

42. A registered practitioner filed a first patent application wherein claims 1-10 claims are directed to a widget and claims 11-20 are directed to a method of making a widget. Following a proper restriction requirement, claims 1-10 were elected for prosecution. The primary examiner rejected claims 1-10. The practitioner filed a reply that only consisted of argument. The examiner was unpersuaded by the argument, and entered a final rejection of claims 1-10. In reply, the practitioner filed a continuing application containing claims 1-10 directed to a widget, and claims 11-20 directed to a method of using a widget. In the continuing application, the examiner enters a new written restriction requirement requiring a provisional election between claims 1-10 and claims 11-20. The practitioner believes the new restriction requirement is improper and would like the rejection in the parent application reviewed as well. The new restriction requirement has not been made final. Which of the following best describes whether and why, in accordance with the patent laws, rules, and procedures as related by the MPEP, the reply to the restriction requirement may be by appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences?

- (A) Yes. An immediate appeal to the Board can be filed to review the restriction requirement if any claims have been twice rejected.
- (B) No. An immediate appeal cannot be filed to the Board because the new claims directed to a method of using a widget have not been twice rejected.
- (C) Yes. An immediate appeal can be filed for any claims that have been twice rejected because the Board can also review any second restriction requirement made against the same claims.
- (D) No. An immediate appeal to the Board cannot be lodged because a provisional election has not been made of either the claims to a widget or claims to a method of use of the widget.
- (E) No. An immediate appeal cannot be taken because no claims are currently under rejection. Review of a final restriction requirement is only possible as a petitionable matter before a Technology Center Director. It is not an appealable matter to the Board.

43. In accordance with the patent laws, rules and procedures as related in the MPEP, where the independent claim in an application is to an article of manufacture, then a dependent claim to the article of manufacture does not comply with 35 USC 112, fourth paragraph, if:

- (A) the further limitation changes the scope of the dependent claim from that of the claim from which it depends.
- (B) the further limitation of the dependent claim is not significant.
- (C) it does not refer back to and further limit the claim from which it depends.
- (D) it relates to a separate invention.
- (E) it is separately classified from the claim from which it depends.