

EXECUTIVE BENCH BRIEFING FOR FOREIGN PATENT COUNSEL

Overcoming Section 16 Continuation & Section 57–59 Amendment Traps in Indian PCT Prosecution

Author: Gaurav Arora | Advocate, High Court of Delhi & Regd. Patent Agent (INPA-1900)

Dual-Jurisdiction Specialist (Passed USPTO Patent Bar Exam; LL.M., Cardozo Law School, NYC) | Lead Counsel, **Arora IP Counsel**

1. The Operational Conflict: *Boehringer Ingelheim vs. Syngenta v. Controller*

Foreign patent applicants navigating Indian national phase prosecution frequently face erroneous divisional rejections. While the Delhi High Court Division Bench in *Syngenta v. Controller* (2023) rightly discarded the former *Boehringer Ingelheim* rule—which improperly required divisional claims to pre-exist in the parent claim set—it introduced a new administrative hurdle: requiring a threshold showing of a 'plurality of inventions' in the parent specification prior to examination. Demanding a threshold finding of 'plurality' at filing puts the cart before the horse, as patentable distinctness can only be properly evaluated during substantive examination by a Controller.

2. Statutory Realignment: Section 16(1) as India's Continuation Gateway (35 U.S.C. § 120 Equivalence)

Deconstructing Section 16(1) of the Indian Patents Act, 1970 reveals two autonomous statutory limbs:

- **Limb 1 (Voluntary Continuation Gateway):** Triggered by the applicant '*if he so desires*'. This is Parliament's autonomous continuation gateway (equivalent to US 35 U.S.C. § 120 and EPO Article 76 EPC), granting an unconditional right to convert any unclaimed disclosure into a divisional application prior to grant based solely on original written description support.

- **Limb 2 (Official Non-Unity Remedy):** Triggered to remedy official non-unity objections raised by the Controller in an FER.

Legislative Intent & Disclaimer Doctrine: Justice Ayyangar (*Ayyangar Committee Report, 1959, Para 387*) explicitly codified 'Case 2' specifically to protect applicants who disclosed an embodiment in the complete specification but inadvertently omitted it from original claims. Furthermore, Lord Russell's disclaimer maxim in *EMI v. Lissen* ('what is not claimed is disclaimed') applies strictly to granted, published patents in infringement litigation—NEVER to pending, unexamined patent applications.

3. Resolving the Section 57–59 & Section 16 Amendment-Divisional Trap

Foreign counsel routinely face prosecution deadlocks where Examiners pressure applicants to narrow parent claims under Section 59 during national phase entry, while simultaneously rejecting voluntary divisionals under Section 16 for lack of pre-existing claims. Proper statutory construction resolves this trap: **Sections 57–59 operate as a narrow valve** strictly governing claim amendments (requiring strict support in original claims), whereas **Section 16 establishes a broad statutory genus** of 'further applications' functioning as an autonomous continuation channel for any unclaimed disclosure. Pleading Section 16 Limb 1 prevents the forfeiture of non-elected subject matter during claim narrowing.

4. Practitioner Action Protocol: 4-Step FER Response Strategy

Step / Phase	Prosecution Action & Statutory Argument
Step 1: Specification Audit	Establish complete written description support for divisional claims in the parent complete specification as filed (Section 10(4) compliance).
Step 2: Limb 1 Pleading	Formally invoke Section 16(1) Limb 1 ('if he so desires') as an autonomous statutory continuation right (35 U.S.C. § 120 equivalence), establishing that voluntary division requires no prior administrative non-unity objection.
Step 3: Ayyangar & Syngenta Citation	Cite Para 387 (Case 2) of the Ayyangar Report (1959) to rebut 'pre-existing claim' traps, and distinguish <i>Syngenta</i> by demonstrating that 'plurality' determination belongs exclusively to substantive examination.
Step 4: Sections 57–59 & EMI Rebuttal	Differentiate claim narrowing strictures under Sections 57–59 from voluntary continuation rights under Section 16 Limb 1, and refute administrative disclaimer rejections by asserting that <i>EMI v. Lissen</i> is an infringement rule for granted patents, inapplicable to unexamined applications.

5. Authoritative Master Research Suite (SSRN Approved & Live)

Full Master Working Paper Series Available on SSRN (Approved & Live):

1. **Paper 2 (Section 16 Divisionals):** Gaurav Arora, *Deconstructing the Divisional Dilemma in India: Section 16(1), the Ayyangar Committee Report, and the Fallacy of 'What is Not Claimed is Disclaimed'* (2026).

SSRN Abstract ID: 7543682 (Approved & Live) | Direct Link: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=7543682>

2. **Paper 3 (Claim Amendments & Traps):** Gaurav Arora, *The Amendment-Divisional Trap in Indian Patent Practice: Reconciling Sections 57–59 and Section 16* (2026).

SSRN Abstract ID: 7547402 (Approved & Live) | Direct Link: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=7547402

3. **Paper 1 (Section 2(1)(ja) Inventive Step):** Gaurav Arora, *Reconciling India's 'Dual-Gate' Inventive Step Architecture with TRIPS Footnote 5 and PCT Article 33(3)* (2026).

SSRN Abstract ID: 7543080 (Approved & Live) | Direct Link: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=7543080