judge of County Court of Halifax,
R. v.

KALLE, Leonardt v.
Karo, Siemens v.
Kaye, Tucker v.
Keating, Stevens v.
Keegan, Incandescent Gas Light
Co. v.
Keeling, Dowler v.
Keen, Cornish v.
Keen, Westhead v.
Keenes (James) & Sons, Ld., West v.
Keighley, Bentley v.
Kelley, Poulton v.
Kennard, Booth v.
Kensington and Knightsbridge Elec-
tric Lighting Co., Lane-Fox v.
Kenyon (Lord), Myddelton v.
Kerr, Guilbert-Martin v.
Kershaw, Nicholls v.
Keyworth, Bovill v.
Kidd, Albo-Carbon Light Co. v.
King, Brown & Co., Anglo-American
Brush Electric Light Corpora-
tion v.
King Mendham & Co., Jardine v.
King, Rothwell v.
Kinnell, Baker v.

lxxxii LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS.

- Kirby, Hogg *v.*
 Kirkman, Meadows *v.*
 Kitchin, Leadbeater *v.*
 Knight, Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.*
 Krebs, British Dynamite Co. *v.*
 Krupp, Vavasseur *v.*
 Kurtz, Gamble *v.*
 Kynock, Batley *v.*
- LAFITTE, Fabriques de Produits Chimiques de Thann et Mulhouse *v.***
 Lambert, Wood *v.*
 Laming, Hills *v.*
 Lamplough, Brooks *v.*
 Lancashire and Yorkshire Ry. Co., Westinghouse *v.*
 Lane-Fox Electrical Co., Kensington and Knightsbridge Electric Light Co. *v.*
 Laporte, Farbenfabriken vorm. F. Bayer *v.*
 Lardeur, Briggs *v.*
 Larmuth, Shillito *v.*
 La Roche, Talbot *v.*
 La Société des Usines du Rhône, Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.*
 Latham, Blakeys *v.*
 Lavater, Walton *v.*
 Law, Ashworth *v.*
 Lawes & Co., Ld., McLay *v.*
 Lawson's Non-Conducting Composition, Ld., Newlith Glass Tile Co., Ld. *v.*
 Leadbitter, Wood *v.*
 Leathem, Quinn *v.*
 Leather, Lister *v.*
 Ledsam, Russell *v.*
 Lee, Jones *v.*
 Lee, Sudbury *v.*
 Leeds Forge Co., Ld., North Eastern Marine Engineering Co., Ld. *v.*
 Leese, Charter *v.*
 Leicester Pneumatic Tyre and Automatic Valve Co., Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
 Levinstein, Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.*
- Levinstein, Cassella *v.*
 Lovinstein, Renard *v.*
 Levinstein, Ld., Vidal Dyes Syndicate, Ld. *v.*
 Levy Bros., Presto Coat Collar Co. *v.*
 Lewis, Davis *v.*
 Leyson, Carter *v.*
 Liebig's Extract of Meat Co., Anderson *v.*
 Lindsay, Gaulard *v.*
 Linford, Otto *v.*
 Linotype Co., Ld., Pashley *v.*
 Lister, R. *v.*
 Livesey, Ward *v.*
 Lloyd, Coppin *v.*
 Lloyd (Edward), Ld., European Eibel Co., Ld. *v.*
 Lloyd, Flower *v.*
 Lockwood, Chartered Institute of Patent Agents *v.*
 Lockwood, Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
 Loe, Frearson *v.*
 London and Globe Telephone and Maintenance Co., United Telephone Co. *v.*
 London and North-Western Ry. Co., Holmes *v.*
 London and North-Western Ry. Co., Sharrod *v.*
 London and South Western Railway Co., British Vacuum Cleaners Co., Ld. *v.*
 London County Council, Cooper Patent Anchor Rail Joint Co., Ld. *v.*
 London County Council, North Metropolitan Tramways Co., Ld. *v.*
 London Gas Light Co., Hills *v.*
 London Phonograph Corporation, Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation *v.*
 London Small Arms Co., Dixon *v.*
 Longford Wire, Iron, and Steel Co., Rowcliffe *v.*
 Longmead, Oldham *v.*
 Loog, Singer Manufacturing Co. *v.*
 Lord Mayor, &c. of Manchester, Geipel *v.*
 Luna Safety Razor Co., Ld., Gillette Safety Razor Co. *v.*

LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS. lxxxiii

- Lund, Axman *v.*
 Lycett (E.), Ld., Brooks *v.*
 Lycett's Saddle and Motor Accessories Co., Ld., Brooks *v.*
 Lyle (D. T. J.) & Son, Ld., Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
 Lyons, Fairfax *v.*
 Lyons, Walcott *v.*
- MABON, Horton *v.*
 Macdonald, Neil *v.*
 Macdonald, Thomson *v.*
 Macfarlane, Templeton *v.*
 Macintosh, North British Rubber Co. *v.*
 MacIvor's Patents, Alliance Pure White Lead Syndicate *v.*
 Mack, Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
 Mackenzie, Bulnois *v.*
 MacKernan, How *v.*
 Mackie, Solvo Laundry Supply Co. *v.*
 Mackintosh, Rothwell *v.*
 Maclaren, Aveling *v.*
 Maddever, Three Towns Banking Co. *v.*
 Magill, Hugh *v.*
 Maignen's Filtro Rapide Co., Parker *v.*
 Malcolmson, Plimpton *v.*
 Malins, Moss *v.*
 Mallett, Dunncliff *v.*
 Maltz, Hague *v.*
 Managers of the Metropolitan Asylums District, Fleet *v.*
 Manchester Steam Tramways Co., Winby *v.*
 Mangnall, McAlpine *v.*
 Mann, Newsum *v.*
 Manton, Manton *v.*
 Marling, Lewis *v.*
 Marples, Leach & Co., Ld., "Z" Electric Lamp Manufacturing Co., Ld. *v.*
 Marsden, Monforts *v.*
 Marsden, Moser *v.*
 Marsh, Miligan *v.*
 Marsh, Steadman *v.*
 Marshall, Kay *v.*
 Marshalls, Ld., Chameleon Patents Manufacturing Co., Ld. *v.*
- Martin, Lyons *v.*
 Martins, Cochrane (T. P.) & Co. *v.*
 Martyn, Ellam *v.*
 Marwood, Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
 Mason, Gawthorp *v.*
 Massam, Thorley's Cattle Food Co. *v.*
 Massey, Pilkington *v.*
 Mather, Birch *v.*
 Matin, Nadol *v.*
 Maxim-Nordenfelt Guns and Ammunition Co., Delta Metal Co. *v.*
 Maxim-Nordenfelt Guns and Ammunition Co., Nordenfelt *v.*
 May, Wenham *v.*
 Mayor and Corporation of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Lyon *v.*
 Mayor, &c. of Bradford, Chamberlain and Hookham, Ld. *v.*
 Mayor, &c. of Huddersfield, Chamberlain and Hookham, Ld. *v.*
 Mayor of Manchester, British Thomson-Houston Co., Ld. *v.*
 Mayor of Manchester, Gadd *v.*
 Mayor of Salford, Automatic Coal-gas Retort Co. *v.*
 McAlpine, Bridson *v.*
 McGeoch, Leggott *v.*
 McGrady (John & Co., Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld. *v.*
 McMillan, Bergman *v.*
 Mechan, Chadburn *v.*
 Menck, National Phonograph Co. of Australia *v.*
 Menzies, Betts *v.*
 Mercantile Bank of Lancashire, Ld., Chatwoods Patent Safe and Lock Co., Ld. *v.*
 Metcalf, R. *v.*
 Metropolitan Gas Meters, Ld., Martins, Ld. *v.*
 Metropolitan Gas Meters, Ld., Meters, Ld. *v.*
 Meyer's Patent, Meyenburg and The Clayton Anilin Co.'s Application *v.*
 M'Grundy & Co., Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.*
 Middleton, Morton *v.*
 Midland Acetylene (Parent) Syndicate, Acetylene Illuminating Co., Ld. *v.*

lxxxiv LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS.

- Midland Lighting Co., Société Anonyme pour la Fabrication d'Appareils d'Eclairage *v.*
 Midland Ry. Co., Stark *v.*
 Miles, Earl de la Warr *v.*
 Mill, R. *v.*
 Millard, Grover and Baker Sewing Machine Co. *v.*
 Miller, Lucas *v.*
 Minerals Separation, Ltd., British Ore Concentration Syndicate, Ltd. *v.*
 Mitchell, Perry *v.*
 Monopole Cycle and Carriage Co., Ltd., Spaul *v.*
 Monto Video Gas Co., Jones *v.*
 Moore, Bovill *v.*
 Moore, Jordan *v.*
 Moore, Thomson *v.*
 Moorwood, Crossthaite *v.*
 Morgan, Burt *v.*
 Morgan, Knott *v.*
 Morgan, Shrewsbury and Talbot Cab Co. *v.*
 Morley, Mandelberg *v.*
 Morris, Rowcliffe *v.*
 Morris, Young *v.*
 Mort, Parnell *v.*
 Mottershead, United Telephone Co. *v.*
 Moule's Earth Closet, Baird *v.*
 Moulton, Hancock *v.*
 Mower, Minter *v.*
 Moy (Ernest F.), Ltd., Reason Manufacturing Co., Ltd. *v.*
 Mullinar, Redges *v.*
 Muntz Metal Co., Drake *v.*
 Murdock, Warner *v.*
 Mussary, R. *v.*
 Mutual Cycle and Manufacturing Co., Ltd., Osmond *v.*
- NAIRN, Linoleum Co. *v.*
 Nash, Williams *v.*
 National Bolivian Navigation Co., Republic of Bolivia *v.*
 National Exhibitions Association, Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.*
- National Saccharin Co., Ltd., Saccharin Corporation, Ltd. *v.*
 Neal, Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ltd. *v.*
 Neal, Smith *v.*
 Needle, Jackson *v.*
 Neilson, Baird *v.*
 Neilson, Betts *v.*
 Neilson, Househill Co. *v.*
 Neilson, R. *v.*
 Neilson, United Telephone Co. *v.*
 Nelson, Swinborne *v.*
 New Incandescent Mantle Co., Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.*
 New Ixion Tyre and Cycle Co., Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
 New Lamb Tyre Co., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ltd. *v.*
 New Seddon Pneumatic Tyre and Self-closing Tube Co., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
 New Townsend Cycle Co., Ltd., Dover (H. W.) and Dover, Ltd. *v.*
 Newton Hindmarch on Patents, R. *v.*
 Nicholls, Clark *v.*
 Nicholson, Harrison Patents Co., Ltd. *v.*
 Nicholson, Murchland *v.*
 Nickalls, Merry *v.*
 Nightingale, Arkwright *v.*
 Nobel's Explosive Co., Ltd., Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.*
 Noel, Betts *v.*
 Norden, Heine *v.*
 North British Ry. Co., Adams *v.*
 North British Rubber Co., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ltd. *v.*
 North British Rubber Co., Ltd., Gormully and Jeffery Manufacturing Co., Ltd. *v.*
 North Somerset Ry. Co., Bristol *v.*
 Norton, Geary *v.*
 Norton, Lister *v.*
 Nott, Electric Telegraph Co. *v.*
 Nottingham Manufacturing Co., Lamb *v.*
 Nurse, Hewett *v.*
 Nuttall, Cannington *v.*
 Nuttall, Cheetham *v.*
 Nye, Williams *v.*

LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS. lxxxv

- OATES, Allen *v.*
 Oldham, Cheetham *v.*
 O'Neill and Brown, Gall *v.*
 Oppenheim, Wittman *v.*
 Ore Concentration Co., Ltd., Minerals Separation, Ltd. *v.*
 Orme Evans & Co., Ltd., Presto Gear Case and Components Co., Ltd. *v.*
 Osborne, Hind *v.*
 Osgerby, Hudson *v.*
 Osram Lamp Works, Ltd., "Z" Electric Lamp Manufacturing Co., Ltd. *v.*
 Owen, Peters *v.*
 Owens, Tadman *v.*
 Oxley, Needham *v.*
- PAIN, Schermuly *v.*
 Palmer, Parrott *v.*
 Parker, Manton *v.*
 Parker, Mountain *v.*
 Parmentier, Mathews *v.*
 Parnell, Dredge *v.*
 Parr, Potter *v.*
 Parr (J.) & Co., Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
 Partington, McDougall *v.*
 Passberg Grain Syndicate, Stavert *v.*
 Patent Oxonite Co., Anderson *v.*
 Patents and Machine Improvements Co., Ltd., Hickton's Patent Syndicate *v.*
 Patents Investments Co., Crampton *v.*
 Paterson, Montgomerie *v.*
 Patterson, United Telephone Co. *v.*
 Patterson, Washburn and Moen Manufacturing Co. *v.*
 Pattullo, Hutchinson *v.*
 Pavement Light Co., Hayward *v.*
 Payne, Blofield *v.*
 Payne, Elwes *v.*
 Peach, Crofts *v.*
 Peacock, International Harvester Company of America *v.*
 Pearce, Cook *v.*
 Pearce, Jones *v.*
 Pearson, Morrell *v.*
- Pearson, Whately *v.*
 Penn, Dobbs *v.*
 Perks, Deeley *v.*
 Perks, Westley, Richards & Co. *v.*
 Perry, Lawrence *v.*
 Perry, Skinner *v.*
 Phillips, Davenport *v.*
 Phillips (John) & Co., Lynch and Henry Wilson & Co., Ltd. *v.*
 Picard, Edwards & Co. *v.*
 Picksley, Bamlett *v.*
 Pimm, Bovill *v.*
 Pinto Leite, Craven *v.*
 Pintsch's Patent Lighting Co., Douglass *v.*
 Piper, Gregory *v.*
 Pirrie, Elmore *v.*
 Pitcher, McGrunther *v.*
 Pitman, Nicols *v.*
 Plaff, Deutsche Nähmaschinen Fabrik vorm. Wertheim *v.*
 Plane, Harmer *v.*
 Platt, Curtis *v.*
 Pneumatic Tyre and Brook's Cycling Agency, Edlin *v.*
 Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ltd., Palmer Tyre Co., Ltd. *v.*
 Pointon, Pooley *v.*
 Postill, Hoffman *v.*
 Pott, Cassels and Williamson, Watson, Laidlaw & Co., Ltd. *v.*
 Potter, Crossley *v.*
 Potter, Walton *v.*
 Pratt, Jupe *v.*
 Prescott, Pickard *v.*
 Price, Crane *v.*
 Price, Macfarlane *v.*
 Price, Savory *v.*
 Priestman, Rockliffe *v.*
 Prosser, R. *v.*
 Provezende, Seixo *v.*
 Province of Brescia Steam Tramways Co., Fraser *v.*
 Puncture Proof Pneumatic Tyre Co., Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
 Purday, Chappell *v.*
 Purser, Lawes *v.*
 Pyatt, Allen *v.*

lxxxvi LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS.

- QUEEN, Feather *v.*
 Quick, Southwark and Vauxhall
 Water Co. *v.*
 Quincey, Saccharin Corporation,
 Ld. *v.*
- RAMSEY Urban District Council,
 Bostock *v.*
 Raphael, Wood *v.*
 Ratner Safe Co., Ld., Chatwood's
 Patent Safe and Lock Co., Ld. *v.*
 Rawlinson, Coleman *v.*
 Rawson, Allen *v.*
 Read, Holliday & Sons, Ld., Vidal
 Dyers Syndicate, Ld. *v.*
 Reddaway, Gandy *v.*
 Redgate, Bates *v.*
 Reitmeyer, Saccharin Corporation,
 Ld. *v.*
 Reliance Tyre Co., Birmingham
 Pneumatic Tyre Syndicate *v.*
 Remus, Actien Gesellschaft für Car-
 tonagen Industrie *v.*
 Rendell, Underwood & Co., Ltd.,
 Brooks (A. B.) & Co., Ld. *v.*
 Rennie, Mackelcan *v.*
 Reynolds, Mitchell *v.*
 Reynolds, Nettlefolds *v.*
 Richards, Davenport *v.*
 Richards, Patent Type Foundry
 Co. *v.*
 Richardson, Benno Jaffé und Darm-
 staedter Lanolin Fabrik *v.*
 Richardson, Bereton *v.*
 Richardson, Universities of Oxford
 and Cambridge *v.*
 Richez, Wool, Hide and Skin Syнди-
 cate *v.*
 Riekman, Thierry *v.*
 Riemer, Incandescent Gas Light
 Co. *v.*
 Rimington, Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre
 Co., Ld. *v.*
 Riviere, Forsyth *v.*
 Roberts, Ashworth *v.*
 Roberts, Smith *v.*
 Robertson, Bailey *v.*
 Robertson, Holste *v.*
 Robinson, Germ Milling Co. *v.*
- Roburite Explosives Co., Lancashire
 Explosives Co. *v.*
 Rodgers, Stocker *v.*
 Roe, Taylor *v.*
 Rogers, Steers *v.*
 Rolte, Gordon *v.*
 Rosenberg, Edison-Bell Consolidated
 Phonograph Co., Ld. *v.*
 Rosenthal, Young *v.*
 Rosenwald, Kopp *v.*
 Ross, Nickels *v.*
 Ross, Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
 Rotax Motor Accessories Co., Lake
 and Elliot *v.*
 Rothwell, Harris *v.*
 Rowland, Peckover *v.*
 Royle, Challender *v.*
 Rudge's Cycle Co., Singer *v.*
 Ruhl, Gramophone Co., Ld. *v.*
 Runcorn Soap and Alkali Co., Hen-
 derson *v.*
 Russell, Ledsam *v.*
 Rylands, Davenport *v.*
 Rylands, Hazelhurst *v.*
 Rylands, Useful Patents Co. *v.*
 Rylands' Glass and Engineering Co.,
 Ld., Beavis *v.*
- SAFETY Lift and Elevator Co., Ld.,
 General Electric Co. *v.*
 Safety Lighting Co., Hinks *v.*
 Salisbury, Hoffnung *v.*
 Salvo Laundry Co., Mackie *v.*
 Sampson, Printing and Numerical
 Registering Co. *v.*
 Samuel, Postcard Automatic Supply
 Co. *v.*
 Sansom, Brown *v.*
 Sansum, Woodward *v.*
 Saqui, Cole *v.*
 Saupe, Embossed Metal Plate Co. *v.*
 Saville Street Foundry and Engi-
 neering Co., Marsden *v.*
 Sayer, Herbert *v.*
 Schröder, Actien Gesellschaft für
 Cartonagen Industrie *v.*
 Schwan, Beardsell *v.*
 Scott, Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
 Scott, Smith *v.*
 Seabrook, Combination Hubs, Ld. *v.*

LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS, lxxxvii

- | | |
|--|--|
| Searle, Miller <i>v.</i> | Smith, Bowden's Patent Syndicate (E. M.), Ld. <i>v.</i> |
| Sears, Pickard <i>v.</i> | Smith, Carpenter <i>v.</i> |
| Seaward, Morgan <i>v.</i> | Smith, Cropper <i>v.</i> |
| Seine, R. <i>v.</i> | Smith, Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation <i>v.</i> |
| Senior, Crossthwaite Fire Bar Syndicate <i>v.</i> | Smith, Heath <i>v.</i> |
| Sewell, Moser <i>v.</i> | Smith, Jensen <i>v.</i> |
| Seymer, Patent Bottle Envelope Co. <i>v.</i> | Smith, Kerrison <i>v.</i> |
| Shankey, Duckett <i>v.</i> | Smith, Oddy <i>v.</i> |
| Sharp, Cartsburn Sugar Refining Co. <i>v.</i> | Smith, Ralston <i>v.</i> |
| Sharples, United Telephone Co. <i>v.</i> | Smith (Herbert) & Co., Ld., Reynolds <i>v.</i> |
| Shaw, Barker <i>v.</i> | Smith, Riding <i>v.</i> |
| Shaw, Longbottom <i>v.</i> | Smith, Vidi <i>v.</i> |
| Shaw, Pether <i>v.</i> | Snell, Dansk Rekylriffel Syndikat Aktieselskab <i>v.</i> |
| Sheba Gold Mining Co., African Gold Recovery Co. <i>v.</i> | Société de Lunetiers, Perry <i>v.</i> |
| Shephard, Gavioli <i>v.</i> | Société General d'Electricité, Werderman <i>v.</i> |
| Sherrin, British Motor Syndicate, Ld. <i>v.</i> | Somervell, Hancock <i>v.</i> |
| Sherwood, Defries <i>v.</i> | Somervell, Kenny's Patent Buttonholing Co. <i>v.</i> |
| Shewes, Bickford <i>v.</i> | South Eastern Ry. Co., London Chatham and Dover Ry. Co. <i>v.</i> |
| Shiels, Hendersen <i>v.</i> | Sowerby Bridge Flour Society, Van Gelder Apsimon & Co. <i>v.</i> |
| Shippey, Edison Electric Co. <i>v.</i> | Speight, Tolson <i>v.</i> |
| Shoppee, Binn <i>v.</i> | Spence, Kurtz <i>v.</i> |
| Siddell, Vickers <i>v.</i> | Spence, Mayer <i>v.</i> |
| Siemens Brothers & Co., Ld., Patent Exploitation, Ld. <i>v.</i> | Spiller, Plimpton <i>v.</i> |
| Silber, Sugg <i>v.</i> | Spilsbury, New Ixion Tyre and Cycle Co. <i>v.</i> |
| Silver, Tuck <i>v.</i> | Spirey, Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik <i>v.</i> |
| Simmons, Hicks <i>v.</i> | Sponge, Heine <i>v.</i> |
| Simms, Colburn <i>v.</i> | Spottiswood, Bacon <i>v.</i> |
| Simon, Parkinson <i>v.</i> | Squire, Herrberger <i>v.</i> |
| Simon Collier, Ld., British United Shoe Machinery Co., Ld. <i>v.</i> | Standard Piston Ring and Engineering Company, Ld., Robertson <i>v.</i> |
| Simplex Gear Case Co., Ld., Presto Gear Case and Components Co., Ld. <i>v.</i> | Starbuck Waggon Co., Eades <i>v.</i> |
| Singer, Otto <i>v.</i> | Stassen, Singer <i>v.</i> |
| Singer Manufacturing Co., Ld., Gammons <i>v.</i> | Steel, Brooks <i>v.</i> |
| Singer Manufacturing Co., Nähmaschinen Fabrik <i>v.</i> | Steel, Crossthwaite <i>v.</i> |
| Skidmore, Saccharin Corporation, Ld. <i>v.</i> | Steel, Otto <i>v.</i> |
| Skinner, Perry <i>v.</i> | Stephens, Edgebury <i>v.</i> |
| Sluces, Incandescent Gas Light Co. <i>v.</i> | Stepney Spare Motor Wheel, Ld., Hall <i>v.</i> |
| Smethurst, Cochrane <i>v.</i> | Sterckx, Shrewsbury and Talbot Cab Co. <i>v.</i> |
| Smith, Bancroft <i>v.</i> | Sterious, Taddy <i>v.</i> |
| Smith, Bovill <i>v.</i> | Stevens, Parkes <i>v.</i> |

lxxxviii LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS.

- Stevens, Watling *v.*
 Stevenson, Boake Roberts & Co. *v.*
 Stevenson, Hess *v.*
 Stevenson, Temler *v.*
 Stewart, Crossley *v.*
 Stewart, United Horseshoe and Nail
 Co. *v.*
 St. George, United Telephone Co. *v.*
 St. James Electric Light Co., Hop-
 kinson *v.*
 Stone, Wyeth *v.*
 Stone and Corser, Dunlop Pneumatic
 Tyre Co. *v.*
 Stott, Tangye *v.*
 Stowers, York *v.*
 Stubbs, Horrocks *v.*
 Suction Cleaners, Ld., British
 Vacuum Cleaners Co., Ld. *v.*
 Sugg, Ungar *v.*
 Sun Fan Co., Ld., Davidson *v.*
 Sunlight Incandescent Gas Lamp
 Co., Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.*
 Sutton Lodge Chemical Co., Proc-
 tor *v.*
 Sutton, Swabey *v.*
 Swears, Nicoll *v.*
 Swedish Horse Nail Co., United
 Horseshoe and Nail Co. *v.*
 Syer, Humpherson *v.*
 Szalay, Sandow *v.*
- TANGYES, Magee *v.*
 Tasker, United Telephone Co. *v.*
 Tate, Burnett *v.*
 Taunton, Pow *v.*
 Taylor, Annand *v.*
 Taylor, Bailey *v.*
 Taylor, Bowman *v.*
 Taylor & Sons (John), Ld., British
 Motor Syndicate, Ld. *v.*
 Taylor, Harrison *v.*
 Taylor, Hilleary *v.*
 Taylor, Millar *v.*
 Taylor, Siemens *v.*
 Taylor, Willoughby *v.*
 Taylor, Maddox & Co., Wrightson *v.*
 Temler, Actien Gesellschaft für Car-
 tonagen Industrie *v.*
 Terry, Hyam *v.*
- Thierry, Rickman *v.*
 Thomas, Hill *v.*
 Thompson, Guyot *v.*
 Thompson, Neilson *v.*
 Thomson, American Braided Wire
 Co. *v.*
 Thomson, Badische Anilin und Soda
 Fabrik *v.*
 Thomson, British United Shoe
 Machinery Co., Ld. *v.*
 Thomson, Dudgeon *v.*
 Thomson, Hill *v.*
 Thomson, Moore *v.*
 Thorley's (T. W.) Cattle Food Co.,
 Massam *v.*
 Tilghman's Patent Sand Blast Co.,
 Société Anonyme de Manufactures
 de Glaces *v.*
 Timmis' Patent, Currie *v.*
 Tindal, Wilson *v.*
 Tobin, Ruston *v.*
 Todd, Stoner *v.*
 Tolley, Westley *v.*
 Tombs, Hill *v.*
 Tomey, Crossley *v.*
 Toms, White *v.*
 Toope, Pascall *v.*
 Tootal Broadhurst Lee Co., Boyd *v.*
 Topham, Leaf *v.*
 Touts, Hill *v.*
 Townsend, Davies *v.*
 Townsend, R. *v.*
 Townsend (R.) & Co., Ld., Molas-
 sine Co., Ld. *v.*
 Trapp & Co., Adhesive Dry Mount-
 ing Co., Ld. *v.*
 Tremere, Lainsou *v.*
 Trigg, Hall *v.*
 Truman, Hall *v.*
 Tubeless Tyre and Capon Heaton,
 Ld., Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
 Tullis, Dick *v.*
 Tupper, Morewood *v.*
 Turner, Beard *v.*
 Turner, Elliot *v.*
 Turner, Winter *v.*
 Turton, Turton *v.*
 Tweedale, Howard *v.*

LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS. lxxxix

- ULLMANN, Gramophone and Typewriter, Ld. *v.*
 Union Boot and Shoe Machine Co., English and American Machinery Co. *v.*
 Union Oil Mills, Wilson *v.*
 United Alkali Co., Ld., Acetylene Illuminating Co., Ld. *v.*
 United Flexible Metallic Tubing Co., Ld., Crowther *v.*
 United Motor Co., De Young *v.*
 United Rubber Works, Ld., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
 United Telephone Co., Barney *v.*
 Unwin, Heath *v.*
 Upton, Smith *v.*
 Urry, Automatic Diversions Syndicate *v.*
 Usher, Lines *v.*
- VAN Vlissingen, Caldwell *v.*
 Vaucher, Newton *v.*
 Vestry of Bermondsey, Attorney-General *v.*
 Vickers, Siddell *v.*
 Victoria Press Manufacturing Co., Elder *v.*
 Victoria Rubber Co., Moseley *v.*
 Vivian, Muntz *v.*
- WAGSTAFFE, Palmer *v.*
 Wakeham, Legge *v.*
 Walker, Betts *v.*
 Walker, Cheaving *v.*
 Walker, Collins *v.*
 Walker Mitchell, John Varey, Ld. *v.*
 Walker, Power *v.*
 Walker, United Telephone Co. *v.*
 Wallington, Weston & Co., Sirdar Rubber Co., Ld. *v.*
 Wallis, Crow *v.*
 Wallis, R. *v.*
 Wallis and Stevens, Ld., Foden *v.*
 Wallwork, Cleaver *v.*
 Walter, Patent Type Founding Co. *v.*
 Wapshaw Tube Co., Ld., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
 Warmer, Stocker *v.*
- Warrillow, Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
 Water Tube Boiler and Engineering Co., Babcock and Wilcox, Ld. *v.*
 Waterloo & Co., Driffield *v.*
 Watson, Gratton *v.*
 Watson, Haggemacher *v.*
 Watts, Beston *v.*
 Webb, Copeland *v.*
 Webb, Kynoch & Co., Ld. *v.*
 Webber, Howes *v.*
 Webber, Parmenter *v.*
 Webster, Foxwell *v.*
 Welch, Thomas *v.*
 Weldite, Ld., Thermit, Ld. *v.*
 Weller, Fradella *v.*
 Wells, Minter *v.*
 Wells, Parker *v.*
 Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld., Bevan *v.*
 West London Cycle Works, Lees *v.*
 West London Rubber Co., Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
 Wheeler, R. *v.*
 White, Baker *v.*
 White (R.) & Sons, Ld., Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
 White, Thomson & Co., Kelvin *v.*
 White, Young *v.*
 Whitecross Co., Lang *v.*
 Whitehead, Duckett *v.*
 Whitlingham, Cooper *v.*
 Whitworth, Roskell *v.*
 Wholesale Incandescent Fittings Co., Anti - Vibration Incandescent Lighting Co., Ld. *v.*
 Wigan & Co., Lee *v.*
 Wigg, Brooke *v.*
 Wilby, Gillett *v.*
 Wild, Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
 Wild, Wheatstone *v.*
 Wild, Wren *v.*
 Wilk's Patent, Thornborough *v.*
 Williams, Elsas *v.*
 Williams, Minter *v.*
 Williams, Stead *v.*
 Williams, Thomas *v.*
 Williams, Williams *v.*
 Wills, Dawson *v.*
 Wilmott, Betts *v.*
 Wilson, Clement Talbot, Ld. *v.*
 Wilson, Bowden's Patent Syndicate, Ld. *v.*

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Wilson, Church (Walter C.) Engineering Co. <i>v.</i>
 Wilson, Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ltd. <i>v.</i>
 Wilson, Fenner <i>v.</i>
 Wilson, Grover and Baker Sewing Machine Co. <i>v.</i>
 Wilson, Newall <i>v.</i>
 Wilson, Singer Manufacturing Co. <i>v.</i>
 Wilson & Co. (Barnsley), Ltd., Wilson <i>v.</i>
 Wilson & Co. (Barnsley), Ltd., Wilson Brothers Bobbin Co., Ltd. <i>v.</i>
 Windover, Morgan <i>v.</i>
 Winter, Thomas <i>v.</i>
 Winter, Turner <i>v.</i>
 Winyard, Youatt <i>v.</i>
 Wolff, Marsh <i>v.</i>
 Wolstenholms, Jackson <i>v.</i>
 Wood, Lister <i>v.</i>
 Wood, Siddell and Hilton, Ltd. <i>v.</i>
 Wood, Trotman <i>v.</i>
 Woodhouse, Edison and Swan Co. <i>v.</i>
 Woodley, David <i>v.</i>
 Worthing Skating Rink Co., Thorn <i>v.</i>
 Wren, Bercham <i>v.</i></p> | <p>Wright, Bessmans <i>v.</i>
 Wright, Hassall <i>v.</i>
 Wright and Butler, Ltd., Tilghman's Patent Sand Blast Co. <i>v.</i>
 Wrightson, Richmond & Co., Ltd. <i>v.</i>
 Wrigley, Bainbridge <i>v.</i>
 Wyatt, Johnson <i>v.</i></p> <p>YATES, Mathias <i>v.</i>
 Yeatley Vacuum Hammer Co., Pillington <i>v.</i>
 York Street Flax Spinning Co., Pirrie <i>v.</i>
 Young, Adair <i>v.</i>
 Young, Edison United Phonograph <i>v.</i>
 Young, Fernie <i>v.</i>
 Young, Morris <i>v.</i>
 Young, Scott <i>v.</i>
 Yuill, May <i>v.</i></p> <p>ZIMMER, Wood <i>v.</i></p> |
|---|--|

LETTERS PATENT FOR INVENTIONS.

CHAPTER I.

THE STATUTE LAW OF PATENTS.

THE existing statute law of England relating to Letters Patent for Inventions consists of the unrepealed portions of the Statute of Monopolies (*a*), the Patents and Designs Act, 1907 (*b*), and the Patents and Designs Act, 1908 (*c*).

Statute Law.
Existing statutes.

Before the reign of James I., the Sovereigns of England laid claim to, and exercised, the right of granting monopolies of carrying on certain trades, or producing various articles within the realm, or importing them from other countries.

Early monopolies.

These monopolies were given to the recipients in respect of services rendered by them, or as marks of royal favour.

The system of creating monopolies was made the means on various occasions of raising large sums of money for the expenditure of the government, and the support of the Crown, to the detriment of the public at large.

Under the Tudor Sovereigns monopolies were granted to such an extent, and became so monstrously oppressive, that, finally, in the twenty-first year of James I., Parliament passed the celebrated Statute of Monopolies (*d*), which, *as a declaration of the Common Law on the subject*, must be considered as the foundation of our modern patent laws.

Statute of Monopolies.

The Statute of Monopolies is the earliest statute which relates to grants of the sole use and exercise of inventions, though several Acts had been previously passed for suppressing various illegal monopolies (*e*).

(*a*) 21 Jac. 1, c. 3.

(*b*) 7 Edw. 7, c. 29.

(*c*) 8 Edw. 7, c. 4.

(*d*) 21 Jac. 1, c. 3.

(*e*) See Mag. Ch. c. 30; 9 Edw. 3,

st. 1, c. 1; Stat. of Cloths (25 Edw. 3, c. 2); Stat. 27 Edw. 3, st. 2; 28 Edw. 3, c. 13, s. 3; 31 Edw. 3, c. 10; 2 Ric. 2, st. 1, c. 1; 7 Hen. 7, c. 9; and 12 Hen. 7, c. 6.

Statute
Law.

There is no doubt, however, that the Crown, before the Statute of Monopolies, did exercise the right, which it claimed at Common Law, of granting to inventors the sole use and exercise of their inventions. There are several reported cases dealing with grants of letters patent from the Crown to inventors before 1623, the date of the statute (*f*), and the practice is referred to by the early text-writers (*g*).

The unrepealed portions of the Statute of Monopolies (*h*) recite and enact, shortly, as follows:—

The preamble recites:

“Forasmuch as your most excellent Majesty, in your royal judgment, and of your blessed disposition to the weal and quiet of your subjects, did in the year of our Lord God one thousand six hundred and ten, publish in print to the whole realm and to all posterity, that all grants of monopolies, and of the benefit of any penal laws, or of power to dispense with the law or to compound for the forfeiture, are contrary to your Majesty’s laws, which your Majesty’s declaration is truly consonant and agreeable to the ancient and fundamental laws of this your realm: And whereas your Majesty was further graciously pleased expressly to command that no suitor should presume to move your Majesty for matters of that nature; yet, nevertheless, upon *misinformations* and *untrue pretences of public good*, many such grants have been unduly obtained and unlawfully put in execution to the great grievance and inconvenience of your Majesty’s subjects, contrary to the laws of this your realm, and contrary to your Majesty’s most royal and blessed intention so published as aforesaid: For avoiding whereof and preventing the like in time to come, may it please your excellent Majesty,” &c.

The first section declares and enacts that:—

“All monopolies and all commissions, grants, licences, charters, and letters patent heretofore made or granted,

† (*f*) *Darcy v. Allin* (1602), Noy R. 182; 1 W. P. C. 5; *Hastings’ Case* (1561), Noy R. 182; 1 W. P. C. 6; *Clothworkers of Ipswich Case* (1615), Godb. 252; S. C. 1 Rol. R. 4; *Mitchell v. Reynolds* (1713), 1 P. Wms. 181;

10 Mod. 130.

(*g*) Sheppard’s Abridgment, part iii. tit. Prerog. p. 61; Hawkins, Pleas of the Crown, bk. i. c. 79, s. 20; Coke, 3 Inst. 184.

(*h*) See Vol. II., p. 251.

or hereafter to be made or granted, to any person or persons, bodies politic or corporate, whatsoever, of or for the sole buying, selling, making, working, or using of anything within this realm or the dominion of Wales, or of any other monopolies, or of power, liberty, or faculty to dispense with any others; or to give licence or toleration to do, use or exercise anything against the tenor or purport of any law or statute; or to give or make any warrants for any such dispensation, licence, or toleration, to be had or made, or to agree or compound with any others for any penalty or forfeitures limited by any statute or of any grant or promise of the benefit, profit, or commodity of any forfeiture, penalty, or sum of money, that is or shall be due by any statute before judgment thereupon had, and all proclamations, inhibitions, restraints, warrants of assistance, and all other matters and things whatsoever, any way tending to the instituting, erecting, strengthening, furthering, or countenancing of the same or any of them, *are altogether contrary to the laws of this realm, and so are and shall be utterly void and of none effect, and in nowise to be put in use or execution.*"

The second section provides that all monopolies, and all such grants, letters patent, &c., ought to be, and shall be, tried by the common laws of the realm, and not otherwise.

The third section provides that all persons shall be disabled and incapable to have or exercise any monopoly, or any such grant, letters patent, &c., as aforesaid.

The fourth section provides that any person aggrieved by any monopoly, or any such commission, grant, letters patent, &c., shall have a remedy by action to recover treble damages and double costs, and imposes the penalties of præmunire upon persons delaying such actions except by authority of the Court.

The fifth and sixth sections refer to letters patent for inventions, and exclude them from the effect of the foregoing clauses, which effectually suppressed all illegal monopolies, and deprived the Crown of all claims to grant such monopolies in the future, and also of all power to prevent persons aggrieved from pursuing their legal remedies.

**Statute
Law.**

The repealed fifth section referred to patents already granted, and declared that none of them should be of any force for a longer period than twenty-one years from the date of the grant.

The terms of the sixth section, which deals with patents to be granted after the date of the statute, are as follows:—

“Provided also that any declaration before mentioned shall not extend to any letters patent and grants of privilege, for the term of fourteen years or under, hereafter to be made, *of the sole working, or making of any manner of new manufactures within this realm, to the true and first inventor and inventors of such manufactures, which others at the time of making such letters patents and grants shall not use*, so as also they be not contrary to the law, or mischievous to the State, by raising prices of commodities at home, or hurt of trade, or generally inconvenient; the said fourteen years to be accounted from the date of the first letters patents or grants of such privilege hereafter to be made, but that the same shall be of such force as they should be if this Act had never been made and of none other.”

Acts between
1623 and
1883.

Between the years 1623 and 1883 many statutes relating to letters patent for inventions were passed and repealed.

Acts between
1883 and
1907.

In 1883 the Statute Law then relating to Patents for Inventions, Registration of Designs, and of Trade Marks, was amended and consolidated by the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883 (*i*). The Act of 1883 was subsequently amended, or construed, by the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks (Amendment) Act, 1885 (*k*), the Patents Act, 1886 (*l*), the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1888 (*m*), the Patents Act, 1901 (*n*), the Patents Act, 1902 (*o*), and the Trade Marks Act, 1905 (*p*).

The Trade Marks Act, 1905, repealed all the sections of the Acts of 1883 and 1888 which related exclusively to trade marks, and also, in so far as they related to trade marks,

(*i*) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 57.
(*k*) 48 & 49 Vict. c. 63.
(*l*) 49 & 50 Vict. c. 37.
(*m*) 51 & 52 Vict. c. 50.

(*n*) 1 Edw. 7, c. 18.
(*o*) 2 Edw. 7, c. 34.
(*p*) 5 Edw. 7, c. 15.

most of such other sections as had reference to trade marks as well as to patents and designs.

**Statute
Law.**

During the Parliamentary Session of 1907 a Bill was introduced to amend the Law relating to Patents and Designs. The Bill, on August 28, 1907, received the Royal assent and became the Patents and Designs (Amendment) Act, 1907 (*q*). On the same day the Patents and Designs Act, 1907 (*r*), was added to the Statute Book.

Patents and
Designs
(Amendment)
Act, 1907,
and Patents
and Designs
Act, 1907.

It was provided by sect. 51, sub-sect. 2 of the Patents and Designs (Amendment) Act, 1907, that that Act should, save as otherwise expressly provided, come into operation on January 1, 1908. The Act provided that certain sections should come into operation after January 1, 1908, but it did not provide that any of the sections should come into operation before that date.

The Patents and Designs Act, 1907, by sect. 99 provided that, save as otherwise expressly provided, the Act should come into operation on January 1, 1908. Certain sections were to come into operation at a later date, but it was not provided that any section should come into operation before January 1, 1908.

The Patents and Designs Act, 1907, repealed (*inter alia*) the whole of the Patents and Designs (Amendment) Act, 1907.

It is provided by sect. 36, sub-sect. 2 of the Interpretation Act, 1889, that when an Act passed after the commencement of that Act is expressed to come into operation on a particular day, the same shall be construed as coming into operation immediately on the expiration of the previous day. Since the Patents and Designs (Amendment) Act, 1907, and the Patents and Designs Act, 1907, are both expressed to come into operation on the same day, *i.e.* January 1, 1908, it, therefore, follows that the Patents and Designs (Amendment) Act, 1907, was repealed at the moment it would otherwise have come into operation, and, so, never had operative effect.

The Patents and Designs Act, 1907, repealed, as from the commencement of the Act, or as from the date when certain rules came into operation (see sect. 98), the whole of the following Acts:—The Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act,

(*q*) 7 Edw. 7, c. 28.

(*r*) 7 Edw. 7, c. 29.

Statute
Law.

1883; the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks (Amendment) Act, 1885; the Patents Act, 1886; the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1888; the Patents Act, 1901; the Patents Act, 1902; and the Patents and Designs (Amendment) Act, 1907; and re-enacted them, with the exception of certain sections mentioned in the Schedule to the Patents and Designs (Amendment) Act, 1907, which would have been repealed by that Act if it had been of operative effect.

The said sections which are not re-enacted are Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883, sects. 17 (in part), 19, 25, 26 (in part), 29, 34 (in part), 50 (in part), 51 (in part), 54, 59, 90, 91, 98, and 106; Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1888, sect. 24; and Patents Act, 1902, sect. 3 (in part).

Thus the Patents and Designs Act, 1907, gives operative effect to the provisions of the Patents and Designs (Amendment) Act, 1907, and re-enacts most of the provisions of the other repealed Acts relating to patents and designs. It is a Consolidation Act, and its full title is "An Act to consolidate the Enactments relating to Patents for Inventions and the Registration of Designs and Certain Enactments relating to Trade Marks." The "certain enactments relating to Trade Marks" are those sections of the repealed Acts which related to Trade Marks and were not previously repealed by the Trade Marks Act, 1905.

It has not been thought desirable to discuss here the actual details of the alterations in and additions to the law which are effected by the new Act. Such alterations and additions are dealt with hereafter as the various subject-matters thereof are referred to.

By means of tabular statements it is easy to indicate where the re-enacted provisions of the various sections and sub-sections of the repealed Acts occur, and also the nature of the new provisions and where they are embodied in the new Act.

With this object in view the following tables have been prepared. Table I. shows which sections and sub-sections of the repealed Acts are reproduced and where each appears. Table II. indicates the subject-matter of each new provision, and where it is to be found in the Act, as well as the section of the repealed Patents and Designs (Amendment) Act, 1907, by virtue of which it was added to the Statute Book.

TABLE I.

SHOWING WHERE THE RE-ENACTED PROVISIONS OF THE REPEALED ACTS, 1883—1902, ARE TO BE FOUND IN THE PATENTS AND DESIGNS ACT, 1907 (7 EDW. 7, c. 29).

The Act of 1883 (46 & 47 Vict. c. 57).	The Act of 1907 (7 Edw. 7, c. 29).	The Act of 1883 (46 & 47 Vict. c. 57).	The Act of 1907 (7 Edw. 7, c. 29).
S. 4, ss. 1 } 4 2 } 5 1 5 2 5 3 5 4 5 5 6 8 1 8 2 9 1 9 2 9 3 9 4 9 5 10 11 1 11 2 11 3 & 4 12 1 12 2 12 3 13 14 15 16 17 1 17 2, 3 & 4 (a) 17 4 (b) 18 1 18 2 18 3 18 4 18 5 18 6 & 7 18 8 18 9 18 10 19 20 21 23 1 23 2 23 3 24 25 26 1	S. 1, ss. 1 1 2 1 3 2 1 2 2 2 4 3 1 5 1 5 2 6 1 & 2 6 2, 3 (a) & 4 6 4 6 5 68 9 11 1 (a) 11 2 & 3 11 3 12 1 14 1 12 2 13 4 10 14 17 1 17 2 17 3 21 1 21 2 21 3 & 5 21 5 21 4 21 5 21 6 21 7 21 8 22 (substituted) 23 21 (2) & 22 28 1 28 3 28 4 65 18 cf. 25 1	S. 2 i, ss. 2 26 3 26 4 (a) & (b) 26 4 (c) 26 4 (d) 26 4 (e) 26 5, 6 & 7 27 1 & 2 28 1, 2 & 3 29 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6 30 31 32 33 34 1 & 2 35 36 37 38 39 40 1, 2 & 3 41 42 43 1 & 2 44 1—12 45 46 47 1, 2 & 3 47 4 & 5 47 6 & 7 48 1 & 2 49 1 & 2 50 1 50 2 51 52 1 & 2 53 54 55 1 55 2 56 57 58 (a) 58 (b) 59	S. 25, ss. 1 25 2 (a) 25 3 (a) & s. 94 25 3 (b i.) 25 3 (b ii.) 25 3 (b iii.) 98 (which see) 29 31 98 (which see) 34 35 36 14 2 43 1 & 2 15 1 14 1 44 40 45 1 46 1, 2 & 3 47 1 47 2 48 1 & 2 30 1—12 cf. 98 2 93, 94 8 49 1 49 2 49 3 49 1 (see notes). 50 1 & 2 53 54 1 (a) 54 1 (b) 56 1 & 2 57 cf. 58 52 1 52 3 65 59 1 60 1 (a) 60 1 (b) & 2 cf. 60

LETTERS PATENT FOR INVENTIONS.

Statute Law.	The Act of 1883 (46 & 47 Vict. c. 57).	The Act of 1907 (7 Edw. 7, c. 29).	The Act of 1883 (46 & 47 Vict. c. 57).	The Act of 1907 (7 Edw. 7, c. 29).
	S. 60	S. 93	S. 101, ss. 4 & 5	S. 86, ss. 3
	61	93	102	76
	82, ss. 1	62, ss. 1	103 1	91 1
	82 3	62 2	103 2	91 2
	82 4	62 3	103 3	91 3 (b)
	83 1 & 2	63 1 & 2	103 4	91 4
	84	64	104 1	91
	85	66	104 2	88
	86	75	105 1	89 2
	87	71 1 & 3	105 2	89 3
	88	67	106	90
	89	79	107	94 1
	90	cf. 72	108	94 2
	91	cf. 70	109 1 & 2	94 3
	93	89 1	110	95 1
	94	73	111 1	{ 94 4
	95	74		{ 95 2
	96	78	112 1, 2 & 3	96 1, 2 & 3
	97	81	114 1	28 2
	98	cf. 82	114 2	52 2
	99	83	115	98 1
	100	80 1 & 2	116	97
	101 1 & 2	86 1	117	{ 92 1
	101 3	86 2		{ 93

The Act of 1885 (48 & 49 Vict. c. 63).	The Act of 1907 (7 Edw. 7, c. 29).
S. 2	S. 1, ss. 4
3	{ 5 1
4	{ 6 5
5	{ 12 2 (a), (c)
6	69
	1 1
	91 1

The Act of 1886 (49 & 50 Vict. c. 37).	The Act of 1907 (7 Edw. 7, c. 29).
S. 2	S. 2, ss. 3, and Patent Rules, 1908, r. 26.
3	{ 45, ss. 2
	{ 59 2

THE STATUTE LAW OF PATENTS.

**Statute
Law.**

The Act of 1888 (51 & 52 Vict. c. 50).	The Act of 1907 (7 Edw. 7, c. 29).	The Act of 1888 (51 & 52 Vict. c. 50).	The Act of 1907 (7 Edw. 7, c. 29).
S. 1, ss. 1 1 2 1 3 1 4 1 5 2 3 4 5	S. 84, ss. 1 86 1 (g) 84 2 84 3 84 5 3 68 11 1 (d) 21 8	S. 6 7, ss. 1 7 2 21 22 23 24 25	S. 56, ss. 1 60 1 (a) 60 2 71 3 67 cf. 72 1 cf. 70 87

The Act of 1901 (1 Edw. 7, c. 18).	The Act of 1907 (7 Edw. 7, c. 29).
S. 1, ss. 1 1 2	S. 91, ss. 1 (a) 91 3 (a)

The Act of 1902 (2 Edw. 7, c. 34).	The Act of 1907 (7 Edw. 7, c. 29).	The Act of 1902 (2 Edw. 7, c. 34).	The Act of 1907 (7 Edw. 7, c. 29).
S. 1, ss. 1 1 2 1 4 1 5 1 6 1 7 1 8 1 9	S. 7, ss. 1 7 2 68 7 3 7 4 7 5 5 1 7 6	S. 1, ss. 10 2 3 1 3 2 3 3 3 7 4	S. 65 41, ss. 1 24 1 24 2 24 3 24 6 62 3

LETTERS PATENT FOR INVENTIONS.

Statute
Law.

TABLE II.

SHOWING WHICH SECTIONS OF THE PATENTS AND DESIGNS ACT, 1907 (7 EDW. 7, c. 29), INCORPORATE THE NEW LAW INTRODUCED BY THE PATENTS AND DESIGNS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1907 (7 EDW. 7, c. 28).

Subject.	The Act of 1907 (7 Edw. 7, c. 29).	The (Amendment) Act of 1907 (7 Edw. 7, c. 28).
PART I.		
PATENTS.		
<i>Application for and Grant of Patent—</i>		
Specifications	S. 2, ss. 1, 2 & 3	S. 2
Comparison of specifications	2 5	3
Refusal of grant in lieu of references	6 3	8
Extension of investigations	7 4	7
New grounds of opposition	8	6
Extension of period for sealing	11 1 (b) & (c)	10
Date of substituted patent	12 2 (d)	11, ss. 1 & 2
Single patent for cognate inventions	15 2	18
	16 1 & 2	4
<i>Term of Patent—</i>		
Term of patent	17 2	12
Extension of term of patent	18	17
Patents of addition	19	5
<i>Restoration of Lapsed Patents—</i>		
Restoration by comptroller	20	23
<i>Amendment of Specification—</i>		
Amendment by the Court	22	13
<i>Compulsory Licences and Revocation—</i>		
Compulsory licence or revocation	24	16
Revocation on petition	25 2 (b)	25
Revocation by comptroller	26	14
Working outside United Kingdom	27	15
<i>Crown—</i>		
Assignment to Admiralty	30 1—12	21, ss. 1
	30 13	21 2
<i>Legal Proceedings—</i>		
Counterclaim for revocation	32	26
Damages	33	27
<i>Miscellaneous—</i>		
Grant to two or more persons	37	1
Avoidance of certain conditions on sale, &c. of patented articles	38	24
Costs and security for costs	39	46
Provisions as to anticipations	41 2	22
Disconformity	42	9
Patent on application of representa- tive of deceased inventor	43 2	20

Subject.	The Act of 1907 (7 Edw. 7, c. 29).	The (Amendment) Act of 1907 (7 Edw. 7, c. 28).	Statute Law.
PART II.			
DESIGNS.			
<i>Registration of Designs—</i>			
Application for registration	S. 49, ss. 4 49 5	S. 29 (8) 29 (10)	
Registration in new classes	50	33	
<i>Copyright in Registered Designs—</i>			
Copyright on registration	53 2 & 3	31, ss. 1	
Requirements before delivery on sale {	54 1 (b)	32 1	
	54 2	32 2	
Effect of disclosure on copyright	55	31 2	
Inspection of registered designs .. {	56 1	34 1	
	56 2	34 2	
Cancellation of registration of designs used wholly or mainly abroad	58	35	
<i>Legal Proceedings—</i>			
Piracy of registered design..... {	60 1 (a)	36 1	
	60 1 (b)	36 2	
	60 2	36 3	
Application of certain provisions as to patents to designs	61	37	
PART III.			
GENERAL.			
<i>Patent Office and Proceedings thereat—</i>			
Rules as to establishment of branch offices for designs.....	62 4	38	
<i>Provisions as to Registers and other Documents in Patent Office—</i>			
Prohibition of publication of specification, &c., where application is abandoned, &c.	69 2	29 9	
Power of comptroller to correct clerical errors	70	41	
Entry of assignments and trans- missions in registers	71 2	39	
Rectification of registers by Court ..	72	40	
<i>Evidence, &c.—</i>			
Evidence before comptroller	77	45	
Excluded days	82	42	
<i>Register of Patent Agents—</i>			
Agents for patents	85	48	
<i>Offences—</i>			
Penalties for false representations....	89 4	43	
Misuse of title of "Patent Office" ..	89 5	47	
Unauthorised assumption of Royal Arms	90	44	

LETTERS PATENT FOR INVENTIONS.

<u>Statute Law.</u>	Subject.	The Act of 1907 (7 Edw. 7, c. 29).	The (Amendment) Act of 1907 (7 Edw. 7, c. 28).
	<i>Definitions—</i> Provisions as to appeals and refer- ences to the Court	S. 92, ss. 2	S. 28
	<i>Application to Scotland, Ireland, and the Isle of Man—</i> Application to Scotland	94 5 & 6	50
	<i>Repeal, Savings, and Short Title—</i> Repeal of provisions as to procedure..	98 1 (b)	19
	Rules as to applications for registra- tion of designs	98 1 (c)	30
	Construction	98 2	49

CHAPTER II.

THE PATENTEE.

WHO MAY APPLY FOR LETTERS PATENT.

FROM the sixth section of the Statute of Monopolies it is clear that, unless otherwise provided by subsequent statutes, the grantee of letters patent for an invention must be the true and first inventor; and, if there are two or more grantees, the true and first inventor must be included in their number, otherwise the Crown has no power to make the grant. Any person may be an applicant,

Any person, whether a British subject or not, may make an application for letters patent for an invention, and two or more persons may make a joint application (*a*). Moreover, a patent granted to several persons, jointly, is not invalid because some or one of them only are or is the true and first inventors or inventor (*b*); and, consequently, a capitalist may advance money to a needy inventor and obtain an interest in the patent from the beginning.

The usual application form contains a declaration to the effect that the applicant is in possession of an invention, whereof he, or, in the case of a joint application, one at least of the applicants claims to be the true and first inventor, and for which a patent is desired (*c*). if he can make the necessary declaration.

The legal representative of a person claiming to be an inventor and dying without making an application for a patent for the invention, may apply for, and obtain, a patent in respect of it, upon a declaration that he believes such person to be the true and first inventor (*d*). The application must be accompanied by the original probate of the will of the deceased, or letters of administration granted of his estate and Legal representative.

(*a*) 7 Edw. 7, c. 29, s. 1.

(*b*) 7 Edw. 7, c. 29, s. 1 (1).

(*c*) 7 Edw. 7, c. 29, s. 1 (3). See Vol. II. p. 377.

(*d*) 7 Edw. 7, c. 29, s. 43.

Who may Apply.

effects, or an official copy of such probate or letters, and such further evidence as may be necessary (*e*).

The legal representative of a person dying possessed of an invention in respect of which he has made an application for a patent within fifteen months prior to his decease, may obtain a grant of a patent in respect of the invention within twelve months of the decease of the person so dying. It is the practice for the legal representative of a person so dying after having made an application for a patent, to produce the probate of the will, or letters of administration granted of the estate and effects of the deceased, for the inspection of the Comptroller, and subsequently to carry out the later stages of the application in his own name.

Married woman.

A married woman may be a patentee, and the property in the invention will be her separate estate (*f*).

Lunatic.

A patent may be granted to a person found lunatic; but, in such case, the declaration, which must accompany the application, must be made by the guardian or committee of the lunatic, or a person appointed by the Court (*g*).

The Comptroller of the Patent Office does not inquire as to the age, coverture, or sanity of an applicant.

TRUE AND FIRST INVENTOR.

Patent invalid unless true and first inventor is a grantee.

Letters patent for an invention can, except under sects. 43 or 91 of the Act of 1907, be validly granted only to the true and first inventor either alone or together with another person or persons (*h*).

Except where, pursuant to sects. 43 or 91 of the Act of 1907, a patent obtained by one person alone who was not the true and first inventor would be void, for the Crown would have been deceived in its grant (*i*).

It therefore becomes a very important question to decide what, in the patent law, is the meaning of the words "true and first inventor."

Except in the case of an invention communicated from

(*e*) See Patents Rules, 1908, r. 11.

(*f*) M. W. P. Act (45 & 46 Vict. c. 75).

(*g*) 7 Edw. 7, c. 29, s. 83.

(*h*) See p. 13, *ante*.

(*i*) Com. Dig. Grant, cc. 8 and 9; Earl of Devon's Case, 11 Co. 90; R. v. Mussary, 1 W. P. C. 41; Minter v. Wells (1834), 1 W. P. C. 129.

abroad (*k*) a person will not be considered the true and first inventor if he himself did not make the invention, or if the idea of it did not originate in his own mind (*l*), or if it was suggested to him by another (*m*), or taken from a book or other document circulated in the United Kingdom or Isle of Man (*n*), or if the invention was publicly used before the date of the patent by a member of the public other than the person claiming to be the true and first inventor (*o*).

**True and
First
Inventor.**

It is not an objection to a patent that the discovery was the result of accident; and it is immaterial whether it be the outcome of some happy thought, or great study, labour, and expense (*p*).

The true and first inventor must have invented every part of that for which he claims protection (*q*). If he claims a number of things, as being the inventor of them, whether they consist of improvements or original inventions, and it turns out that some of them are not his own ideas, his patent is void (*r*).

The person who himself actually makes an invention and is the first to disclose that invention will be the true and first inventor in the legal sense of the term, and a valid patent may be granted to him notwithstanding the fact that it may possibly be shown that the invention had been previously made by another who did not disclose it (*s*). Thus, *Tindal*, C.J., in *Cornish v. Keene* (*t*), stated the law as follows:—

**Inventor who
first discloses
the invention.**

“Sometimes it is a material question to determine whether the party who got the patent was the real and original inventor or not; because these patents are granted as a reward, not only for the benefit that is conferred upon the public by the discovery, but also to the ingenuity of the first inventor; and although it is proved that it is a new discovery, so far as the world is concerned, yet if anybody is able to show that

**Law as to first
discloser
stated by
Tindal, C.J.**

(*k*) Pp. 22—26, *post*.

(*l*) *Jones v. Pearce* (1832), 1 W. P. C. 124.

(*m*) *Tennant's Case* (1798), 1 W. P. C. 125.

(*n*) *Arkwright's Case* (1785), Dav. P. C. 61; *Hill v. Thompson* (1817), 8 Taunt. 375; 2 B. Mo. 424, S. C.; *The Househill Co. v. Neilson* (1843), 1 W. P. C. 673; *Lang v. Gisborne* (1862), 31 Beav. 133; *Plimpton v. Malcolmson* (1876), L. R. 3 Ch. D.

531; *Plimpton v. Spiller* (1877), L. R. 6 Ch. D. 412; chap. iv.

(*o*) Chap. iv.

(*p*) *Crane v. Price* (1842), 1 W. P. C. 411.

(*q*) *Tennant's Case* (1798), 1 W. P. C. 125; *Arkwright's Case* (1785), Dav. P. C. 61.

(*r*) *Losh v. Hague* (1860), 1 W. P. C. 203.

(*s*) Chap. iv.

(*t*) (1835), 1 W. P. C. 501, 507.

**True and
First
Inventor.**

although that was new—that the party who got the patent was not the man whose ingenuity first discovered it, that he had borrowed it from A. or B., or taken it from a book that was printed in England, and which was open to all the world—then, although the public had the benefit of it, it would become an important question whether he was the first and original inventor. . . . A man may make experiments in his own closet for the purpose of improving any art or manufacture in public use; if he makes these experiments and never communicates them to the world, and lays them by as forgotten things, another person who has made the same experiments, or has gone a little further, or is satisfied with the experiments, may take out a patent, and protect himself in the privilege of the sole making of the article for fourteen years; and it will be no answer to him to say that another person before him made the same experiment, and, therefore, that he was not the first discoverer of it—because there may be many discoverers starting at the same time, many rivals that may be running on the same road at the same time, and the first which comes to the Crown and takes out a patent, it not being generally known to the public, is the man who has a right to clothe himself with the authority of the patent and to enjoy its benefits” (u).

And again in *Gibson v. Brand* (x):

“A man may publish to the world that which is perfectly new in all its use, and has not before been enjoyed, and yet he may not be the first and true inventor; he may have borrowed it from some other person, he may have taken it from a book, he may have learnt it from a specification, and then the Legislature never intended that a person who had taken all his knowledge from the art of another—from the labours and assiduity or ingenuity of another—should be the man who was to receive the benefit of another’s skill.”

**Dollond’s
Case.**

In *Dollond’s Case*, one of the earliest on the subject of true and first inventor, which is not reported, but is often referred to (y) in subsequent decisions, and always with approval, it was objected that *Dollond* was not the inventor of a new method of making object-glasses, but that a Dr. *Hall* had made the same discovery before him. It was, however, held that as

(u) But see Vol. II. chap. i.
(x) (1841), 1 W. P. C. 627, 628.

(y) *Boulton v. Bull* (1795), 2 H. Bl. 463.

Dr. *Hall* had confined it to his closet, and the public were not acquainted with it, *Dollond* was to be considered as the inventor.

True and
First
Inventor.

In *Tennant's Case* (z) the patent was declared void on the ground that though the utility of the invention and the general ignorance of it of those engaged in the trade to which it referred were proved, yet the plaintiff was not the true and first inventor, as the process had been used by one engaged in the trade for five or six years before the date of the patent.

Tennant's
Case.

From the principles of these two cases it appears that in order to invalidate a patent on the ground that the patentee is not the true and first inventor, it is not enough to show that the alleged invention is only a disclosure of what was known to others before. It must be shown that it was communicated to some extent, or that it was more or less made use of about the date of the patent, so as to constitute discovery as applied to the subject with which the invention deals—*i.e.*, that the alleged prior user was not merely experimental and partial, but was a user of the completed invention (a).

Result of
above cases.

If several persons about the same time discover the same thing and keep it secret and make no use of it, the party first making application for a patent becomes the true and first inventor, and is entitled to the benefit of a grant of letters patent (b); provided that no application has been made by or on behalf of a person, who has within twelve months applied for protection in respect of the same invention in any State with the Government of which His Majesty has made any arrangement for mutual protection of inventions (c). If a man makes a discovery and is enabled to produce an effect from his own experiments, judgment, and skill, it is no objection that some one else has made a similar discovery by his mind unless it has become public (d) or been put to practical use (e). There is no case in which a patentee has been deprived of the benefit of his invention because another also had invented it, unless he had also brought it into practical use or disclosed it (f).

Several
independent
inventors.

(z) (1798), Dav. P. C. 429; 1 W. P. C. 125.

(a) *Hill v. Thompson* (1818), 1 W. P. C. 239.

(b) P. 114, *post*.

(c) 7 Edw. 7, c. 29, s. 91.

(d) As to publication, see chap. iv., *post*.

(e) See pp. 117–134, *post*.

(f) As to practical use, see chap. v., *post*.

**True and
First
Inventor.**Joint in-
ventors.Inventors
may employ
assistants.

A true and first inventor must have invented every part of that which he claims to have invented (*g*); hence, if different parts of an invention are the outcome of the inventive faculty of different minds, it will be necessary that all the inventors join in applying for a patent to be granted to them jointly.

Master and Servant.—There is nothing in law to prevent an inventor from availing himself of the assistance of workmen or servants in the prosecution of his search after a new manufacture. Indeed, many processes cannot be conducted by the unaided exertions of a single individual, and in almost all cases actual experiments are a necessity in order to find out how a desired end may be best obtained. It would, therefore, be absurd to confine the rewards given to inventors to that small class of them only, who have entirely, and without any assistance whatever, brought their discoveries to perfection, and it is grave matter of doubt whether, strictly speaking, any such could be found. The law, therefore, considers workmen and servants merely as tools of the inventor, and instruments in his hands, carrying out the ideas which originate in the master mind; and a person who has invented a main and leading idea remains the true and first inventor, and, as such is entitled to apply for a patent notwithstanding that he avails himself of the assistance and suggestions of workmen and servants in bringing his invention to a state of perfection (*h*).

Cases.

This principle has been frequently acted upon by the Courts in cases of which the following are examples:—

In *Minter v. Wells* (*i*), *Alderson*, B., addressing the jury, said: “*Minter* and *Sutton* were together about the time the invention took place: which of the two suggested the invention, and which carried it into effect, is the question for you to decide. If *Sutton* suggested the principle to Mr. *Minter*, then he would be the inventor. If, on the other hand, Mr. *Minter* suggested the principle to *Sutton*, and *Sutton* was assisting him, then Mr. *Minter* would be the first and true inventor, and *Sutton* would be a machine, so to speak, which Mr. *Minter* uses for the purpose of enabling him to carry

(*g*) See p. 15, *ante*.

(*h*) *Minter v. Wells* (1834), 1 W. P. C. 132; *Bloxam v. Elsee* (1832), 1 C. & P. 567; 1 W. P. C. 132; *Allen*

v. Rawson (1845), 1 C. B. 551; *David v. Woodley* (1884), Griff. L. O. C. 26; *Kurtz v. Spence* (1888), 5 P. O. R. 181. (*i*) (1834), 1 W. P. C. 132.

his original conception into effect. You will judge which is the more probable of the two. Mr. *Minter* makes out his *primâ facie* case; he is the person who takes out the patent. If *Sutton* has received a compensation, nothing would have been more simple and easy than that he should have taken out the patent, and still Mr. *Minter* might have the same benefit to-day; and there is no apparent reason why *Sutton* should not have taken out the patent which Mr. *Minter* has taken out, unless they were both desirous to ruin the invention: for suppose two persons are engaged on an invention of this description, they know perfectly well between themselves who is the real inventor of it, and who is the workman to carry into effect the conception, but they would destroy the value of it to both if they did not take it out in the name of the right person" (j).

**True and
First
Inventor.**

In *Bloxam v. Elsee* (k), an action in respect of two patents granted to *John Gamble*, it was objected that the improvements on the first invention, which formed the subject of the second patent, were the invention of one *Donkin*, an engineer. It was established that the improvements were the invention of *Donkin*, but it appeared that at the time he invented them he was employed by the patentee and one *Foudrinier*, his partner, as an engineer, for the purpose of bringing the machine to perfection, and was paid by them for so doing; and therefore he was acting as their servant for the purpose of suggesting improvements in the machine. The plaintiff, on the other hand, contended that the improvements were the patentee's inventions, and that *Donkin* was employed by him to carry his ideas into effect, and this view of the case seems to have prevailed with the Court.

Allen v. Rawson (l), is another case supporting the same principle. In this case it was sought to upset a patent for improvements in the manufacture of felted fabrics on the ground that parts of the invention were discovered by two workmen. *Erle*, J., in directing the jury, stated the law thus: "I take the law to be that, if a person has discovered an improved principle, and employs engineers, agents, or other persons to assist him in carrying out that principle, and they,

(j) See also *Makepeace v. Jackson*,
4 Taunt. 770.

(k) (1825), 1 C. & P. 558.

(l) (1845), 1 C. B. 551.

**True and
First
Inventor.**

in the course of experiments arising from that employment, make valuable discoveries accessory to the main principle and tending to carry that out in a better manner, such improvements are the property of the inventor of the original improved principle, and may be embodied in his patent; and if so embodied the patent is not avoided by evidence that the agent or servant made the suggestion of the subordinate improvement of the primary and improved principle." A motion for a new trial on the ground that the judge had misdirected the jury was refused, *Tindal*, C.J. (*m*), saying: "It would be difficult to define how far the suggestions of a workman employed in the construction of a machine are to be considered as distinct inventions by him so as to avoid a patent incorporating those taken out by his employer. Each case must depend upon its own merits. But when we see that the principle and object of an invention are complete without it, I think it is too much that a suggestion of a workman employed in the course of the experiments, of something calculated more easily to carry into effect the conceptions of the inventor should render the whole patent void."

In *The matter of Smith's Patent* (*n*), the above statement of the law by *Tindal*, C.J., in *Allen v. Rawson* was applied to the particular facts before the Court, and the patent was revoked on the ground that the patentee was not the true and first inventor.

Master is not entitled to the invention of his servant,

The reward of workmen employed to make inventions or improvements upon existing inventions, whether patented or not, is often made the subject of special contract, which is, of course, enforceable in an action for specific performance (*o*).

The mere relationship of master and servant gives no right to the master in the invention of his servant (*p*). If an employer takes out a patent for an invention discovered and worked out by a workman in his employ, and the patentee has no more connection with the invention than that he is the employer of the workman, the patent will be void, on the ground that the workman and not the patentee is the true and first inventor. Thus, in *Arkwright's Case* (*q*) it ap-

(*m*) 1 C. B. 574.

(*n*) (1904), 22 R. P. C. 57.

(*o*) See *Pashley v. Linotype Co.* (1903), 20 R. P. C. 633.

(*p*) *Saxby v. Gloucester Waggon Co.* (1883), Griff. L. O. C. 56.

(*q*) (1785), *Rex v. Arkwright*, Dav. P. C. 61; 1 W. P. C. 64; *Barker v. Shaw*, 1 W. P. C. 126, n.

peared that the patentee *Arkwright* had been told of a particular roller, part of the machinery, by one *Kay*, and, perceiving the value of the invention, he took *Kay* into his service for two years, and employed him in making models, and subsequently applied for and obtained a patent for the invention as his own. In the same way *Arkwright* adopted a crank invented by one *Hargreave*. At the trial *Arkwright* was declared not to be the true and first inventor (*r*).

**True and
First
Inventor.**

When, however, a workman, who is employed by his master to make models, or to carry out experiments, in the course of his employment, makes improvements in details, the improvements so made are the property of the master (*s*), and the workman cannot patent them (*t*). There is in fact a confidential relationship between a master who experiments with a view to taking out a patent for an invention, the leading idea of which originated with him, and the workman he employs in aiding him to perform those experiments, and anything suggested by the workman during such confidential employment will not necessarily vitiate the subsequent patent of the master (*u*). It is always, however, a question of evidence whether such confidential relationship actually existed between the employer and employed (*x*). In general, whether the benefit of suggestions made by a person employed to carry out an invention belong to him or to his employer is a question depending on the merits of each case, but where the main principle and object are complete without the suggestions, which are merely matters calculated more easily to carry into effect the conceptions of the inventor, they are considered as merely accessory (*y*).

but only to
improve-
ments in
details made
by him.

In the absence of special contract, the invention of a servant, even though made in the employer's time, and with the use of the employer's materials, and at the expense of the employer, does not become the property of the employer so as to justify him in opposing the grant of a patent for the invention to the servant, who is the proper patentee (*z*), and

(*r*) *Rex v. Arkwright* (1785), Dav. P. C. 61; 1 W. P. C. 64.

(*s*) P. 18, *ante*.

(*t*) *David v. Woodley* (1884), Griff. L. O. C. 26; *Kurtz v. Spence* (1888), 5 R. P. C. 181.

(*u*) *Saxby v. Gloucester Waggon Co.* (1883), Griff. L. O. C. 57;

Homan's Patent (1889), 6 P. O. R. 104.

(*x*) *Humpherson v. Syer* (1887), 4 R. P. C. 407, 413.

(*y*) See *Allen v. Rawson*, p. 19, *ante*; *Smith's Patent* (1904), 22 R. P. C. 58.

(*z*) *Heald's Patent* (1891), 8 R. P. C. 430; *Homan's Case* (1889), 6 R. P. C. 184; *Siddell v. Vickers* (1888), 5 R.

**True and
First
Inventor.**

the patent when obtained may be the exclusive property of the servant (*a*). It may very well be that, under the circumstances of a particular case, it is inconsistent with the good faith which ought properly to be inferred or implied as an obligation arising from the contract of service that the servant should hold the patent otherwise than as trustee for his employer, and a declaration of the Court may be obtained to that effect (*b*); or it may be proved to the satisfaction of the Court that the position of trustee can be inferred from the servant's duty, and that he was a trustee for his employer (*c*), and this though the patent was applied for after the employment ceased (*d*).

A patent may be invalidated on the ground of publication of the invention by one workman to another, for there is no necessary presumption of any confidential relationship between fellow-workmen such as will prevent this result ensuing (*e*).

Communicators of Foreign Inventions.—Before the passing of the Patent Act, 1883, the law had long allowed grants of patents, in their own name, to persons who were in possession of inventions which they had received from others resident in foreign countries, but which inventions had never before been published within this realm.

It was stated in the celebrated *Clothworkers of Ipswich Case* (*f*), which was prior to the Statute of Monopolies, "if a man hath brought in a new invention and a new trade within the kingdom in peril of his life and consumption of his estate, or stock, &c., or if a man hath made new discovery of anything, in such cases the King of his grace and favour in recompense of his costs and travail may grant by charter unto him that he only shall use such trade or trafique for a certain time, because at the first the people of the kingdom are ignorant, and have not the knowledge or skill to use it. But when

P. O. 93; *Saxby v. Gloucester Waggon Co.* (1880), Griff. L. O. C. 56. The above statement was approved by Farwell, J., in *Marshall and Naylor's Patent* (1900), 17 R. P. C. 555.

(*a*) *Saxby v. Gloucester Waggon Co.*, Griff. L. O. C. 56.

(*b*) *Worthington Pumping Engine Co. v. Moore* (1902), 20 R. P. C. 41; *Richmond & Co., Ltd. v. Wrightson* (1904), 22 R. P. C. 25; *Lamb v. Evans*,

[1893] 1 Ch. 218; *Robb v. Green*, [1895] 2 Q. B. 315.

(*c*) *Edisonia, Ltd. v. Forse* (1908), 25 R. P. C. 549.

(*d*) *Wollaston and Knowles v. Chapman* (1908), 25 R. P. C. 733.

(*e*) *Saxby v. Gloucester Waggon Co.* (1883), Griff. L. O. C. 56.

(*f*) (1615), Godb. 252; S. C., 1 Rol. R. 4.

Inventions
communicated
from
abroad.

that patent is expired the King cannot make a new grant thereof." This practice was continued after the Statute of Monopolies of 21 James I., and has frequently been sanctioned by the judges in many cases, from *Edgebury v. Stephens* (g), which decided that if the invention be new in England, a patent may be granted though the thing was practised beyond sea before; "for the statute speaks of new manufactures within this realm; so that if it be new here it is within the statute; for the Act intended to encourage new devices useful to the kingdom, and whether learned by travel or by study it is the same thing," down to cases such as *Carpenter v. Smith* (h), *Nickels v. Ross* (i), and *Plimpton v. Malcolmson* (k), from which the proposition is established that the first actual importer of an invention into this country is *in law the true and first inventor*.

True and
First
Inventor.

The Act of 1907 does not contain anything to prevent a person who has become acquainted with an invention abroad, though it was not actually made by him, coming over to this country and applying for a patent for it in his own name, and making the declaration (l) as to true and first inventor comprised in Patents Forms 1 (m), in the schedule to the Patents Rules 1908, which is sufficiently wide to meet such a case. Before the Act of 1883 it was long the practice for a person applying for a patent in respect of a communication from abroad, in his declaration (n), to state that he claimed to be the true and first inventor *within this realm*—though the words "within this realm" might have been omitted, without detraction from the validity of the declaration; and in the form of declaration, given in the schedule to the repealed Act of 1852, as in the forms subsequently in force, they were in fact so omitted. It was objected by some that under the Act of 1883 (which was the same in this respect as the Act of 1907), a person could not obtain a valid patent for an invention communicated from abroad, seeing that the Act required him to declare himself the true and first inventor, which it was said he could not be unless he himself actually made the

(g) (1691), Salkeld's Rep. 477; 1 W. P. C. 35; Dav. P. C. 36.

(h) (1841), 1 W. P. C. 530, 535.

(i) (1849), 8 C. B. 679.

(k) (1876), L. R. 3 Ch. D. 531.

(l) Vol. II. chap. i.

(m) See Appendix; see also Société Anonyme du Générateur du Temple's Patent (1896), 13 R. P. C. 54.

(n) Vol. II. chap. i.

**True and
First
Inventor.**

discovery, and the case of *Milligan v. Marsh* (*o*), decided in 1856, and *Renard v. Levinstein* (*p*), decided in 1865, were relied on as supporting this view. On a reference to these cases it will be found that neither of them amounts to a decision on the point; the at most dicta of *Wood*, V.-C., and *Knight Bruce*, L.J.

The Act of 1907, like that of 1883, defines "invention" to be "any manner of new manufacture as defined in 21 Jac. I. c. 3," and it is only reasonable to infer that "inventor" has the same meaning as it has been declared to have in the latter statute—*i.e.*, it includes the actual importer of a communicated invention (*q*).

Many patents have in fact been granted under the Acts of 1883 and 1907 to importers in respect of inventions communicated to them from abroad, and it has never been established that the grantees of such patents are not entitled to hold them for their own benefit in the absence of a fiduciary relationship between the grantee and the actual foreign inventor (*r*).

It must also be noticed that the clauses in the Act of 1907 relating to revocation of the grant of a patent do not exclude the case of a person without the knowledge or against the will of a foreigner endeavouring to forestall him in this country, even though the Comptroller and law officer on appeal have decided to allow the patent (*s*).

**Preference to
foreign
inventor who
has made an
application
abroad.**

In virtue of sect. 91 of the Act of 1907, and the International Convention of 1884 (*t*), a foreign inventor who has applied for a patent in any State or States to which the powers of sect. 91 of the Act of 1907 have been applied, has a right of priority to a British patent, if he applies for it during a period of twelve months from the date of his first foreign application, notwithstanding any intermediate publication of the invention in this country (*u*).

**Communica-
tions made
in England.**

The communication, made in England, by one British subject to another of an invention does not make the person

(*o*) (1856), 2 Jur. N. S. 1083.

(*p*) (1865), 10 L. T. N. S. 177.

(*q*) *Marsden v. Saville Street Foundry and Engineering Company* (1878), L. R. 3 Ex. D. 203.

(*r*) See *Nickels v. Ross* (1849), 8 C. B. 679; *Steadman v. Marsh* (1856), 2 Jur. N. S. 391; *Avery's Patent*

(1887), L. R. 36 Ch. D. 307, 318, 324: see Vol. II. chap. i., *post*.

(*s*) See *Edmunds' Patent* (1886), Griff. P. C. 281; *Higgins' Patent* (1891), 9 R. P. C. 74.

(*t*) See Appendix.

(*u*) See Vol. II. p. 27, *post*.

to whom the communication is made the true and first inventor within the meaning of 21 Jac. I. c. 3, so as to enable him to obtain letters patent for the invention in his own name alone (x).

**True and
First
Inventor.**

There may well be circumstances under which an oral communication by an agent of a foreigner made in this country to a British subject might entitle such British subject to apply for a patent, and to sustain it on the ground that it was a *bonâ fide* communication from abroad; e.g., where a foreigner resident abroad sends over his clerk to communicate the invention orally to a British subject (y). It has been held that where there was a confidential communication in this country to the agent of a foreigner, and by such agent communicated abroad to the foreigner, who in his turn, by letter, instructed a British patent agent to apply in his own name for a patent on a communication from abroad, the innocent patent agent was the true and first inventor (z). It would appear that a valid patent could not be granted in respect of a communication by an alien permanently domiciled in this country as being a communication from abroad.

Wirth's Patent (a) decided that letters patent may be granted to a foreigner resident abroad for an invention communicated to him by another foreigner resident abroad; but agents resident abroad, and without a place of business in the United Kingdom, are not now recognised (b).

In *Beard v. Egerton* (c), it was held that a person taking out a patent for a communication from abroad need not necessarily be the *meritorious* importer; he may be the mere clerk or agent of the foreign inventor.

Patentee need not be meritorious importer.

The law recognises, however, only the person to whom the patent is granted. Thus it is no objection to the sufficiency of a specification that a foreign inventor was possessed of knowledge, which ought to have been indicated in the specification, when it appears that the actual patentee, who was merely

(x) *Marsden v. Saville Street Foundry and Engineering Company* (1878), L. R. 3 Ex. D. 203.

(y) See *Pilkington v. Yeakley Vacuum Hammer Co.* (1901), 18 R. P. C. 459. On the facts of this case the communication was held in fact to have been made from abroad: Jame-

son's Patent (1902), 19 R. P. C. 246.

(z) *Marks' Patent* (1908), 25 R. P. C. 583.

(a) (1879), L. R. 13 Ch. D. 303.

(b) P. R. 1908, r. 9.

(c) (1846), 3 C. B. 97; see also *Chappell v. Purday* (1845), 14 M. & W. 310.

Persons incapable of being Patentees.

the agent of the foreign inventor, was not possessed of that information (*d*). And again, it is not a sufficient answer to an objection that a specification is insufficient to say that it contains all the information which the foreign inventor communicated to his agent, the actual patentee (*e*).

PERSONS INCAPABLE OF BEING PATENTEES.

We have seen that any person, whether a British subject or not, may make an application for a patent (*f*), but there are certain persons who, by virtue of their position, could not obtain a valid grant.

The King.

It seems that the King himself could not become a patentee, for he could not grant to himself.

Body corporate.

It is clear that a body corporate could not alone obtain a grant of a patent for an original invention, for it could not make the requisite declaration (*g*), invention being an act of the mind, which could not proceed from such a body in its corporate capacity.

Letters patent may be granted to a body corporate, together with the true and first inventor, since "person," in the Act of 1907, includes a body corporate (*h*). It is the practice of the Patent Office in the case of an invention communicated from abroad to grant the patent to a corporation alone, since such corporation, as the first introducer of the invention into this country, is in law the true and first inventor (*i*). A foreign corporation is entitled to apply for a patent under the provisions of sect. 91 of the Act of 1907 (*k*).

Corporation sole.

A corporation sole, *as such*, cannot become a patentee of an original invention, for he must make the invention by his own mind in his individual capacity, and in that capacity only could he, therefore, become a patentee.

Official persons.

Official persons are in certain cases incapable of obtaining a patent for an invention connected with the subject-matter of their official position.

(*d*) *Plimpton v. Malcolmson* (1876), L. R. 3 Ch. D. 531, 582.

(*e*) *Wegmann v. Corcoran* (1878), L. R. 13 Ch. D. 65; 44 L. T. N. S. 357.

(*f*) P. 13, *ante*.

(*g*) Vol. II. p. 377.

(*h*) 52 & 53 Vict. c. 62, s. 19; Vol. II. p. 305.

(*i*) In the matter of Carez's Application (1889), 6 R. P. C. 552, p. 18.

(*k*) See Carez's Patent (1889), 6 R. P. C. 18; *Société Anonyme du Générateur du Temple* (1896), 13 R. P. C. 56; see Vol. II. p. 30.

Thus, in *Patterson v. Gas Light and Coke Co.* (l), the House of Lords held that *Patterson*, who had obtained a knowledge of the patented process in the discharge of the duties of his official position of gas referee, appointed by the Board of Trade, under the City of London Gas Act of 1868, was incapable of obtaining a valid patent, as such process was described in an official report of himself and his two colleagues, and thus was public property, notwithstanding that the report was kept back from the authorities to whom it was addressed till after the date of the patent.

**Persons
incapable
of being
Patentees.**

It is doubtful whether a patent granted to an alien enemy would be valid. It has been doubted whether letters patent taken out on a secret trust, to be held for the benefit of the real inventor, who was an alien enemy, were void or not. To hold that such a trust could not exist would appear contrary to the spirit and policy of the patent law which recognises communications from foreigners as good subject-matters for letters patent; but no action could be maintained by such alien, or by the trustee on his behalf, on any contract, because the resulting moneys might be employed against the country (m).

(l) (1875), L. R. 2 Ch. D. 812;
L. R. 3 App. Cas. 239.

(m) Webster on Patents, p. 23; also
1 W. P. C. 418, n.

CHAPTER III.

SUBJECT-MATTER.

GENERAL.

Any Manner of Manufacture.—The Statute of Monopolies, in a sense the statutory foundation of our modern patent laws (*a*), defines, by its *sixth* section, the Common Law right of the Crown to grant letters patent for inventions as limited to the granting of patents for “the sole working or making of any manner of new manufactures within this realm to the true and first inventor or inventors of such manufactures, which others at the time of making such letters patent and grants shall not use, so as also they be not contrary to the law, nor mischievous to the State, by raising prices of commodities at home, or hurt of trade, or generally inconvenient.”

Subsequent enactments have not in any way altered the provisions of the Statute of Monopolies as regards subject-matter of letters patent for inventions; and the Act of 1907 (*b*) expressly states that the word “invention” shall mean any manner of new manufacture the subject of letters patent and grants of privilege within section “six” of the Statute of James I.—*i.e.*, the above quoted words.

It is well to remember, in considering various questions of patent law, that the word “invention” is frequently used in at least three different senses as indicating (*a*) an inventive act; (*b*) a thing which is new and has required an inventive act to produce it; (*c*) a particular inventive act which the inventor has performed (*c*).

The effect of the sixth section of the celebrated statute is twofold: (*i*) it exempts all patents and grants of privilege

(*a*) P. 1, *ante*.

(*b*) Sect. 93.

(*c*) See per Moulton, L.J., British

United Shoe Machinery Co., Ltd. v. Fussell (A.) & Sons, Ltd. (1908), 25 R. P. C. 651.

which its terms embrace from the abolition of monopolies in general which the preceding sections of the Act effected, and (ii) it expressly declares that such patents and grants of privilege shall have the same effect as they would have had if the Act had never been passed and none other—*i.e.*, they are not rendered valid by virtue of the Act, but obtain their force from the Common Law.

Defined by
Statute
of Mono-
polies.

The words “working and making of any manner of new manufactures,” coupled with the fact that “manufacture” is capable of more than one meaning, suggest the question, What is it the working and making of which the enactment contemplates as forming the subject-matter of a patent?

“Manufacture” used as a noun may mean either (i) the art or practice of making or constructing any piece of workmanship, or (ii) anything made by art. The words “working or making” used in conjunction with the word “manufactures,” seem to imply both these meanings, and the decisions of various Courts warrant the statement that in the contemplation of the patent law the word bears both significations (*d*).

“Manufacture.”

It is to be noticed that the word “manufactures,” construed with the word “working,” signifies the art or processes of making, and the words “working of manufactures” refer to the exercise of arts of making or constructing; whereas the word “manufactures” construed with the word “making” signifies articles or things made, and the words “making of manufactures” therefore mean the art of making articles or things which, when made, may properly be nominated manufactures, and which must be articles of trade or commerce (*e*).

The subject of a valid patent must, consequently, be the working or making of a manner of new manufacture (in one or other of its two meanings) which must be new, useful, and not contrary to the law, nor mischievous to the State by raising the prices of commodities at home, or hurt of trade, or generally inconvenient. It must be new and useful because if it were not so the consideration for which the Crown makes

Subject-matter must be a manufacture which is new, useful, and not contrary to the law, nor mischievous to the State by raising the

(*d*) *Crane v. Price* (1842), 4 M. & G. 580; *Househill Co. v. Neilson* (1843), 1 W. P. C. 683; *Hornblower v. Bouiton* (1799), 8 T. R. 98; *Dav. P. C.* 225; *R. v. Wheeler* (1819), 2 B. & Ald. 349;

1 Cary, P. C. 393; *Stevens v. Keating* (1847), 2 W. P. C. 182.

(*e*) *Boulton v. Bull* (1795), 2 H. Bl. 463; *Hindmarch on Patents*, pp. 80, 81. See also p. 31, *post*.

Defined by
Statute
of Mono-
polies.

prices of com-
modities at
home, or hurt
of trade, or
generally in-
convenient.

the grant would fail; and it must be not contrary to the law, nor mischievous to the State by raising the prices of commodities at home, or hurt of trade, or generally inconvenient, for the Crown has not the power to make such a grant.

The commodities above referred to must clearly be commodities open to trade before the patent, and cannot include the commodity which is the subject of the new invention. The patentee in fixing the price at which he will sell the new article does not raise the price of the commodity, for the article was not to be obtained at all before he put it on the market. The idea prevalent at the date of the Statute of Monopolies was that some inventions might be of such a nature that if they were put in practice the manufacture would consume such a quantity of a known article of common use in trade as would, in consequence of a limited supply, raise its price to the hurt of other trades, and this is the evil which the limitation is intended to guard against. Protection of trade was a very prevalent notion when the Statute was passed. Whether or not the objection of general inconvenience would be maintained against any particular invention would depend upon the notions of public convenience and political economy prevalent at the time of decision. Thus in the case of a new invention referred to by Coke (*f*), which related to a fulling mill by means of which more bonnets and caps might be thickened and fulled in a single day than by the labour of four-score men who got their living by the trade, this objection as to hurt of trade was held to prevail. The ground of the decision, as recorded by Coke, was that it was ordained that bonnets and caps should be thickened and fulled by the strength of man and not in a fulling mill, for it was holden inconvenient to turn so many labouring men to idleness. It is safe to predict that this objection to the patent for the fulling mill would not prevail to-day. There is no recorded case within modern times in which a patent has been declared void expressly on the ground of mischief to the State by raising the prices of commodities at home, or hurt of trade, or general inconvenience. The objection now takes the form of a plea that the invention is not new or useful (*g*). The plea of want of utility is, therefore, in effect, a plea that the inven-

(*f*) 3 Inst. c. 85, p. 184.

(*g*) See p. 157, *post*.

tion is, on the specific ground of lack of utility, tainted with the defect which renders the patent granted in respect of it void by reason of the proviso of sect. 6 of the Statute of Monopolies. It is open to a defendant in an action, or petitioner for revocation, to allege any other specific ground which is covered by the proviso in question. If the plea were raised in the general form, according to modern practice, the person raising it would be required to give particulars as a matter of course.

Subject-matter must be an Art.

Subject-Matter must be an Art.—The subject-matter of letters patent for an invention must be an *art*. For, if any person other than the patentee makes any article or articles in accordance with the patentee's specification, he thereby commits an infringement of the patent, and yet the patent does not vest in the grantee the right to use the particular materials of which the articles made in infringement consist, for they may never have been his property. What the infringer does besides using the materials, which he has a right to do, and the physical power, which he is also entitled to avail himself of, is to use the art of applying the physical power to the materials in the manner set forth in the specification (*h*). It is this *art*, therefore, which is the exclusive property of the patentee, and which he, his agents or licensees, and no one else, is entitled to use during the continuance of the privilege. In the case of an article made in infringement of a patent the right of property remains in the infringer (*i*), though he may be ordered to destroy such article, completely or partially, as may be necessary to render further infringement by its use impossible (*k*).

Subject-matter must be an art,

It has been said that only an art by the exercise of which vendible articles, or articles of trade or commerce, are capable of being produced can form the subject-matter of valid letters patent (*l*), for two reasons:—(*i*) If the articles made by the exercise of the protected art cannot be sold, the invention will not be used, and therefore will not give any new employment to the people, and the public will receive no benefit from

by which vendible articles can be produced,

(*h*) *Huddart v. Grimshaw* (1803), Dav. P. C. 278; 1 W. P. C. 86.

(*i*) *Vavasseur v. Krupp* (1878), L. R. 9 Ch. D. 351; p. 525, *post*.

(*k*) See p. 525, *post*.

(*l*) *Boulton v. Bull* (1795), 2 H. Bl. 493; *R. v. Wheeler*, 2 B. & Ald. 349; *Cornish v. Keene* (1837), 3 Bing. N. C. 570; *Cooper's Patent* (1901), 19 R. P. C. 53; *Johnson's Patent* (1901), 19 R. P. C. 56.

Subject-matter must be an Art.

the invention. (ii) The intent of the patent is to reward the inventor by means of the profit arising from making and selling the patented articles during the continuance of the privilege (*m*). Since the subject of the patent must be a manufacture, it must result in the production of a material entity. Consequently a patent could not be validly granted for a literary composition, or a mere scheme or plan—*e.g.*, a plan for becoming rich; a plan for the better government of a State; a plan for the efficient conduct of business (*n*).

and which is not to be exercised for illegal purposes.

An art which is to be exercised for the sole object of breaking the law, or for the sole purpose of producing anything designed to be used for an illegal purpose—*e.g.*, implements for housebreaking, picking pockets, locks, &c.—cannot form the subject-matter of valid letters patent. A grant of letters patent for such an object would be void, both on the ground of want of utility (*o*), and as being contrary to public policy. "It would be absurd if by one law patents might be granted to reward persons for providing the means of violating any other law" (*p*). It is, however, no objection to a patent that it was taken out for the purpose of evading a statute—*e.g.*, the Pharmacy Act (*q*).

Difference between discovery and invention.

Discovery and Invention.—The words of the exception clause of the statute of James I. appear so wide and extensive as to embrace almost the whole domain of the inventive faculty of the human mind. But there are, nevertheless, certain discoveries which may be most highly beneficial to mankind, and yet, for meritorious reasons, are not capable of forming the subject-matter of a valid patent. Moreover, if a part of what the patentee claims as being his invention is not proper subject-matter, it will vitiate the whole and render the grant entirely void so long as the specification remains unamended (*r*).

Many instances of discoveries which are incapable of protection by letters patent, and the reasons why, will be found in the following pages.

Discovery and invention are clearly not the same thing. A discovery will not form the basis of a patentable invention

(*m*) See Hindmarch on Patents, pp. 101, 102.

(*n*) See Cooper's Patent (1901), 19 R. P. C. 54.

(*o*) Chap. iv., *post*.

(*p*) See Hindmarch on Patents, p. 142.

(*q*) Vaisey's Patent (1894), 11 R. P. C. 593.

(*r*) Vol. II. p. 103.

unless the discoverer thereby adds something to the stock of public knowledge, and points to an act to be done, which, besides being new and useful is, on the facts of the particular case, the outcome of skilful ingenuity (s).

Discovery
and
Invention.

In the language of Lord Justice *Buckley*, then *Buckley, J.* (t)—

“Of course the difference between discovery and invention is very familiar. Discovery adds to the amount of human knowledge, but it does so only by lifting the veil and disclosing something which before had been unseen or dimly seen. Invention also adds to human knowledge, but not merely by disclosing something. Invention necessarily involves also the suggestion of an act to be done, and it must be an act which results in a new product, or a new result, or a new process, or a new combination for producing an old product or an old result” (u).

The following words of Lord *Lindley*, then *Lindley, L.J.*, taken from his judgment in *Lane Fox v. Kensington and Knightsbridge Electric Lighting Co.* (v) are most instructive upon this point.

“An invention is not the same thing as a discovery. When *Volta* [*sic. Galvani*] discovered the effect of an electric current from the battery on a frog’s leg he made a great discovery, but no patentable invention. Again, a man who discovers that a known machine can produce effects which no one knew could be produced by it before may make a great and useful discovery, but if he does no more his discovery is not a patentable invention (x). He has added nothing but knowledge to what previously existed. A patentee must do something more: he must make some addition, not only to knowledge, but to previously known inventions and must use his knowledge and ingenuity so as to produce either a new and useful thing or result, or a new method of producing an old thing or result. On the one hand, the discovery that a known thing—such for

(s) See p. 34, *post*.

(t) *Reynolds v. Herbert Smith & Co., Ltd.* (1902), 20 R. P. C. 126.

(u) See also *Jandus Arc Lamp and Electric Co., Ltd. v. Arc Lamp Co.* (1905), 22 R. P. C. 277, 296-7.

(v) (1892), 9 R. P. C. 416.]

(x) *Britain v. Hirsch* (1888), 5 R. P. C. 226 (on p. 232); *Harwood v. Great Northern Ry. Co.* (1865), 11 H. L. C. 654; *Horton v. Nabon* (1862), 12 C. B. N. S. 437; *Saxby v. Gloucester Waggon Co.* (1880), L. R. 7 Q. B. D. 305.

**Discovery
and
Invention.**

example as a *Planté* battery—can be used for a useful purpose for which it has never been used before is not alone a patentable invention; but, on the other hand, the discovery how to use such a thing for such a purpose will be a patentable invention, if there is novelty in the mode of using it as distinguished from novelty of purpose; or if any new modification of the thing, or any new appliance is necessary for using it for its new purpose, and if such mode of using or modification or appliance involves any appreciable merit. It is often extremely difficult to draw the line between patentable inventions and non-patentable discoveries; but I have endeavoured to state the distinction as I understand it, and so far as is necessary for the purpose of the present case. I have, of course, been guided by the previous decisions on the subject, and especially by *Harwood v. Great Northern Railway Co.* (y), which is the most instructive of them all. I have been induced to make these observations in order to apply them to the question whether the plaintiff's invention is anything more than a discovery that *Planté* cells can be usefully employed for incandescent lighting" (z).

Invention.—At common law the Crown has authority to grant letters patent for inventions to the true and first inventor only, *i.e.*, to the true and first inventor alone, or in conjunction with some other person or persons. This is the effect of the statements contained in the Statute of Monopolies (a), and the provisions of sect. 1 of the Patents and Designs Act, 1907. It is evident, therefore, that the grantee of the patent, or one of the grantees as the case may be, must be an inventor. That is to say he must, in arriving at the application of the discovery, which is the subject-matter of the patent, have exercised that faculty of the mind which is called invention.

Mere *scintilla*
of invention
is sufficient to
support a
patent.

The question arises as to whether any particular quantum of invention, in this sense, is necessary to the support of a grant of letters patent. The result of the cases on the point

(y) (1865), 11 H. L. C. 654.

(z) See also *Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ltd. v. Daylight Incandescent Mantle Co.* (1899), 17 R. P. C. 141, 148; *Case v. Cressy* (1900), 17 R. P. C. 261, 263; *Acetylene Illuminating Co., Ltd. v. United Alkali*

Co., Ltd. (1903), 20 R. P. C. 173; 22 R. P. C. 156; and compare *Jandus Arc Lamp and Electric Co., Ltd. v. Arc Lamp Co.* (1905), 22 R. P. C. 296-7.

(a) See p. 4, *ante*.

is that, provided the subject-matter of the patent is a manufacture, within the meaning of the Statute of Monopolies, and new and useful, a mere *scintilla* of invention is sufficient (b).

Invention.

(b) The following are the leading authorities on the point that a mere *scintilla* of invention is sufficient to support a patent for subject-matter which is in fact a new and useful "manufacture" within the meaning of the Statute of Monopolies, with the most important passages of the quoted judgments printed in *italics* :—

Harwood v. Great Northern Ry. Co. (1865), 11 H. L. C. 654; 35 L. J. Q. B. 27. In this case the patent related to "improvement in fishes and fish-joints for connecting the rails of railways," and was declared invalid. When the case reached the House of Lords the judges were summoned and requested to give their opinions as to whether upon the findings of the jury on the facts of the case a verdict should be entered for the plaintiffs or the defendants.

Blackburn, J., in delivering the opinions of himself and Shee, J., stated the law in the following terms, with which all the judges consulted and the House agreed (11 H. L. C. 666): "The Statute of Monopolies (21 Jac. 1, c. 3, s. 6) excepts from the abolition of monopolies patents for 'the sole working or making of any manner of new manufactures within this realm to the true and first inventor and inventors of such manufactures, which others at the time of making such letters patents and grants shall not use.' In order to bring the subject-matter of a patent within this exception, there must be *invention* so applied as to produce a practical result. And we agree with the Court of Exchequer Chamber that a mere application of an old contrivance in the old way to an analogous subject, *without any novelty or invention* in the mode of applying such old contrivance to the new purpose, is not a valid subject-matter of a patent. There are many decisions to that effect, which were referred to at your Lordships' bar; and, if the matter were now, for the first time, to be decided on the construction of the statute, without reference to the cases, we should think on principle that such should be the conclusion of the Court. But then in every case arises a question of fact whether the contrivance before in use

was so similar to that which the patentee claims that there is no invention in the differences, if any, between the old contrivance and that for which the patentee claims a monopoly; and, if there is none, there arises a further question—viz., whether the purpose to which the contrivance was before applied and the new purpose are so analogous or cognate that there is no discovery or invention in the new application? Whether, in short, it is a mere application or not? *For if there is invention or discovery producing a practical benefit, as in the case of Crane v. Price* (1840), 1 W. P. C. 377; 4 Man. & Gr. 580, it is the valid subject of a patent. And we think it always must be a question of degree—a question of more or less—whether the analogy or cognateness of the purposes is so close as to prevent them being an invention in the application. Mr. Grove, in his very able arguments, contended, we believe correctly enough, that if there was any real invention, though a slight one, producing a practical beneficial result, the patent was good. But the question still remains, was there such an amount of cognateness in the purposes that there was no real invention or discovery?"

Lord Westbury, L.C., in moving the House to confirm the decision of the Court of Exchequer Chamber, said (11 H. L. C. 682): "Then, my Lords, the question is, whether there can be any invention of the plaintiff in having taken that thing which was a fish for a bridge, and having applied it as a fish to a railway. Upon that I think the law is well and rightly settled, for there would be no end to the interference with trade and with the liberty of adopting any mechanical contrivance, if every slight difference in the application of a well-known thing should be held to constitute ground for a patent. There is the familiar contrivance of the button to the button-hole taken from the waistcoat or the coat, which may be applied in some particular mechanical combination in which it has not hitherto been applied; but it would be an idle thing, if it were possible, to take a well-known mechanical contrivance, and by applying it to a subject to which it had

Invention. There are dicta of some judges which, at first sight, at any rate, appear to the contrary (c), but it is submitted that the

not hitherto been applied to constitute that application the subject of a patent to be granted as for a new invention. No sounder or more wholesome doctrine, I think, was ever established than that which was established by the decisions which are referred to in the opinions of the four learned judges who concur in the second opinion delivered to your Lordships, namely, that you cannot have a patent for a well-known mechanical contrivance merely when it is applied in a manner or to a purpose, which is not quite the same, but is analogous to the manner or the purpose in or to which it has been hitherto notoriously used."

In *Elias v. Grovesend Tinplate Co.* (1890), 7 R. P. C. 455, Smith, L.J., pointed out that when Lord Westbury, L.C., stated that you cannot have a patent for a well-known mechanical contrivance *merely* when it is applied in an analogous manner or to an analogous purpose his Lordship meant "*unless there is invention in the adaptation or mode of application.*"

In *Penn v. Bibby* (1866), L. R. 2 Ch. 127; 36 L. J. Ch. 453, the patent related to "an improvement in the bearings and brushes for the shafts of screw and submerged propellers."

It was objected against the patent that it was a case of mere analogous use of bearings known in connection with grindstones and water-wheels. Lord Chelmsford, L.C., to whom there was an appeal for a new trial, in reference to the question of invention, said (L. R. 2 Ch. 135): "It was objected that the finding was erroneous, because the alleged invention was merely a new application of an old and well-known thing. It is very difficult to extract any principle from the various decisions on this subject which can be applied with certainty to every case; nor indeed is it easy to reconcile them with each other. The criterion given by Lord Campbell in *Brook v. Aston*, 8 E. & B. 485, has been frequently cited (as it was in the present argument), that a patent may be valid for the application of an old invention to a new purpose, but to make it valid there must be some novelty in the application. I cannot help thinking that there must be some inaccuracy in his Lordship's words, because according to the proposition,

as he stated it, if the invention be applied to a new purpose, there cannot but be some novelty in the application. In every case of this description one main consideration seems to be whether the new application lies so much out of the track of the former use as not naturally to suggest itself to a person turning his mind to the subject, but *to require some application of thought and study.* Now, strictly, applying this test to the present case, it appears to me impossible to say that the patented invention is merely an application of an old thing to a new purpose."

Thomson v. American Braided Wire Co. (1889), 6 R. P. C. 518, was a case near the border line, but the patent was upheld by the House of Lords on the ground that there was quite sufficient invention in the mode of application. Lord Herschell's judgment contains the following passage (6 R. P. C. 527): "It cannot be denied that both the prior patents to which I have referred afford some colour to the defendants' contention that the patentee has done nothing more than apply a known substance in a manner and to a purpose analogous to that in and to which it had been already applied, and that the patent therefore cannot be supported. If I thought that the patentee had claimed the mere use of tubular sections of braided wire as a bustle, however fastened or secured, I should arrive at the conclusion that the defendants' contention was well founded, but I do not thus construe the specification. I have already stated that in my opinion it is the combination alone for which protection is sought, and that the method of fastening the ends by clamping plates is an essential part of that which is claimed. Taking this view of the patent, *I think that*, even with the state of knowledge which existed at the time the patent was applied for, *some invention was required to produce the bustle claimed to be protected by it.* All the learned judges in the Court of Appeal, although they arrived at the same conclusion, stated that they had done so with hesitation, and expressed the opinion that but little invention was requisite, and that the case was near the border line. I

(c) See p. 37 for note (c).

above is a correct statement of the law. In all cases the question to be decided is, does the specification describe and claim *an* invention. If an invention is disclosed, it is quite immaterial, from the point of view of the validity of the patent, whether the invention is a great one or a small one. The essential consideration is the pure question of fact whether, in view of the circumstances peculiar to the case and the state of public knowledge at the date of the application for the patent, there has been an exercise of invention or not. The Courts adopt the view that though it is important to encourage inventions,

Invention.

entirely agree, and have not been without doubt as to the proper decision to be arrived at."

In *Vickers v. Siddell* (1890), 7 R. P. C. 292, the subject-matter of the patent related to an improved mechanical appliance for making or operating on large forgings in iron or steel. In the House of Lords, Lord Herschell said (7 R. P. C. 304): "The objections of want of novelty and subject-matter cover to some extent the same ground, but it will be expedient to deal with them as far as possible separately. The invention, so far as we are concerned with it in this part of the case, consists of an apparatus for turning heavy forgings, composed of a wheel and endless chain, the wheel being internally toothed, and having a ratchet working in it, by means of which the wheel is caused to rotate, and the forging which rests in the endless chain is thus turned from time to time to the extent desired. It is admitted by the respondent that the elements which form this combination are all old. On the other hand, the appellants admit that the combination was never in use prior to the date of the patent. But they allege that to combine these well-known elements into the apparatus needed no invention, and that it is therefore not proper subject-matter for a patent. Forgings, they say, had long rested in an endless chain, the idea of turning such forgings by turning the wheel over which the chain passed was not a new one, and a ratchet working in teeth was a well-known device for causing a wheel to rotate to the desired extent. All this, I think, cannot be denied. But the result is an apparatus of extremely simple character, which possesses the advantage of being easily moved from place to place and applied wherever

wanted. And the question remains whether this mode of dealing with forgings which require to be gradually turned was so obvious that it would at once occur to anyone acquainted with the subject and desirous of accomplishing the end, or *whether it required some invention to devise it*. There is no doubt about the law applicable to such a question, though it is often difficult to apply it to the circumstances of a particular case, and its application is perhaps most difficult when the alleged invention consists of a new apparatus combining known elements. If the apparatus be valuable by reason of its simplicity, there is a danger of being misled by that very simplicity into the belief that no invention was needed to produce it. But experience has shown that not a few inventions, some of which have revolutionised the industries of this country, have been of so simple a character that when once they were made known it was difficult to understand how the idea had been so long in presenting itself, or not to believe that they must have been obvious to every one." See also *Rickmann v. Thierry* (1896), 14 R. P. C. 105; *Longbottom v. Shaw* (1891), 8 R. P. C. 333; *Losh v. Hague* (1837), 1 W. P. C. 202, 207; *R. v. Cutler* (1847), 4 Q. B. 372, n.; 3 C. & K. 215; *Neilson v. Harford* (1841), 8 M. & W. 806; 11 L. J. Ex. 20; 1 W. P. C. 331; *Hayward v. Hamilton* (1879-81), Griff. P. C. 115; *Patent Exploitation, Ltd. v. Siemens Brothers & Co., Ltd.* (1904), 21 R. P. C. 549; *Gramophone and Typewriter, Ltd. v. Ullmann* (1906), 23 R. P. C. 260, 752; *Dredger v. Parnell* (1899), 16 R. P. C. 629.

(c) *E.g.*, in *Carter v. Leyson* (1902), 19 R. P. C. 478.

Invention. however small, having regard to their possible influence on the development of trade and manufacture, yet it is equally important that traders and manufacturers should not be hampered by the granting of patents where there has been no exercise of the inventive faculty at all (*d*). As is only to be expected, it is frequently found that judges differ *inter se* as to the correct conclusion to be drawn from the circumstances peculiar to a particular case (*e*). A decision of fact in one case is neither an authority, nor a help, to a decision of fact in another case. In the words of Lord Bowen (*f*): "Has there been an exercise of the inventive faculties? That depends on a true view of all the circumstances, and it cannot be governed in any one case by a finding of fact, on a totally different invention, by a tribunal like the House of Lords. We must apply our minds to the specific facts in the case before us; and nothing is more pernicious, or likely to lead the Court astray, than, when it has to decide a question of fact in one case, to wander into another case; to look at the decision of fact in that case and then to see what differentiations there can be between the facts in the cited case and the one before the Court. The Court that travels on these lines always goes wrong."

Essential considerations.

It is true that every invention capable of supporting a patent must be a new manufacture, but it does not follow that every novelty, though an important and useful one, is good subject-matter. In order to support a patent the novelty must be *de jure* as well as *de facto* (*g*). In other words, it must be the result of invention. It is not, however, necessary that any great amount of thought, design, or skilful ingenuity must have actually been expended in making the invention, for the discovery may have been the outcome of a mere guess or happy accident, suggesting the novel application which is the real meritorious invention. Thus, the discovery of water tabbies was made by mere accident. A man having spat upon the floor, placed a hot iron on the moisture, and observed that it spread out into a kind of flower. He afterwards tried

(*d*) See per Parker, J., *West v. Keaves (James) & Sons, Ltd.* (1911), 28 R. P. C. 478.

(*e*) See, e.g., *Hill v. Thomas & Sons* (1907), 24 R. P. C. 415; *Atkinson v.*

Britton (1910), 27 R. P. C. 469.

(*f*) *Lyon v. Goddard* (1893), 10 R. P. C. 346.

(*g*) See *Murray v. Clayton* (1872), L. R. 7 Ch. 578.

the experiment upon linen, and found it produced the same effect. He then obtained a patent for a process based on the accidental discovery, which proved of great value (*h*). Invention.

If the alleged invention is obvious, and it cannot be presumed that the exercise of thought, design, or skilful ingenuity was required in making it, the patent is void, on the ground that there is no invention. It has been authoritatively stated that in point of law the labour of thought or experiment, and the expenditure of money, are not the essential grounds of consideration on which the question whether the invention is, or is not, the subject-matter of a patent ought to depend; for if the invention be new, and useful to the public, it is not material whether it be the result of long experiment and profound search, or of some sudden and lucky thought, or mere accidental discovery (*i*). The conception of the idea is, in many cases, the whole merit of the invention; and its application, when once conceived, becomes the simplest thing in the world, and, consequently, does not evidence the expenditure of much thought, design, or skilful ingenuity (*l*).

The task of the Court in deciding whether the patentee has made an invention or not is one of varying difficulty. Thus, when the patentee's claim, properly construed, is for a thing substantially as described, and the fact is that no such thing ever existed before and, by means of the thing, a result not previously produced can be attained, it is difficult to say that that thing is not subject-matter for a valid patent, especially where there is no evidence of any prior instrument performing the same function as the thing described and claimed (*l*). And as stated by Lord *Halsbury*, L.C.: "There is nothing, I suppose, more difficult, when you are dealing with a mechanical combination, than to keep one's mind free from the impression created by the fact that all the elements, or most of the elements, in such a case are old . . . it is, of course, extremely difficult to deal with such questions in the abstract, and I am disposed to think myself that the source of error is in dealing with it

Decision may
be difficult.

(*h*) See *Liardet v. Johnson* (1778), 1 W. P. C. 54; see also 2 H. Bl. 486; *Crane v. Price* (1842), 1 W. P. C. 411.

(*i*) Per Tindal, C.J., *Crane v. Price* (1842), 1 W. P. C. 411.

(*l*) See pp. 42, 43, *post*.

(*l*) See the above-quoted passage from *Vickers v. Siddell*; *Annand v. Taylor* (1900), 18 R. P. C. 53; *British United Shoe Machinery Co. v. Thompson* (1904), 22 R. P. C. 177, 196; *Gramophone and Typewriter, Ltd. v. Ulman* (1906), 23 R. P. C. 260, 752.

Invention. in the abstract; because you have to start with the proposition that everything is old, and until you apply yourself to what is the peculiar mechanism for the purpose required, you do not adequately appreciate—and I may frankly say that I did not adequately appreciate—what the invention is until you come to put it in a concrete form and to see what the thing is, what the thing was intended to do, and then apply your mind to see whether in its combination it has been anticipated or not” (*m*).

An obvious combination is not subject-matter.

A new combination which is obvious and consists merely in putting together two known things, each being applied to do that which it had been used to do before, without making any other experiment, or gaining any further information, is not proper subject-matter (*n*), neither is the mere duplicating of a known thing, though the result is eminently useful (*o*).

For example, in *Williams v. Nye* (*p*), the patent was for a sausage-making machine, and it appeared that there was known an old machine, *Nye's*, in which there was a combination of a cutting process and a forcing forward or filling into the skin which was to enclose the meat when cut up. *Nye's* cutting process was defective. There was also known an old cutting process, *Donald's*, which was satisfactory. What the plaintiff did, was to introduce into *Donald's* cutting machine, and on the shaft which worked it, a screw to force the meat when minced into the sausage skin. Such a forcing screw was used in *Nye's* machine. Though the plaintiff did in fact turn *Donald's* machine into a machine which filled as well as cut, and so produced a machine which was now and better than *Nye's* cutting and filling machine, yet the Court of first instance and the Court of Appeal held that there was no sufficient invention, and the patent was bad on the ground of lack of subject-matter.

The mixing of two substances together may result in a useful chemical effect, which is not produced by either of the

(*m*) *Taylor v. Annand* (1900), 18 R. P. C. 62.

(*n*) *Williams v. Nye* (1890), 7 R. P. C. 62; *Ormson v. Clarke* (1862); 13 C. B. 339; 14 C. B. 490; *Newsom v. Mann* (1890), 7 R. P. C. 307; *Heys v. Hallmark* (1891), 9 R. P. C. 25; *Bridges' Patent* (1901), 18 R. P. C. 257; *Ward-*

roper v. George Gibbs, Ltd. (1903), 20 R. P. C. 355; *Northern Press and Engineering Co., Ltd. v. Hoe (R.) & Co.* (1906), 23 R. P. C. 417, 613.

(*o*) *Elias v. Grovesend Tinsplate Co.* (1890), 7 R. P. C. 455; *Morgan v. Windover* (1890), 7 R. P. C. 131.

(*p*) (1890), 7 R. P. C. 37, 62, 66.

substances separately, and under such circumstances the mixture may be good subject-matter for a patent (*q*). Invention.

The practical success of a new article is in itself cogent evidence from which the conclusion may be drawn that the exercise of invention was necessary to the first production of the article; though in many cases commercial success is by no means proof of invention (*r*). Nevertheless, immediate commercial success has a very important bearing on the question, especially when it appears that the thing never was done in the memory of man down to a particular point, and at the moment it is done it is a great success as regards utility (*s*). Practical and commercial success.

When an article suddenly springs into existence and meets a long unsatisfied demand, the length of time during which the demand was unsatisfied is matter from which it may be inferred that it is ingenuity alone which has enabled the inventor to surmount the obstacle, which otherwise would seem, from the mere existence of the long unsatisfied demand, to have existed somewhere, or in some shape (*t*). The merits of an invention are not to be deemed any the less because it subsequently appears what a little alteration was required in, or in the adjustment of, some of the parts of previously known machines, in order to produce the patented machine which will successfully do the work first done by it (*u*). Unsatisfied demand.

The fact, however, must not be overlooked that the demand itself may be quite new, and the novelty of the demand may have led immediately to the production, without ingenuity, of an obvious article to satisfy it, which consequently could not be good subject-matter (*x*).

Though the exact thing claimed by the patentee cannot be said to have been anywhere actually published or described Effect of common knowledge on question of invention.

(*q*) See *Molassine Co., Ltd. v. Townsend (R.) & Co., Ltd.* (1906), 23 R. P. C. 27.

(*r*) *E.g.*, *Riekmann v. Thierry* (1896), 14 R. P. C. 103; *Fawcett v. Horman* (1896), 16 R. P. C. 274; *Longbottom v. Shaw* (1891), 3 R. P. C. 333.

(*s*) See per Bowen, L.J., *American Braided Wire Co. v. Thomson* (1888), 5 R. P. C. 125; *Ehrlich v. Ihlee* (1888), 5 R. P. C. 205; *Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation v. Smith* (1894), 11 R. P. C. 398; *Parker v. Satchwell* (1901), 18 R. P. C. 367-8; *British Vacuum Cleaner Co., Ltd. v.*

Suction Cleaners, Ltd. (1904), 21 R. P. C. 312; *Patent Exploitation, Ltd. v. Siemens Brothers & Co., Ltd.* (1904), 21 R. P. C. 548.

(*t*) *Gosnell v. Bishop* (1888), 5 R. P. C. 158; *American Braided Wire Co. v. Thomson* (1888), 5 P. O. R. 125; *Blakey v. Latham* (1889), 6 R. P. C. 187; *Elias v. Grovesend Tinplate Co.* (1890), 7 R. P. C. 455; *Gammons v. Battersby* (1904), 21 R. P. C. 331.

(*u*) See *ibid.*; *Gammons v. Battersby* (1904), 21 R. P. C. 332.

(*x*) *Ibid.*

Invention. in its entirety, yet the state of common knowledge may be such that there is, as a fact, no invention in passing from what was known to the thing claimed by the patentee (*y*).

Simplicity no
bar to
invention.

No apparent smallness or simplicity in what the patentee does will prevent the patent being good, if some invention was requisite to produce the new result; but, on the other hand, mere novelty of manufacture, or usefulness in the application of known materials to analogous uses or the arrangement of old parts in combination, will not necessarily establish invention within the meaning of the patent law (*z*).

Sometimes an invention which is an improvement on what has gone before appears extremely simple when discovered and explained, but it does not at all follow that it was obvious before, or did not require invention, or is not of great merit, and the proper subject-matter of a patent. Thus in the case of the discovery of Lanolin the invention consisted in freeing the known commercial wool-fat from fatty acids and other impurities and so leaving only the cholesterine fats, which it was discovered when kneaded and worked take up water and form the highly useful product Lanolin. At the date of the patent the methods used for separating the cholesterine fats were old and known, and a preparation of wool-fat described by *Dioscorides* and called *œsypus*, from which the fatty acids had not been completely removed, was known as an unguent to the ancients. The Courts nevertheless found that the process which yielded the highly useful product Lanolin was the outcome of great invention and the subject-matter of a valid patent (*a*).

Conception of
an idea may

Sometimes the merit of an invention consists in clearly

(*y*) See cases note (*z*), *infra*, and pp. 152, 431, *post*.

(*z*) *Riekmann v. Thierry* (1896), 14 R. P. C. 105; *Longbottom v. Shaw* (1891), 8 R. P. C. 336; *Hinks v. Safety Lighting Co.* (1876), L. R. 4 Ch. D. 607; *Brook v. Aston* (1857-9), 8 Ell. & B. 478; *Ormson v. Clarke* (1862), 13 C. B. 339; 14 C. B. 400; *Saxby v. Gloucester Waggon Co.* (1880), L. R. 7 Q. B. D. 305; 50 L. J. Q. B. 577; *Williams v. Nye* (1890), 7 R. P. C. 62; *Newsum v. Mann* (1890), 7 R. P. C. 307; *Elias v. Grovesend Tinplate Co.* (1890), 7 R. P. C. 455; *Morgan v. Windover* (1890),

7 R. P. C. 131; *Hoys v. Hallmark* (1891), 9 R. P. C. 25; *Duckett v. Whitehead* (1895), 12 R. P. C. 376; *Action Gesellschaft fur Cartonagen Industrie v. Schroeder* (1896), 13 R. P. C. 466; *Fuller v. Handy* (1903), 21 R. P. C. 6; *McNaught v. Dawson* (1905), 22 R. P. C. 389; 23 R. P. C. 219; *Arnot v. Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ltd.* (1904), 22 R. P. C. 105, 472; 25 R. P. C. 309; *Northern Press Engineering Co., Ltd. v. Hoe (R.) & Co.* (1906), 23 R. P. C. 417, 613.

(*a*) *Benno Jaffé und Darmstaedter Lanolin Fabrik v. Richardson* (1893), 11 R. P. C. 93, 261; see also *ibid*.

appreciating some particular useful end to be attained, or, as has been aptly said, in "apprehending a desideratum," the merit of the patent consisting not so much in the way in which the idea was carried out as in conceiving the idea itself (*b*). In fact, invention may lie in an idea, or in the way of carrying out an idea, or in the combination of the two. If the patentee shows a way of carrying out an idea in which invention lies, the patent is valid, though the way of carrying out the idea may involve no invention (*c*). Thus the idea of using the old and well-known operation of "shogging" for the new purpose of obviating waste of thread in lace-making machines has been held to be the basis of a patentable invention, notwithstanding that the realisation of the idea involved no difficulty (*d*).

Invention.

be the merit of an invention.

Again, it has been held that the fact a chemist would know *a priori* that by mixing two known substances together an explosive would be the result, did not destroy the patent of a man, who by experimentally mixing them together and treating the result in a certain known way so as to waterproof it found he did get an explosive, Roburite, which satisfied commercial requisites which were not satisfied by explosives known before (*e*). In this case the invention consisted, as it often does in other cases, of putting together items of common knowledge which no one else has ever thought of combining—common knowledge that you may mix, common knowledge that you may waterproof—but the essence of the invention was that the inventor had taken a great many things which were common knowledge and tried which of them would produce a useful and new result, and he thus ascertained that, following the process described by him in his specification, he arrived at a new and useful result, which was undoubtedly invention, and in the particular case invention of a somewhat high order.

But the mere substitution of an obvious chemical equivalent for a chemical substance used in a known process is not

(*b*) See *Fawcett v. Homan* (1896), 13 R. P. C. 405, 410; *Hayward v. Hamilton* (1881), Griff. P. C. 116, 117.

(*c*) See *Hickton's Patent Syndicate v. Patents and Machine Improvements Co., Ltd.* (1909), 26 R. P. C. 539.

(*d*) *Hickton's Patent Syndicate v. Patents and Machine Improvements Co., Ltd.* (1909), 26 R. P. C. 339.

(*e*) *Lancashire Explosives Co. v. Roburite Explosives Co.* (1895), 12 R. P. C. 470, 482.

Invention. invention. Thus in *McLay v. Lawes & Co., Ltd.* (f), it appeared that calcium sulphate in the form of gypsum had, at the date of the patent sued on, been used and was well known as one of the factors in the manufacture of composition for the covering of boilers, and that calcium sulphate produced by precipitation as a waste product in the manufacture of tartaric acid was chemically substantially the same as gypsum—though physically there might be a slight difference in that the precipitated form was more finely divided than the ground gypsum. The Court held that the patentee's claim, which really amounted to a claim for the use of the waste product instead of native gypsum in the known process, was bad for want of subject-matter.

Where some substantial advance is made in the arts the Courts do not conclude that there is no invention merely because the way in which the advance was effected was very simple, and after its publication it may be matter of surprise that the advance was not made earlier. On the other hand, the Courts in coming to a conclusion whether there has been invention or not, do not forget the prejudicial effects upon trade which may be caused by patents being taken out for unsubstantial alterations in known machines or contrivances in order to effect a small result of trifling or dubious utility (g).

Where the idea has been published, the patent of a person who may be the first to put the idea into practice cannot be valid, if, upon the facts of the case, the putting the idea into practice did not involve invention. Thus, *Hennebique's* patent for a manufactured article, viz., a pile constructed of ferro-concrete, was declared invalid by the Court of Appeal and the House of Lords, because, at the date of the patent, the idea of using ferro-concrete for such a purpose had been published by an abstract from a Belgium specification, and, upon the facts of the case, no invention was involved in constructing the pile of ferro-concrete as *Hennebique* constructed it (h).

Selection of a member of a class.

Invention, again, may sometimes consist in the selection of particular members of a class of substances, which possess

(f) (1905), 22 R. P. C. 199.

(g) See *Waterhouse's Patent* (1906), 23 R. P. C. 476; *International Harvester Company of America v. Peacock* (1908), 25 R. P. C. 765.

(h) *Hennebique v. Cowlin* (1909), 26 R. P. C. 280. This case is reported in the court of first instance and Court of Appeal under the name of *Moucel v. Coignet*, 23 R. P. C. 649; 24 R. P. C. 229.

properties by means of which the inventor is able to produce a result which is new and useful, or, if old, is attained in a better or more economical way than hitherto (*i*). Invention.

So, though a class of bodies may have been employed before for a particular purpose, there may be such invention in selecting one member of the class which possesses particular advantages not shared by the other members of the class as will support a patent for the use of that particular member (*k*).

So also, though different machines of a certain general class or character be well known, if a person selects and applies one specially adapted for his purpose to effect a new object and produce a new article, or an old article in a substantially more expeditious and economical way than it was produced before, then he may properly claim, as subject-matter of a patent, that machine as applied to the new object, notwithstanding that he could not have claimed the machine *per se*—that is to say, without limitation as to its application (*l*). New applica-
tion of known
machine.

Again, invention may consist in the use according to a new method of a known machine whereby no structural alteration is required in the machine, but a new and useful result is produced (*m*); or it may consist in degree—*e.g.*, strengthening a part of a previously proposed combination whereby what is in fact a new and useful process may be effected (*n*); or it may consist in selecting a known thing of a particular size or degree, or constructing a part of a known machine or tool of a particular size and shape (*o*), whereby a result highly desired, but till then incapable of attainment, is achieved. Use according
to new method
of old
machine.

Degree.

Size or shape.

(*i*) *Farbenfabriken vorm. F. Bayer v. Bowker* (1891), 8 R. P. C. 389; *Lancashire Explosives Co. v. Roburite Explosives Co.* (1895), 12 R. P. C. 470, 478; 13 R. P. C. 429; 14 R. P. C. 303; but see *Fabriques de Produits Chimiques de Thanu et de Mulhouse v. Lafitte* (1899), 16 R. P. C. 61.

(*k*) *Hills v. The London Gas Light Co.* (1860), 5 H. & N. 312; 29 L. J. Ex. 409; *Wylie and Morton's Patents* (1896), 13 R. P. C. 97, in which a patent was refused on the ground that there was in that case no invention in making the selection.

(*l*) *Adamant Stone and Paving Co.*

v. Corporation of Liverpool (1896), 14 R. P. C. 21; *Dowling v. Billington* (1889), 7 R. P. C. 191.

(*m*) *Dowling v. Billington* (1889), 7 R. P. C. 191.

(*n*) *British Vacuum Cleaner Co., Ltd. v. Suction Cleaners, Ltd.* (1904), 21 R. P. C. 303; *Lyon v. Goddard* (1893), 10 R. P. C. 121, 334; 11 R. P. C. 113; *British Vacuum Cleaner Co., Ltd. v. London and South Western Ry. Co.* (1911), 28 R. P. C. 77.

(*o*) *Jandus Arc Lamp and Electric Co., Ltd. v. Arc Lamp Co.* (1905), 22 R. P. C. 277, 297; *Fellows v. Brookes* (1910), 27 R. P. C. 89.

Invention.

Mere use of known machine in a more beneficial manner.

Mere adaptation of old idea.

Mere skilful application of known tool, or judicious carrying out of known method,

or mere alteration of shape or proportions of parts is not invention.

Exhaustive classification not possible.

The foregoing instances of invention must, however, be contrasted, and not confused with, the case of a claim to a mere use of a known machine in a more beneficial manner (*p*); or the mere use of a known material for the construction of a known class of articles whereby a pleasing result is produced (*q*).

It is not invention to adapt, without ingenuity, a well-known idea in a well-known manner for a well-known purpose, though the identical adaptation has not been made before and a very useful effect is the result (*r*); or merely with greater skill to apply well-known tools and processes, and so to satisfy a want felt by persons in a particular trade (*s*); or the mere judicious carrying out of a well-known method together with mere adaptive skill in manufacture (*t*).

Neither is it invention merely to alter the shape of a known thing, though to do so might possibly be the subject of a new design (*u*); or to alter the proportions of parts used in combination before, when proportion is not of the essence of success (*x*).

Classes of Inventions.—Any invention which possesses all the attributes imposed as conditions by the law—viz., that it is included in the term “new manufactures” as used in the sixth section of the Statute of Monopolies (*y*) and is new and useful—may be the subject of a grant of letters patent.

It is not possible to give a classification of inventions, including all which may be held to fall within the definition given in 21 Jac. I. c. 3, s. 6. The difficulty which exists in giving an exhaustive classification of all inventions which could possibly support a grant of letters patent arises from the fact that the arts and manufactures of the country are in a continual state of progression, and consequently desirable results, never before contemplated, are continually presenting themselves, and the most minute changes may constitute new and useful inventions when they are the outcome of thought, design, or skilful ingenuity.

(*p*) See pp. 86 and 60, *post*.

(*q*) *Hudson, Scott & Sons, Ltd. v. Barringer, Wallis and Manners, Ltd.* (1905), 23 R. P. C. 79, 502; *March v. Wolf* (1906), 24 R. P. C. 265.

(*r*) Pp. 88—101, *post*.

(*s*) *Dredge v. Parnell* (1899), 16 R. P. C. 625.

(*t*) See *Beavis v. Rylands Glass and*

Engineering Co., Ltd. (1899), 17 R. P. C. 98, 704.

(*u*) *Heys v. Hallmark* (1892), 9 R. P. C. 25; *Beavis v. Rylands Glass and Engineering Co.* (1900), 17 R. P. C. 98, 704.

(*x*) *Savage v. Harris* (1896), 13 R. P. C. 364.

(*y*) 21 Jac. 1, c. 3, s. 6.

It may, however, be pointed out that all inventions for which letters patent have hitherto been upheld on the ground of subject-matter may be classed under one or more of the following heads:—

Classes of Inventions.

- I. New or old methods of applying new principles.
- II. New methods of applying old principles.
- III. New contrivances applied to new objects or purposes.
- IV. New contrivances applied to old objects or purposes.
- V. New combinations of new or old, or partly new and partly old, parts, which result either in the production of a material object or process.
- VI. New methods, involving the exercise of invention, of applying old things or processes.
- VII. Improvements on known methods, processes or combinations consisting in the addition to, the omission from, or the rearrangement of, old steps or parts.
- VIII. Application, with ingenuity, of materials, processes, or things to some one or more specific useful purpose or purposes.

PRINCIPLES.

A new principle—*i.e.*, an abstract law of Nature, a fundamental law of science—cannot be the subject-matter of a valid patent.

Principles alone are not subject-matter,

Principles may be of the utmost value to mankind, as, for instance, the principle of gravitation or the doctrine of evolution, which have in the hands of their discoverers and others been productive of the greatest usefulness. The law, however, will not attempt to secure to the discoverer the sole use and enjoyment of such a bare principle, or to prohibit others from making use of it. In the language of Lord *Kenyon*, it would be difficult to frame a specification of a philosophical principle, it would be something like an idea without a substratum (*z*).

Moreover, the very statement of what a principle is proves it not to be a ground for a patent. It is a first ground and rule for arts and sciences, or, in other words, the elements

(*z*) *Hornblower v. Boulton* (1799), 8 T. R. 95; Dav. P. C. 221; see also *Boulton v. Bull* (1795), 2 H. Bl. 463.

Principles. and rudiments of them. A patent must be for some production from those elements, and not for the elements themselves; for some new manufacture, whether with or without principle, produced by art or accident (a).

A principle cannot of itself, apart from a practical application, produce any vendible article or manufacture, and therefore, unless the discoverer of a principle points out some practical application of it, it is clear that he cannot give the public the consideration necessary to support a patent—viz., a new and useful manufacture.

but may be
together with
a method of
application.

Principles in a concrete form, together with a method of applying them to a new and useful purpose, may form the subject of a grant of letters patent. In other words, a new principle or a new idea as regards any art or manufacture, together with a mode of carrying it into practice, may be patented, though the idea alone, and very likely the machine alone, because the machine might not be new, is not proper subject-matter (b).

The following remarks of *Jessel*, M.R. (c), in reference to the patent for the *Otto* gas engine are most instructive in this connection:

“The first objection is that this is not the subject-matter of a patent, because it is said that what is claimed is a principle . . . or, as it is sometimes termed, the idea of putting a cushion of air between the explosive mixture and the piston of the gas motor engine, so as to regulate, detain, or make gradual what would otherwise be a sudden explosion. Of course that could not be patented. I do not read the patent so. I read the patent as being to the effect that the patentee tells us that there is the idea which he wishes to carry out, but he also describes other kinds of machines which will carry it out, and he claims to carry it out substantially by one or other of these machines. That is the subject of a patent. If you have a new principle, or a new idea, as regards any art or manufacture, and then show a mode of carrying that into practice, you may patent that, though you could not

(a) *Boulton v. Bull* (1795), Dav. 240; *Cassel Gold Extracting Co. v. Cyanide Gold Recovery Syndicate* (1895), 12 R. P. C. 232, 256.
 (b) *Otto v. Linford* (1881), 46 L. T. N. S. 35; L. R. 18 Ch. D. 394;
 (c) *Otto v. Linford* (1881), 46 L. T. N. S. 35.
Crossley v. Porter (1853), Moore, P. C.

patent the idea alone, and very likely could not patent the machine alone, because the machine alone would not be new. One of the strongest illustrations that I know of is the patent for the hot blast in the iron manufacture, where there was nothing new at all except the idea that the application of hot air instead of cold air to the mixture of iron ore and fuel would produce most remarkable results in the shape of economy in the manufacture of iron. The inventor or discoverer could not patent that, but what he did was this. He said: 'I will patent that idea in combination with the mode of carrying it out; that is, I tell you you may heat your air in a closed vessel next your furnace, and then that will effect the object.' It was held that that would do. . . . Now that is a much stronger illustration than this of the validity of a patent as regards the subject-matter. For here is a complicated machine. . . . In the case of the hot blast the man did not pretend to invent anything; he said a machine of any shape in which you can heat air is sufficient. Mr. *Otto* does allege he has invented a machine. It appears that he did, although a machine which, *per se*, was not of sufficient novelty probably to support a patent. It comes therefore to this, that we have a principle and a mode of carrying it out, and, I will assume for this purpose, sufficiently described, and that is good subject-matter for a patent."

Principles.

A claim to every mode of carrying a principle or idea into effect amounts to a claim for the principle or idea itself, and therefore renders the patent void (*d*), unless the patentee has described in the specification a method or methods of utilising the principle or idea, *i.e.*, unless he has embodied the principle or idea, in which case such a claim is good provided always that the patentee was the discoverer of the principle or idea (*e*).

Claim to all methods of application amounts to claim to principle itself.

Thus the patent, the validity of which was questioned in *Neilson v. Harford* (*f*), and also in *Househill Co. v. Neilson* (*g*), was for an improved method of applying air to produce heat in furnaces, and the specification stated that

Illustrations of allowable claims to principles coupled with methods of application.

(*d*) See *Neilson v. Harford* (1841), 1 W. P. C. 295; *Booth v. Kennard* (1856), 2 H. & N. 84; 26 L. T. Ex. 23, 305; *Wyeth v. Stone*, 1 Story, 273; *Arnold v. Bradbury* (1871), L. R. 6 Ch. App. 711; *Patterson v. Gas Light &*

Coke Co. (1875), L. R. 2 Ch. D. 812; 3 App. Cas. 239.

(*e*) See p. 57, *post*.

(*f*) (1841), 1 W. P. C. 295, 328, 331.

(*g*) (1843), 1 W. P. C. 673.

Principios. “a blast or current of air must be produced by blowing apparatus in the ordinary way. The blast so produced is to be passed from the blowing apparatus into an air-vessel, and from that vessel by means of a pipe into the furnace. The air-vessel must be kept artificially heated at a considerable temperature. It is better to be kept to red heat, or nearly so, but so high a temperature is not absolutely necessary to produce a beneficial effect. The size of the air-vessel must depend upon the blast and on the heat necessary to be produced. *The form or shape of the vessel, or receptacle, is immaterial to the effect, and may be adapted to the local circumstances or situation.*” There was no separate claim. The defendants in *Neilson v. Harford* contended that the patent was bad, as being for a principle only, but the Court of Exchequer, after much debate, came to the conclusion that it claimed not only a principle, but also a practical means of carrying the principle into effect—viz., heating the air in a separate vessel, and was therefore good. As reported in *Househill Co. v. Neilson (h)*, Lord Justice Clerk *Hope*, addressing the jury and referring generally to the validity of patents for methods of carrying principles into effect, used the following words, which were not objected to by the House of Lords in that case, and have often been quoted with approval by Judges in subsequent cases:

“It is quite true that a patent cannot be taken out solely for an abstract philosophical principle—for instance, for any law of Nature, or any property of matter, apart from any mode of turning it to account in the practical operations of manufacture, or the business, and arts, and utilities of life. The mere discovery of such a principle is not an invention in the patent law sense of the term. Stating such a principle in a patent may be a promulgation of the principle, but it is no application of the principle to any practical purpose. And without that application of the principle to a practical object and end, and without the application of it to human industry, or to the purposes of human enjoyment, a person cannot in the abstract appropriate a principle to himself. But a patent will be good, though the subject of the patent consists in the discovery of a just, general, and most com-

(h) (1843), 1 W. P. C. 673, 683.

prehensive principle in science or law of Nature, if that principle is by the specification applied to any special purpose, so as thereby to effectuate a practical result and benefit not previously attained. The main merit, the most important part of the invention, may consist in the conception of the original idea—in the discovery of the principle in science, or of the law of Nature, stated in the patent—and little or no pains may have been taken in working out the best manner and mode of the application of the principle to the purposes set forth in the patent. But still if the principle is stated to be applicable to any special purpose, so as to produce any result previously unknown, in the way and for the objects described, the patent is good. It is no longer an abstract principle. It comes to be a principle turned to account to a practical object, and applied to a special result. It becomes, then, not an abstract principle, which means a principle considered apart from any special purpose or practical operation, but the discovery and statement of a principle for a special purpose, that is, a practical invention, a mode of carrying a principle into effect. That such is the law, if a well-known principle is applied for the first time to produce a practical result for a special purpose, has never been disputed. It would be very strange and unjust to refuse the same legal effect, when the inventor has the additional merit of discovering the principle as well as its application to a practical object. The instant that the principle, although discovered for the first time, is stated, in actual application to, and as the agent of, producing a certain specified effect, it is no longer an abstract principle, it is then clothed with the language of practical application, and receives the impress of tangible direction to the actual business of human life.”

In *Patterson v. Gas Light and Coke Co.* (i), a patent, which claimed the employment of sulphide of calcium in separate purifiers as a means of purifying coal-gas from sulphur existing in other forms than that of sulphuretted hydrogen, was declared void, on the ground that the claim amounted to a claim to the known principle however effected as distinct from a particular invented means of carrying it out. The judgment of *James, L.J.*, which was affirmed in the House of

(i) (1875), L. R. 2 Ch. D. 812; 3 App. Cas. 239; 45 L. J. Ch. 843; 47 L. J. Ch. 402.

Principles. Lords, contains the following passage in reference to the claim for "the employment of sulphide of calcium in separate purifiers as a means of purifying coal-gas from sulphur existing in other forms than that of sulphuretted hydrogen":

"There is nothing in this but the enunciation of a chemical truth that pure sulphide of calcium will absorb the sulphur compounds. The plaintiff believed that he had discovered that chemical truth, although it had been taught for many years in many books, and was well known to chemists. There is no invention of any particular process or means of employing the pure sulphide of calcium. If pure sulphide of calcium is to be used, it must be used in some separate purifier, and there is nothing therefore in any previous part of the specification to limit the universality of the claim to the employment of sulphide of calcium for the removal of sulphur in other forms than sulphuretted hydrogen. It is obviously impossible to support such a claim as that, which was plainly based on the plaintiff's mistaken idea that he had discovered that peculiar property in sulphide of calcium."

In *Dangerfield v. Jones (k)*, a patent for a mode of bending wood for the handles of walking-sticks, &c., in which the claim was "the application of a flame of gas or other combustible fluid or liquid as described for softening the fibres of the wood while being bent in combination with a clamping apparatus for securing the wood in its bent form until the fibres are set, so that the work may remain permanent as herein set forth," was declared to be perfectly valid, Vice-Chancellor *Wood*, before whom the case was tried, saying: "If, having a particular purpose in view, you take the general principles of mechanics, and apply one or other of them to a manufacture to which it has never been before applied, that is sufficient ground for taking out a patent, provided that the Court sees that that which has been invented is new, desirable, and for the public benefit" (*l*).

In *Minter v. Wells (m)*, on motion to nonsuit the plaintiff, who had succeeded in an action against the defendant for infringement of a patent, in the specification of which *Minter*

(k) (1865), 13 L. T. N. S. 142.

(l) *Ibid.*

(m) (1834), 1 W. P. C. 134.

claimed "the application of a self-adjusting leverage to the back and seat of a chair, whereby the weight on the seat acts as a counterbalance to the pressure against the back of such chair, as above described," the defendant contended that *Minter* had claimed the principle of the lever, but the Court held that it was the application of a self-adjusting leverage to the back and seat of a chair, the patentee having described what that self-adjusting leverage was. And it was further held that any application of a self-adjusting leverage to the back and seat of a chair producing this effect, that the one acts as a counterbalance to the pressure against the other, would be an infringement of the patent, and it was not a leverage only, but the application of a self-adjusting leverage; and it was not a self-adjusting leverage only, but a self-adjusting leverage producing a particular effect, by means of which the weight on the seat counterbalanced the pressure against the back. *Parke, B.*, in reply to the statement that this was nothing more than one of the first principles of mechanics, observed: "But that not being in combination before cannot that be patented? It is only for the application of a self-adjusting leverage to a chair—cannot he patent that? He claims the combination of the two, no matter in what shape you may combine them, but if you combine the self-adjusting leverage, which he thus applies to the subject of a chair, that is an infringement of his patent."

In the *Electric Telegraph Co. v. Brett* (n) the patentees claimed, substantially: (1) "We wish it to be understood that we make no claim to the application of the multiplying coils of conducting wires herein described (meaning thereby the galvanometer coils and magnetic needles), but the improvement and the adaptation of magnetic needles for giving signals consists in disposing the needles in vertical planes with fixed horizontal axes, making them heavier at one end than the other, so that they hang perpendicularly, and limiting the angular motion by stops, against which the needles may rest in suitable inclining directions for pointing out on a vertical dial the signification of the signals. (2) The combining several needles, so as to give signals by determinate angular motions. (3) The improvement whereby the com-

(n) (1851), 10 C. B. 838; 20 L. J. C. P. 123.

Principles. plete apparatus for giving signals and sounding alarms, as described, may have duplicates of such apparatus at intermediate places between the two ends, all such duplicates operating simultaneously with each other." In the judgment, *Cresswell, J.*, said: "It was insisted that the giving of duplicate signals at intermediate stations was not the proper subject of a patent, being an idea or principle only, and not a new manufacture. But we think that the patentees not only communicated the idea or principle that duplicate signals might be given, but showed how it might be done—*i.e.*, by duplicate apparatus at each station—and that this is a fit subject of a patent."

Claim to a general arrangement distinguished from claim to a principle.

A claim to a particular general arrangement may be distinguished from a claim to a principle itself. Phonographs were at one time made with a single diaphragm, with a single tool or point for recording and reproducing. Later, two diaphragms were used with separate recording and reproducing points, together with a floating weight applied to give the proper pressure to the reproducing point. Edison then discovered that the floating weight might also be applied to the recording point, and so a single diaphragm with both the points on it might be used. For this discovery a patent was obtained, and the specification claimed (*inter alia*) "In a phonograph, attaching both the recording point and the reproducing point to the same diaphragm, means being provided whereby either of the points may be brought into operative position on the surface of the phonogram." In an action brought for the infringement of this patent, it was sought on the defendant's behalf to establish that the claim was a claim to monopolise the principle of having both points on a single diaphragm. It was however held, both by the Judge of first instance and the Court of Appeal, that on the evidence the claim was not for a principle, but for a novel and useful arrangement (*o*). Lord *Esher, M.R.*, in the Court of Appeal, adopted the decision of *Wright, J.*, *ipsissimis verbis*, and said (*p*):

"Now, I have said I have confined this mode of dealing with this patent to the case of a machine, and I therefore adopt

(*o*) *Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation v. Smith* (1894), 11 R. P. C. 148, 389.
 (*p*) 11 R. P. C. 397.

precisely the way in which Mr. Justice *Wright* has stated the matter: 'There remains the question whether the patent is invalidated by the first claim. That claim appears to me to be, on the face of it, a claim of monopoly for every form of phonograph in which two styles are attached to one diaphragm, so that each style can be brought to bear on the cylinder. It is stated that such a claim is a claim to monopolise a principle. I think not.' Now that is the part with which I say I agree. 'It is a claim for a particular arrangement of essential parts of a machine, which arrangement has obvious advantages, but has never before been made practicable in a way disclosed by the specification. Such a claim ought properly to be construed as a claim of monopoly for that arrangement carried out by any means substantially similar to those disclosed in the specification, and that appears to be sufficient.' I agree with that, and therefore I think that so far as this objection is concerned, applying it to each and every one of the claims, it shows that these claims are none of them wanting in that respect."

Principles.

It has been demonstrated in the foregoing pages that a patent for carrying a principle which is new into effect protects the grantee against all other modes of carrying the same principle into effect (*q*).

Ambit of patent for carrying a new principle into effect.

In order that a patent may secure to the patentee the application of a principle by means different to those described in the specification, it is only necessary that the principle itself be new, and the patentee sufficiently describes a means of applying it. It is not necessary that the means, as well as the principle, should be new, for the novelty of the invention consists in applying the new principle by the means specified. If, however, not only the principle but the means is also new, then the means may form the subject of a distinct claim or a separate patent.

(*q*) *Jupe v. Pratt* (1837), 1 W. P. C. 146; *Chamberlain and Hookham v. Mayor, &c. of Bradford* (1903), 20 R. P. C. 684; *Ashworth v. English Card Clothing Co., Ltd.* (1903), 20 R. P. C. 797; *Consolidated Car Heating Co. v. Carne* (1903), 20 R. P. C. 767; *Sandow v. Brooks* (1903), 21 R. P. C. 33, 333; 23 R. P. C. 6; *Haskell Golf Ball Co. v. Hutchison* (1905), 22 R. P. C. 492;

Minter v. Wells (1834), 1 W. P. C. 127; *Househill Co. v. Neilson* (1843), 1 W. P. C. 685; *Otto v. Linford* (1881), 46 L. T. N. S. 35; *Crossley v. Beverley* (1829), 1 W. P. C. 106; *Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v. Levinstein* (1883), L. R. 24 Ch. D. 156, 171; *Easterbrook v. The Great Western Ry. Co.* (1885), 2 R. P. C. 201.

Principles. In *Jupe v. Pratt* (r), *Alderson*, B., in the course of the argument, laid down the law thus:

“You cannot take out a patent for a principle; you may take out a patent for a principle coupled with the mode of carrying the principle into effect, provided you have not only discovered the principle, but invented some mode of carrying it into effect. But then you must start with having invented some mode of carrying the principle into effect; if you have done that, then you are entitled to protect yourself from all other modes of carrying the same principle into effect, that being treated by the jury as piracy of your original invention.”

The above expressions of *Alderson*, B., would at first sight appear to establish the proposition, that if a man has invented a new principle, and shows one method of carrying it into effect, he thereupon becomes entitled to protection against every other possible method of carrying out the new principle. That it does do so must now be conceded, since it has been accepted by the House of Lords as a correct statement of the settled state of the law on the subject (s). Before this decision of the House of Lords, there was some doubt as to whether the dictum must be considered a correct statement of the law. For instance, *Cotton*, L.J., pointed out that the above language of *Alderson*, B., was used during the discussion of the case, probably to meet something that was said by counsel, and did not express his full opinion. The Lord Justice stated that in his opinion a patentee could prevent any one from using the same method of carrying a new principle into effect, or from using the same thing with only a colourable difference. Where there is a principle first applied in a machine, capable of carrying it into effect, the Court looks more narrowly at those who carry out the same principle, and say they do it by a different mode, and looks to see whether, in effect, although the mode is not exactly the same, it is only a colourable difference—a mechanical equivalent for a substantial part of the patentee's invention being looked upon as a mere colourable difference, and there-

(r) 1 W. P. C. 145, 146.

(s) *Chamberlain and Hookham v.*

Mayor, &c. of Bradford (1903), 20 R. P. C. 684.

fore he is entitled to an injunction against that mode of carrying out his principle, which is only the same in substance as that which he patented, though there are colourable differences (*t*). There is no longer any necessity for this qualification of Baron *Alderson's* dictum, since, as stated by Lord *Davey*, the question in every case is in what consists the originality and merit, or to use the well-known phrase of Lord *Cairns*, the "pith and marrow," of the patented invention. If that includes the discovery or suggestion of a new principle, as well as the means of carrying it into effect, an infringer is not entitled to take the principle although he uses somewhat different machinery for the application of it to a particular purpose (*u*). If a patentee desires to claim a general principle he should in his own interest make it clear that he does so (*x*), and he should be careful not to frame his claim so that it will be construed as one for a particular combination only (*y*).

Principles.

If a principle is not new, whether or not it has been successfully applied before (*z*), a patent for a method of applying it only secures to the patentee protection in respect of the particular method specified, and he cannot restrain the use of different methods of carrying the same principle into effect, which may be fit subject-matter for other valid patents (*a*).

Ambit of patent for carrying old principle into effect.

Thus finishing hosiery and other goods by pressing between steam-heated rollers was no infringement of a patent for

(*t*) See judgment of Cotton, L.J., *Automatic Weighing Machine Co. v. Knight* (1889), 6 P. O. R. 304, 305; see also *Automatic Weighing Machine Co. v. Combined Weighing Machine Co.* (1889), 6 P. O. R. 367; *Automatic Weighing Machine Co. v. National Exhibitions Association* (1891), 8 R. P. C. 345; 9 R. P. C. 41, 44; *Nobel's Explosives Co. v. Anderson* (1894), 11 R. P. C. 527, 530.

(*u*) *Chamberlain and Hookham v. Mayor, &c. of Bradford* (1903), 20 R. P. C. 684; *Consolidated Car Heating Co. v. Carne* (1903), 20 R. P. C. 767; *Ashworth v. English Card Clothing Co., Ltd.* (1903), 20 R. P. C. 797, 798; *Sandow v. Brooks* (1903), 21 R. P. C. 33, 333; 23 R. P. C. 6; *Haskell Golf Ball Co. v. Hutchison* (1906), 22 R. P. C. 492.

(*x*) See p. 200, *post*.

(*y*) See *Ackroyd and Best, Ltd. v. Thomas* (1904), 21 R. P. C. 737.

(*z*) *Chamberlain and Hookham v. Mayor, &c. of Bradford* (1903), 20 R. P. C. 673.

(*a*) *Proctor v. Bennis* (1887), 4 R. P. C. 333; L. R. 36 Ch. D. 740; *Automatic Weighing Machine Co. v. Knight* (1889), 6 R. P. C. 113; *Siddell v. Vickers* (1888), 5 R. P. C. 416; *Needham v. Johnson* (1888), 5 R. P. C. 49; *Bovill v. Pimm* (1856), 1 Ex. R. 718, 739; *Barber v. Grace* (1847), 1 Ex. R. 339; 17 L. J. Ex. 122; *Jupe v. Pratt* (1837), 1 W. P. C. 145; *Curtis v. Platt* (1863), L. R. 3 Ch. D. 135, n.; *Lister v. Leather* (1857), 8 E. & B. 1004, 1033; *Saxby v. Clunes* (1877), 43 L. J. Ex. 228; *Dudgeon v. Thomson* (1877), L. R. 3 App. Cas. 34; *Nordenfelt v. Gardner* (1884), 1 R. P. C. 61; *Hocking v. Hocking* (1889), 6 R. P. C. 76.

Processes. finishing such goods by pressing between steam-heated flat-sided boxes, the principle of steam-heating being old for the purpose (b).

PROCESSES.

Processes
are subject-
matter.

The proposition that a method or process of itself and apart from the thing produced, or result, can be the subject-matter of a valid patent was finally established by the decision in *Crane v. Price* (c), in 1842.

History of
the cases.

For some time prior to that decision there were many cases and dicta of the Judges indicating the general opinion that grants made in respect of such subject-matter were not invalid. *Abbot*, C.J., in *R. v. Wheeler* (d), pointed out that the word "manufacture" "may perhaps extend to a new process to be carried on by known implements, or elements, acting upon known substances, and ultimately producing some other known substance, but producing it in a cheaper or more expeditious manner, or of a better or more useful kind." In *Boulton v. Bull* (e), the Court was divided in opinion, but *Eyre*, C.J., made the following remarks:

"It was admitted in the argument at the Bar that the word 'manufacture' in the statute (f) was of extensive signification, that it applied not only to things made but to the *practice of making*, to principles carried into practice in a new manner, to new results of principles carried into practice. Let us presume this admission. Under *things made* we may class, in the first place, new compositions of things, such as manufactures in the most ordinary sense of the word; secondly, all mechanical inventions, whether to produce old or new effects, for a new piece of mechanism is certainly a thing made. Under the *practice of making* we may class all new artificial manners of operating with the hand, or with instruments in common use, new processes in any art producing effects useful to the public. When the effect produced is some new substance or composition of things, it would seem that the privilege of the sole working or making ought to be

(b) *Barber v. Grace*, 1 Ex. R. 339 ;
17 L. J. 122.

(c) 4 M. & G. 580 ; 1 W. P. C. 393 ;
12 L. J. C. P. 81 ; see p. 60, *post*.

(d) (1850), 2 B. & Ald. 493.

(e) (1795), 2 H. Bl. 463 ; 3 Revised
Reports, 439.

(f) 21 Jac. 1, c. 3.

for such new substance, or composition, without regard to the mechanism or process by which it has been produced, which, though perhaps also new, will be only useful as producing the new substance. . . . When the effect produced is no substance or composition of things, the patent can only be for the mechanism, if new mechanism is used, *for the process, if it be a new method of operating*, with or without old mechanism, by which the effect is produced. . . . In the list of patents with which I have been furnished there are several for *new methods* of manufacturing articles in common use, where the sole merit and the whole effect produced are the saving of time and expense, and thereby lowering the price of the article and introducing it into more general use. Now I think these *methods* may be said to be new manufactures. . . . The patent cannot be for the effect produced, for it is either no substance at all, or, what is exactly the same thing as to the question upon a patent, no new substance, but an old one produced advantageously for the public. It cannot be for the mechanism, for there is no new mechanism employed; it must then be for the method; and I would say, in the very significant words of Lord *Mansfield*, in the great case of the copyright (*g*), it must be for the method detached from all physical existence whatever.”

Processes.

Hall v. Jarvis (*h*) decided that though the application of the flame of oil to remove the superfluous fibres from lace and other goods was a mere process, yet a patent for this invention could be upheld on the ground of subject-matter. In *Hill v. Thompson* (*i*), Lord *Eldon*, L.C., stated that “there may be a valid patent for a new combination of materials previously in use for the same purpose, *or for a new method of applying such materials.*” So also in *Morgan v. Seaward* (*k*), *Parke*, B., said that the word “manufacture” in the statute (*l*) must be construed in one of two ways; it may mean the machine when completed, *or the mode of constructing the machine*; but in *Gibson v. Brand* (*m*), *Tindal*, C.J., pointed out that it was not necessary in that case to go into the question whether or not a patent can be supported

(*g*) 4 Bun. 2397.

(*h*) (1822), 1 W. P. C. 100, approved in *Losh v. Hagne* (1838), 1 W. P. C. 207, and *Crane v. Price* (1842), 5 M. & G. 580; 1 W. P. C. 393; 12 L. J. C. P. 81.

(*i*) (1817), 1 W. P. C. 237.

(*k*) (1837), 1 W. P. C. 193.

(*l*) 21 Jac. 1, c. 3, s. 6.

(*m*) (1841), 4 M. & G. 179; 1 W. P. C. 627.

Processes. for a *process* only. If the specification were properly prepared it probably might be considered a fit subject for a patent.

Law settled
by *Crane v.*
Price.

Crane v. Price (*n*), tried in 1842, finally settled the question. In this case the patent related to the use of anthracite or stone coal, in conjunction with a hot-air blast, for the smelting of iron, and the claim was in the following terms: "The application of anthracite or stone coal combined with the using of a hot-air blast in the smelting and manufacture of iron." In delivering the judgment of the Court of Common Pleas, *Tindal*, C.J., said:

"The question becomes this, whether admitting the using of the hot-air blast to have been known before in the manufacture of iron with bituminous coal, and the use of anthracite or stone coal to have been known before in the manufacture of iron with the cold blast, but that the combination of the two together (the hot-air blast and the anthracite) was not known before in the manufacture of iron—such combination can be the subject of a patent. We are of opinion that, if the result produced by such a combination is either a new article, or a better article, or a cheaper article to the public than that produced before by the old method, such combination may well become the subject of a patent."

Since *Crane v. Price* it has been held that a new and alternative method of arriving at a known result, irrespective of whether that result is attained in a better or cheaper form, may be patentable if the new method was the outcome of invention. But a process, to be patentable, must be a process which leads to some result, and the result arrived at must be useful, though it need not be an article at all; for example, a new process for chemically cleaning dirty linen would be good subject-matter, but a process of treating materials of which no result at all could be predicted would not be patentable (*o*).

Decision in
Crane v. Price
doubtful upon
the facts.

Though the above statement of the law by *Tindal*, C.J., in *Crane v. Price* has never been questioned, Judges have expressed doubts as to whether, upon the facts, the case was correctly decided (*p*). Novelty of the result is, no doubt, evi-

(*n*) (1842), 4 M. & G. 580; 1 W. P. C. 393; 12 L. J. C. P. 81.

(*o*) See *Alsop's Patent* (1907), 24 R. P. C. 752, per Parker, J.

(*p*) See *Bamlett v. Picksley* (1875), Griff. 40; *Rushton v. Crawley* (1870), L. R. 10 Eq. 522; *Murray v. Clayton* (1872), L. R. 7 Ch. 570.

dence of invention in the process which produces it, but it is not necessarily conclusive evidence (*q*). If the case were open to review on the facts, another Court would probably come to the conclusion that since the hot-air blast was known with bituminous coal, and the cold blast was in use with anthracite, and both processes were used for the manufacture of iron, the patent could not be supported; for all that the patentee did was to apply the hot blast in conjunction with anthracite to the manufacture of iron in a manner analogous to the former application of the hot blast to bituminous coal for the same purpose, and though the discovery was commercially very important, it was not one involving the exercise of invention. Further, the grant of the patent was an undue curtailment of the right of the public to use the hot blast in the manufacture of iron with bituminous coal, anthracite, or any other known fuel.

Sometimes in a patent case a conclusion may be arrived at in favour of the defendant by considering the infringement apart from the patent. If it can be shown that the alleged infringement is an act which, having regard to the state of public knowledge prior to the date of the patent, the public actually did or had the right to do (*i.e.*, passing from what was actually known or done to the act complained of involved no inventive step), the patentee cannot complain. He is in this dilemma, either the patent includes that which was actually done before or that which the public had the right to do—that is, something which involved no invention—in which case the patent is bad for want of novelty; or it does not include it, in which case the defendant is not an infringer. Thus in *Waterhouse's* patent (*r*), the Court of Appeal decided against the validity of the patent upon the ground (*inter alia*) that taking into consideration all the circumstances of the case, it appeared that to support the patent would be unfairly to take away from the public the full use to which they were entitled of the public knowledge at the date of the patent.

In *Partington v. Hartlepoons Pulp and Paper Co.* (*s*), which is somewhat analogous to *Crane v. Price*, it appeared that paraffin had been used to make wood-pulp pass more easily

Processes.

The analogous case of *Partington v. Hartlepoons Pulp and Paper Co.*

(*q*) *Steiner v. Heald*, 6 Exch. 607; E. B. & E. 585.
Booth v. Kennard (1856), 1 H. & N. 527, 531; *Higgs v. Goodwin* (1858), (*r*) (1906), 23 R. P. C. 470.
 (*s*) (1895), 12 R. P. C. 295.

Processes. through the meshes of machines in which it was manufactured, and had also been used for the purpose of cleaning the machine from resin deposited from the pulp. The patentee discovered that if the machine were perfectly clean to start with, the addition of paraffin to the contents of the machine thus prevented the formation of objectionable specks of a pitchy or resinous nature in the pulp, and also the partial coating or fouling of the machine. *Romer, J.*, held that this commercially important discovery was not the subject-matter for a patent, since all the patentee claimed was to use the old process of adding paraffin, but in a clean machine where the process effected the additional advantages discovered by him. Had the patent been upheld the public would have been prevented from using the old process *with clean machines*, whether for the purpose of making the wood-pulp pass through the meshes as previously, or for the sake of the additional advantage discovered by the patentee. A patent which so curtailed the public right could not be supported (*t*).

New method
of using old
machine.

On the other hand, a new method of using an old machine in a manner not analogous to any use to which it has hitherto been put may, as the outcome of invention, be good subject-matter—*e.g.*, a new method of using an existing weaving machine requiring no structural alteration in the machine, but producing a novel and useful result (*u*).

Strengthen-
ing of a part.

The strengthening, in a manner obvious when the desirability of strengthening is appreciated, of a part of a known or suggested combination of parts may be good subject-matter, if the performance of what is in fact a new and useful process is thereby rendered possible. For instance, the patent for the vacuum carpet cleaner, the subject-matter of which was not the mere generally known but ineffective suggestion of a combination of extractor, dust collector, and pump at large, but the new and useful process comprising the use of an implement which sits tightly on the carpet so that there is practically similarity of vacuum both at the instrument end and at the filter end, which vacuum must be at least five pounds per square inch (*x*); or *Lyon's* patent for the process

(*t*) See also *Patterson v. Gas Light and Coke Co.* (1875), L. R. 2 Ch. D. 812; 3 App. Cas. 239; p. 85, *post*.

(*u*) *Dowling v. Billington* (1889),

7 R. P. C. 191; see also p. 99, *ante*.

(*x*) *British Vacuum Cleaner Co., Ltd. v. Suction Cleaners, Ltd.* (1904), 21 R. P. C. 303; *British Vacuum Cleaner*