Task3 :

The three false positives are id : 14683768 , 13442178, 19505797

I have listed top ten words which has highest weight : plt, mr,clr, hca , relation, submission, applicant, affidavit, proceeding, claim

Id 14683768:

For the first doc, there are some words like Australian and mr that are related to Australia and top ten words, so the theta value could be larger than 0 and the model gives the label 1, which belongs to AU but actually belongs to Wiki.

Hog's Breath CafeHog's Breath Cafe is an Australian chain of steak house restaurants. The first business was opened in July 1989 at Airlie Beach, Queensland by Don Algie. In November the following year, a second store was opened in Mooloolaba. Additional locations quickly followed with stores opening in Townsville, Cairns and interstate DarwinFare.Hog's Breath's Cafe is essentially a Steakhouse that promotes prime rib as its signature dish. These steaks have been slow cooked for 18 hours in a special oven. The steaks start at medium rare and are also recommended at that particular meat temperature. Due to the amount of fats retained in the steaks however, these steaks have a higher fat content than most steaks and are sometimes classified as marbled meat. The restaurant/cafe chain also sells pasta, burgers, wraps, salads and seafood dishes as well as there signature side dish offered is curly fries, referred to by the chain as Hog's Tail Fries.Company.As of December 2011, there were 69 outlets operating in Australia, 3 outlets in New Zealand, 2 outlets in Thailand and 1 in Singapore. Hog’s Breath Company also controls the licensing and use of the Jamaica Joe's trademark in Australia and overseas. Hog’s Breath Company is embarking on further expansion in other Asian countries as well as the UK, Europe and North America. The Hog’s Breath Australia web site identifies the company as being “Creators of restaurant and bar concepts for Australia and the world'”, which some might consider ironic given the nature of the origin of the Australian operation. The ‘Original Hog's Breath Saloon’ was established by Jerry Dorminy in Ft. Walton Beach, FL, in 1976. From the late 1980s, Mr Dorminy has used the name ‘Hog's Breath Café’ in relation to the restaurant part of his business. In establishing the Australian operation Mr Algie appropriated key elements of Mr Dorminy’s business including the business name, theming and logos/artwork. Jerry Dorminy’s association with Don Algie began in 1985 when he employed Mr Algie to organise and promote a series of yacht races in the United States. In mid-1986 Mr Dorminy visited Mr Algie in Australia, and during that visit Mr Algie expressed interest in developing a bar and restaurant business in Australia. Mr Dorminy subsequently asked Mr Algie to register the business name ‘Hog's Breath Saloon’ in New South Wales, in his (Mr Dorminy's) name. Further discussions concerning the possibility of creating an operation in Australia are reported to have taken place in 1987 and 1988. Mr Algie subsequently claimed that he then wrote to Mr Dorminy, saying that he (Mr Algie) intended to open a ‘Hog's Breath’ restaurant in Queensland. Mr Dorminy later denied receipt of that letter, and asserted that he had repeatedly told Mr Algie that "he would not be authorized" to operate his own ‘Hog's Breath’ business in Australia. In July 1988, Mr Algie applied on his own behalf to register the business names ‘Hog's Breath Saloon’ and ‘Hog's Breath Cafe’ in Queensland. Mr Algie opened business as the ‘Hog's Breath Cafe’ at Airlie Beach in July 1989, and in August 1989 he applied to register the first two ‘Hog's Breath’ trademarks.In the legal dispute that ensued, Mr Dorminy’s primary argument was that Mr Algie was not entitled to secure registration because the earlier relationship between himself and Mr Algie gave rise to an obligation by Mr Algie to act in his (Mr Dorminy’s) interest. For reasons set out in a detailed determination dated 30 June 1994, Helen Hardie, Assistant Registrar, declined the application by Mr Dorminy to prevent Mr Algie from registering five Hog’s Breath trademarks.A September 2011 media report detailed a further related development. It stated that in 2006, American designer John Lamb commenced legal action against Hog’s Breath in the Federal Court of Perth. Before Justice Robert French on June 22, 2007, Mr Lamb claimed he owned copyright to a cartoon of a pig known as the “Wave Hog Work”. He said he produced the pig in 1987 to promote the original Hog’s Breath Saloon in Florida. Mr Lamb alleged that, from 1996, companies controlled by a former worker at the Florida eatery had infringed his copyright in various ways including applying the pig logo to clothing related to the Hog’s Breath cafes in Australia. Hog’s Breath subsequently agreed to pay Mr Lamb $750,000, inclusive of Mr Lamb’s legal fees.Hog's Breath Cafe will celebrate 25 years in business in July of 2014.In April 2014, a story ran on A Current Affair (Channel 9) claiming that Hog's Breath had engaged lawyers Finn Roche to demand that a small industrial area takeaway called Hoggy's Takeaway cease and desist using the name Hoggy's in their business name and branding. The owner of the takeaway, Sam Hogg, has received incredible support from the public, with more than 14,000 people to date having signed a petition to demand that Hog's Breath Cafe retract their legal threats and leave the small Gosford takeaway in peace. Not only did this not sway Hog's Breath but incredibly, a day after the program aired, Hog's Breath applied for the trademark Hoggy's Takeaway, knowing that Sam Hogg was already trading under that business name. Additionally, Don Algie, founder of Hog's Breath Cafe has sent several emails out to angry supporters of the Hoggs, stating that (despite a legal letter to the contrary) the Hoggs had 'frabricated' the story for publicity. Hog's Breath Cafe's Facebook page has been under considerable attack from angry members of the public, who have likened the case to the battle between Hungry Jacks and Whambie Whoppers. Hungry Jacks dropped their legal action after the public got behind Whambie Whoppers.</doc>

Id 13442178:

For this doc, same as doc 1, there are many mr, which means the theta value could be greater than 0.

List of minor Mulliner charactersThe following is an incomplete list of the fictional characters featured in the Mr Mulliner stories of P. G. Wodehouse, in alphabetical order by surname.Aurelia Cammarleigh.Aurelia Cammarleigh is a handsome girl, being the one Archibald Mulliner falls in love with. ("The Reverent Wooing of Archibald", "Archibald and the Masses", "The Code of the Mulliners")Mr Mulliner.Mr Mulliner, a long-winded pub raconteur who tells outrageous stories about his family at the Angler's Rest. (All Mulliner stories except "From a Detective's Notebook".)Adrian Mulliner.Adrian Mulliner is a nephew of Mr Mulliner, being a private detective. ("The Smile That Wins", "From a Detective's Notebook")Alfred Mulliner.Alfred Mulliner (twin brother of George) is a nephew of Mr Mulliner, being a stage conjuror. ("George and Alfred")Angela Mulliner.Angela Mulliner is a sister-in-law of Mr Mulliner. ("A Slice of Life", Mulliner's Buck-U-Uppo)Anselm Mulliner.Anselm Mulliner is a younger son of Mr Mulliner's cousin Rupert, being a curate. ("Anselm Gets His Chance")Archibald Mulliner.Archibald Mulliner is a nephew of Mr Mulliner, being a member of the Drones Club and a sock collector who has a masterful impression of a hen laying an egg. He will have to find more in order to seduce and marry Aurelia Cammarleigh. ("The Reverent Wooing of Archibald", "Archibald and the Masses", "The Code of the Mulliners"; mentioned in "The Fat of the Land")Rev. Augustine Mulliner.The Rev. Augustine Mulliner is a nephew of Mr Mulliner, being a meek curate who eventually rose to married vicar thanks to the Buck-U-Uppo tonic invented by Wilfred Mulliner. (Mulliner's Buck-U-Uppo, "The Bishop's Move", "Gala Night")Augustus Mulliner.Augustus Mulliner is a nephew of Mr Mulliner, being in love with Hermione Brimble. ("The Right Approach")Brancepath Mulliner.Brancepath Mulliner is a nephew of Mr Mulliner, being an artist in search of a character. ("Buried Treasure")Bulstrode Mulliner.Bulstrode Mulliner is a nephew (son of Joseph Mulliner) of Mr Mulliner, being a writer in Hollywood. ("The Castaways")Cedric Mulliner.Cedric Mulliner is a cousin of Mr Mulliner, being a foppish bachelor of 45 years. ("The Story of Cedric")Charlotte Mulliner.Charlotte Mulliner is a niece of Mr Mulliner, being a poet writing "Vignettes in Verse". ("The Unpleasantness at Bludleigh Court")Clarence Mulliner.Clarence Mulliner is a cousin of Mr Mulliner, being a photographer. ("The Romance of a Bulb-Squeezer")Cyril Mulliner.Cyril Mulliner is a nephew of Mr Mulliner, being an interior decorator. (Strychnine in the Soup)Egbert Mulliner (1).Egbert Mulliner is a cousin of Mr Mulliner, being an assistant editor. Best Seller)Egbert Mulliner (2).Egbert Mulliner is a cousin of Mr Mulliner, being a civil servant. ("Another Christmas Carol")Eustace Mulliner.Eustace Mulliner is a nephew of Mr Mulliner, being attached to the British Embassy in Switzerland. ("Open House")Evangeline Pembury.Evangeline Pembury is a niece (by marriage) of Mr Mulliner, being married to Egbert (1). (Best Seller)Frederick Mulliner.Frederick Mulliner (brother of Dr George) is a nephew of Mr Mulliner. ("Portrait of a Disciplinarian")Dr George Mulliner.Dr George Mulliner (brother of Frederick) is a nephew of Mr Mulliner, being a doctor. ("Portrait of a Disciplinarian")George Mulliner (1).George Mulliner is a nephew of Mr Mulliner, being in love with Susan Blake. ("The Truth About George")George Mulliner (2).George Mulliner (twin brother of Alfred) is a nephew of Mr Mulliner, being a writer in Hollywood. ("George and Alfred")Ignatius Mulliner.Ignatius Mulliner is a nephew of Mr Mulliner, being a portrait painter. ("The Man Who Gave Up Smoking")Joseph Mulliner.Joseph Mulliner is a brother of Mr Mulliner, being the father of Bulstrode. (Mentioned in "The Castaways")Lancelot Mulliner (1).Lancelot Bassington Mulliner is a nephew of Mr Mulliner, being a poet. ("Came the Dawn")Lancelot Mulliner (2).Lancelot Mulliner is a son of Mr Mulliner's cousin Edward, being a portrait painter. in Bott St, London. Brought up by his uncle Theodore. ("The Story of Webster", "Cats Will Be Cats")Mervyn Mulliner.Mervyn Mulliner is a son of a Mr Mulliner's cousin, being a chump. ("The Knightly Quest of Mervyn")Montrose Mulliner.Montrose Mulliner (Mervyn in the U.S. edition) is a distant cousin of Mr Mulliner, being an assistant director. ("Monkey Business")Mordred Mulliner.Mordred Mulliner is a nephew of Mr Mulliner, being an accidental pyromaniac. ("The Fiery Wooing of Mordred")Osbert Mulliner.Osbert Mulliner is a nephew of Mr Mulliner, being a rich jade collector. ("The Ordeal of Osbert Mulliner")Reginald Mulliner.Reginald Mulliner is a nephew (son of late brother) of Mr Mulliner, being an heir. ("Big Business")Rupert Mulliner.Rupert Mulliner is a cousin of Mr Mulliner, being the father of Anselm. (Mentioned in "Anselm gets hisChance")Sacheverall Mulliner.Sacheverall Mulliner is a nephew of Mr Mulliner, being a very timid man. ("The Voice From the Past")Theophilus Mulliner.Theophilus Mulliner is a cousin of Mr Mulliner's nephew Augustus, being Bishop of Bognor. ("The Right Approach")Wilfred Mulliner.Wilfred Mulliner, a brother of Mr Mulliner, is a chemist and is the inventor of various creams, lotions, and tonics, known in the trade as "Mulliner's Magic Marvels". Featured mainly in A Slice of Life (short story) he also has a cameo role (Rev. Augustine Mulliner reads a letter from him) in Mulliner's Buck-U-Uppo, where the tonic Buck-U-Uppo is introduced. Wilfred marries Angela Purdue, the ward of Sir Jasper ffinch-ffarrowmere (with two small f's) and they have two sons, Percival who goes to a prep school in Sussex and Ferdinand who attends Eton College.Mulliner's Magic Marvels.The following creams, lotions, and tonics invented by Wilfred Mulliner are specifically mentioned in various stories.Wilhelmina Mulliner.Wilhelmina Mulliner is a sister-in-law of Mr Mulliner, being the widow of Sir Sholto Mulliner and the mother of Archibald. ("The Code of the Mulliners")William Mulliner.William Mulliner is an uncle of Mr Mulliner, being a survivor of the San Francisco Earthquake of 1906. ("The Story of William")Wilmot Mulliner.Wilmot Mulliner is a distant relative of Mr Mulliner. ("The Nodder", "The Juice of an Orange")Algernon "Algy" Wymondham-Wymondham.Algernon "Algy" Wymondham-Wymondham ( ) is a member of the Drones Club, being the one helped his fellow Archibald Mulliner find back the anonymous girls of his dreams, Aurelia Cammarleigh.("The Reverent Wooing of Archibald")</doc>

Id 19505797:

For this doc, there are many applicant ,proceeding, claim,these words have a high weight ,leading to a large theta value.

Amendments under the European Patent ConventionArticle 123 of the European Patent Convention (EPC) relates to the amendments under the EPC, i.e. the amendments to a European patent application or patent, and notably the conditions under which they are allowable. In particular, prohibits adding subject-matter beyond the content of the application as filed, while prohibits an extension of the scope of protection by amendment after grant.Article 123(1) EPC.Article 123(1) EPC provides the right for an applicant, in proceedings before the European Patent Office (EPO), to amend its European patent application and for a patent proprietor (during opposition proceedings) the right to amend its European patent. This must however be done in accordance with the Implementing Regulations, considering that the applicant is given "at least one opportunity to amend the application of his own volition." According the Implementing Regulations, amendments before receiving the (extended) European search report are generally not allowed, amendments are allowed in response to the extended European search report (i.e., in response to the communication under ), and amendments are also allowed shortly after entry into European phase of a PCT application (namely, in response to the communication under ), but any further amendment is subject to the consent of the Examining Division.Article 123(2) EPC.Article 123(2) EPC provides that a European patent application, or European patent, may not be amended (during prosecution for an application, and after grant for a patent) in such a way that it contains subject-matter which extends beyond the content of the application as filed. In other words, an amendment cannot go beyond the original disclosure of the application. The amended subject-matter must be directly and unambiguously derivable (i.e., clearly and unambiguously derivable) from the content of the application as filed. The underlying idea of Article 123(2) EPC is that an applicant should not be allowed to improve his position by adding subject-matter not disclosed in the application as filed, which would give him an unwarranted advantage and could be damaging to the legal security of third parties relying on the content of the original application. This legal provision illustrates the importance accorded by the Convention to the content of a European patent application as filed –i.e. on the filing date– in respect of its legal effects.An extension of the subject-matter of the European patent beyond the content of the application as filed is a ground of opposition, and revocation.Application.The provisions of Article 123(2) EPC do not concern whether amendments have introduced an expression not present in the application as filed, but whether the amendments have introduced subject-matter extending beyond the content of the application as filed. In other words, the only relevant question is whether the skilled person is confronted, in the amended version of the application or the patent, with additional technical information compared to the technical information contained in the application as filed. If so, Article 123(2) EPC is violated.When assessing the content of a European patent application as filed, the applicable standard of proof is a rigorous standard, namely the certainty "beyond reasonable doubt" rather than the "balance of probabilities", the normal standard of proof in civil proceedings.Disclaimers.A disclaimer defines, in a claim, subject-matter which is not claimed. By extension, a disclaimer may also mean the action of introduction a negative limitation in a claim, i.e. "an amendment to a claim resulting in the incorporation therein of a "negative" technical feature, typically excluding from a general feature specific embodiments or areas". The allowability of disclaimers is subject to particular conditions.Under the case law of the Boards of Appeal of the EPO, disclaimers are allowed only in certain circumstances, as confirmed in G 1/03 and G 2/03 decisions:In decision G 2/10, the Enlarged Board of Appeal further decided that:Therefore, in G 2/10, the Enlarged Board of Appeal has essentially restored the possibility for an applicant or patentee to renounce part of its patent monopoly, subject to certain conditions.Article 123(3) EPC.Article 123(3) EPC prohibits amendments to granted claims during opposition proceedings in such a way as to extend the protection conferred by a European patent. It is for instance "not allowable to replace a technical feature of a granted claim with another technical feature which causes the claim to extend to subject-matter which was not encompassed by the granted claim." "Article 123(3) EPC is directly aimed at protecting the interests of third parties by prohibiting any broadening of the claims of a granted patent, even if there should be a basis for such broadening in the application as filed." While, before grant, the legal security of third parties has been considered to be "sufficiently protected by the prohibition of extending the content of the application by amendment beyond what was originally disclosed", without therefore prohibiting a broadening of the claims before grant, the situation is different after grant. After grant, "the interests of third parties are further protected by Article 123(3) EPC that the patentee's right to amend the claims is limited by the scope of the granted patent."According to Enlarged Board of Appeal decision G 2/88, "it is the totality of the claims before amendment in comparison with the totality of the claims after the proposed amendment that has to be considered". If for instance the subject-matter of the claims is changed during opposition proceedings to a different embodiment and if, thereby, the scope of protection of the claims has been extended, the amendment, or change, is contrary to Article 123(3) EPC.Inescapable Article 123(2) and (3) EPC trap.If a European patent contains a feature which was not disclosed in the application as filed (in contravention of Article 123(2) EPC) and if the removal of this feature would extend the scope of protection beyond the scope conferred by the patent as granted (in contravention of Article 123(3) EPC), the European patent has, in principle, to be revoked. In principle again, it does not matter whether the amendment leading to such a situation may have been approved during prosecution by the examining division, since the responsibility for any amendment always lies with the applicant.</doc>

To solve this problem, I think we need more specific docs which contains such ambiguous words in both labels to train the model so that it can give more accuracy result.