

will be sent to the patentee. The identity of the applicant will not be disclosed unless an interference is declared. If a final decision is made not to declare an interference, a notice to that effect will be placed in the patent file and will be sent to the patentee.

[24 FR 10332, Dec. 22, 1959, as amended at 53 FR 23735, June 23, 1988; 58 FR 54511, Oct. 22, 1993; 60 FR 14520, Mar. 17, 1995]

**§ 1.608 Interference between an application and a patent; prima facie showing by applicant.**

(a) When the effective filing date of an application is three months or less after the effective filing date of a patent, before an interference will be declared, either the applicant or the applicant's attorney or agent of record shall file a statement alleging that there is a basis upon which the applicant is entitled to a judgment relative to the patentee.

(b) When the effective filing date of an application is more than three months after the effective filing date of a patent, the applicant, before an interference will be declared, shall file evidence which may consist of patents or printed publications, other documents, and one or more affidavits which demonstrate that applicant is *prima facie* entitled to a judgment relative to the patentee and an explanation stating with particularity the basis upon which the applicant is *prima facie* entitled to the judgment. Where the basis upon which an applicant is entitled to judgment relative to a patentee is priority of invention, the evidence shall include affidavits by the applicant, if possible, and one or more corroborating witnesses, supported by documentary evidence, if available, each setting out a factual description of acts and circumstances performed or observed by the affiant, which collectively would *prima facie* entitle the applicant to judgment on priority with respect to the effective filing date of the patent. To facilitate preparation of a record (§ 1.653(g)) for final hearing, an applicant should file affidavits on paper which is 21.8 by 27.9 cm. (8½ x 11 inches). The significance of any printed publication or other document which is self-authenticating within the meaning of Rule 902 of the Federal Rules of Evi-

dence or § 1.671(d) and any patent shall be discussed in an affidavit or the explanation. Any printed publication or other document which is not self-authenticating shall be authenticated and discussed with particularity in an affidavit. Upon a showing of good cause, an affidavit may be based on information and belief. If an examiner finds an application to be in condition for declaration of an interference, the examiner will consider the evidence and explanation only to the extent of determining whether a basis upon which the application would be entitled to a judgment relative to the patentee is alleged and, if a basis is alleged, an interference may be declared.

[60 FR 14520, Mar. 17, 1995]

**§ 1.609 [Reserved]**

**§ 1.610 Assignment of interference to administrative patent judge, time period for completing interference.**

(a) Each interference will be declared by an administrative patent judge who may enter all interlocutory orders in the interference, except that only the Board shall hear oral argument at final hearing, enter a decision under § 1.617, 1.640(e), 1.652, 1.656(i) or 1.658, or enter any other order which terminates the interference.

(b) As necessary, another administrative patent judge may act in place of the one who declared the interference. At the discretion of the administrative patent judge assigned to the interference, a panel consisting of two or more members of the Board may enter interlocutory orders.

(c) Unless otherwise provided in this subpart, times for taking action by a party in the interference will be set on a case-by-case basis by the administrative patent judge assigned to the interference. Times for taking action shall be set and the administrative patent judge shall exercise control over the interference such that the pendency of the interference before the Board does not normally exceed two years.

(d) An administrative patent judge may hold a conference with the parties to consider simplification of any issues, the necessity or desirability of amendments to counts, the possibility of obtaining admissions of fact and