INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE OF SINGAPORE

THE SECOND QUALIFYING EXAMINATION HELD IN NOV 2002

GUIDELINES TO PAPER B

Notice: The guidelines below contains some points (not-exhaustive) that could be covered in the answer to this Paper.

1. Task: Prepare a draft reply to the Written Opinion to the Intellectual Property Office of Singapore (IPOS).

2. The suggested guidelines are as follows.

No amendment has been suggested by the client. The one which seems to best distinguish over the prior art and still gives good protection to the clients that the leg is linked to the lifting arms. Thus the leg always moves with the lifting arms. In the prior art device the leg is linked to the hydraulic actuator and can move when there is no movement of the lifting arms and hence the retaining pin is required.

The amendment could be on the following lines:

To add to claim 1 the following:

Wherein the leg is linked to the lifting arms so that the leg moves to the lower position when the arms move to the outboard position and the leg moves to the upper position when the arms move to the inboard position.

Examiner's note: The basis for this amendment can be found in paragraphs 4 and 5 on page 2 of the description and in the drawings.

To overcome written opinion

A detailed explanation is required showing why the amended claim is novel and inventive over the prior art.

- Novelty of main claim
- Inventive step of main claim
- Patentability of subsidiary claims

Examiner's note: Since no amendment is suggested by the client, amendments other than the ones suggested above may be proposed.