"... it is incumbent upon the Patent Office ... to explain why it doubts the truth or accuracy of any statement in a supporting disclosure and to back up assertions of its own with acceptable evidence or reasoning which is inconsistent with the contested statement; ... ."

From In re Costello, 178 USPQ 290,92:

"There is no justification for simply ignoring appellant's allegations of unexpected results."

From Ex parte Johnson, 40 USPQ 576:

"The examiner makes no showing ... [that applicant's statement is incorrect] and this tribunal is not so expert in the art as to disagree with applicant's sworn description and agree with the examiner without cause."

From In re Andrews, 168 USPQ 360,66:

"We cannot take judicial notice of ... the impossibility of what appellant asserts ... . Accordingly, we reverse the rejection which, in our view, ignored the thrust of appellant's application in this regard."

From Ex parte Ilgen and Michl, 172 USPQ 316,17:

"As the main opinion notes, appellant's specification asserts an improved result ... . The examiner erred in failing to show cause for not giving effect to this assertion."

From Ex parte Leonard, 187 USPQ 122,123-124 (appeal from Group 140):

"... , we fail to find any suggestion from the collective teachings before us that ... the combination ... as claimed would ... [have the results alleged]. This is a totally new and surprising beneficial result, ... Such unexpected results must, of course, be taken fully into account, ... [citations omitted] ....

"We should note that in so holding ... , we rely heavily on appellants' representa-