

Detailed Table of Contents
Mueller on Patent Law Vol. 2: Enforcement
Updated April 14, 2015 (includes 2015 Supp.)

Chapter 13 JURISDICTION AND PROCEDURE

§13.01 U.S. District Courts

- [A] Subject Matter Jurisdiction over Patent Cases
 - [1] Statutory Basis: 28 U.S.C. §1338
 - [2] “Arising under” Jurisdiction
 - [a] “Creation” Test
 - [b] “Serious Federal Interest” Test
- [B] Personal Jurisdiction
- [C] Venue
- [D] Pleading Requirements

§13.02 U.S. International Trade Commission

§13.03 U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

- [A] Subject Matter-Specific Appellate Jurisdiction
- [B] Critiques of the Federal Circuit
- [C] Standards of Review
 - [1] Appeals from Federal District Courts
 - [a] Jury Trial
 - [b] Bench Trial
 - [2] Appeals from the International Trade Commission
 - [3] Appeals from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

§13.04 U.S. Supreme Court

- [A] Before Formation of the Federal Circuit
- [B] After Formation of the Federal Circuit

§13.05 Standing to Sue for Patent Infringement

- [A] Introduction
- [B] Licensees
- [C] Declaratory Judgment Plaintiffs
- [D] Appeals to Federal Circuit from USPTO

§13.06 Patent Declaratory Judgment Actions

- [A] Introduction
- [B] Pre-*MedImmune* “Reasonable Apprehension” Test
- [C] *MedImmune v. Genentech* (U.S. 2007)
- [D] Post-*MedImmune* Federal Circuit Decisions
 - [1] “All the Circumstances” Test
 - [2] Decisions Illustrating Lack of Declaratory Judgment Jurisdiction
 - [3] Decisions Illustrating Existence of Declaratory Judgment Jurisdiction
 - [4] Covenants Not to Sue
- [E] Burden of Proof

Chapter 14 ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

§14.01 Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §271

§14.02 Direct Versus Indirect Infringement

- [A] Introduction
- [B] Direct Infringement under §271(a)
 - [1] Making
 - [2] Using
 - [a] Generally
 - [b] Using a Claimed *System*
 - [c] Using a Claimed *Method*
 - [3] Selling
 - [4] Offering to Sell
 - [5] Importing

§14.03 Territoriality Aspects of §271(a)

- [A] Introduction
- [B] Use of Processes or Methods within the United States
- [C] “Beneficial Use” Doctrine
- [D] “Sells” within the United States

§14.04 Temporal Aspects of §271

- [A] Pre-Issuance Acts
- [B] Post-Issuance Acts

§14.05 Distributed (or “Joint”) Direct Infringement by Multiple Entities

- [A] Introduction
- [B] *Akamai v. Limelight* (Fed. Cir. 2012) (*en banc*)
- [C] *Limelight v. Akamai* (U.S. 2014)

§14.06 Indirect Infringement under §271(b)-(c): Overview

- [A] Practicing Less than Complete Claimed Invention
- [B] Intent Required
- [C] Historical Background
- [D] Direct Infringement as Predicate to Indirect Liability

§14.07 Two-Step Analysis for Patent Infringement

Chapter 15 PATENT CLAIM INTERPRETATION

§15.01 The Central Role of Patent Claims

§15.02 Judge versus Jury as Interpreter

- [A] Pre-*Markman*
- [B] *Markman v. Westview* (U.S. 1996)
- [C] *Markman* Hearings

§15.03 Evidentiary Hierarchy for Claim Interpretation

- [A] Intrinsic Evidence
- [B] Extrinsic Evidence

[C] “Contextualist” versus “Literalist” Approaches

[D] The *En Banc Phillips* Decision (Fed. Cir. 2005)

§15.04 Canons of Patent Claim Interpretation

[A] Perspective: Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art

[B] General Rule: Ordinary and Customary Meaning

[C] Self-Defined Terms (“Own Lexicographer” Rule)

[1] Express Redefinition

[2] Implicit Redefinition

[D] Interpret Claims in View of the Written Description but Do Not Import a Limitation from the Written Description into the Claims

[E] Generally Do Not Exclude Preferred Embodiment

[F] Claim Differentiation Principle

[1] Definition

[2] Weight of Presumption

[G] Generally Do Not Interpret Claims to Preserve Validity

[H] The Indefinite Article “A” Generally Means One or More

[I] Timing: Interpret Claim Term Meaning as of Effective Filing Date

§15.05 Disclaimer or Disavowal

[A] In the Specification

[B] During Prosecution in the USPTO

§15.06 Interpreting Preamble Language

[A] Preamble Not Scope-Limiting

[B] Preamble Is Scope-Limiting

§15.07 Federal Circuit Review of Claim Interpretation Decisions

[A] Question of Law, Fact, or Mixed

[B] *De Novo* Review under *Cybor*

[C] Criticism of *De Novo* Standard of Review

[D] Interlocutory Appeals Rejected

Chapter 16 COMPARING THE PROPERLY INTERPRETED CLAIMS TO THE ACCUSED DEVICE

§16.01 Introduction

§16.02 Literal Infringement

§16.03 Infringement under the Doctrine of Equivalents

[A] Historical Background and Policy Underpinnings

[B] Tension with the Notice Function of Claims

[C] All-Limitations Rule

[1] Defining a “Limitation”

[2] Federal Circuit Examples

[D] The Fact Question of Equivalence

[1] Function/Way/Result Test

[2] Insubstantial Differences Test

[3] Obviousness as a Test of Equivalency?

[4] Known Interchangeability

[E] After-Arising Technology

§16.04 Reverse Doctrine of Equivalents

§16.05 Legal Limitations on the Doctrine of Equivalents

[A] Overview

[B] Prosecution History Estoppel

[1] Definition

[2] Scope of Estoppel

[3] Presumption of Estoppel under *Warner-Jenkinson* (U.S. 1997)

[4] The *Festo* Decisions

[a] Federal Circuit’s Complete Bar Rule

of *Festo I* (2000)

[b] Supreme Court’s Presumptive Bar Rule

of *Festo II* (2002)

[c] Federal Circuit’s Remand Decision

in *Festo III* (2003)

- [5] Applying the *Festo* Rebuttal Criteria
 - [a] Mere Tangentialness
 - [b] Unforeseeability
 - [c] “Some Other Reason”
- [6] What Qualifies as a Narrowing Amendment
- [C] Prior Art
 - [1] Generally
 - [2] Not Applicable to Literal Infringement
 - [3] Hypothetical Claim Analysis
- [D] Dedication to the Public
 - [1] Disclosing without Claiming
 - [2] Level of Specificity to Work a Dedication
- [E] Vitiating of Claim Limitations
 - [1] Generally
 - [2] Decisions Finding Vitiating
 - [3] Decisions Finding No Vitiating
 - [4] Question of Law or Fact?

§16.06 Infringement of Means-Plus-Function Claim Elements

- [A] Literal Infringement
- [B] Infringement under the Judicially-Created Doctrine of Equivalents

Chapter 17 INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT

§17.01 Introduction

§17.02 Inducing Infringement under §271(b)

- [A] Acts
 - [1] Sale of Product Needed to Infringe
 - [2] Provide Instructions, Directions, or Guidance

- [3] Corporate Officer Liability
 - [B] Relationship between Inducing and Direct Infringement
 - [1] Generally
 - [2] Proving Direct Infringement
 - [C] Intent Standard for Inducing Infringement
 - [1] Federal Circuit Decisions
 - [a] Knowledge of the Patent Requirement; “Deliberate Disregard” Standard
 - [b] Good Faith Belief of Invalidity
 - [2] Supreme Court Decisions
 - [a] “Willful Blindness” Standard
 - [b] Good Faith Belief of Invalidity
 - [D] Induced Divided (or “Distributed,” “Joint,” or “Collective”) Infringement
 - [1] Pre-*Akamai* Federal Circuit Decisions
 - [2] *Akamai v. Limelight* (Fed. Cir. 2012) (*en banc*)
 - [3] *Limelight v. Akamai* (U.S. 2014)
 - [E] Pleading Inducing Infringement
- §17.03 Contributory Infringement under §271(c)
- [A] Acts
 - [1] Supply Component
 - [2] Supply Material or Apparatus
 - [3] Repair versus Reconstruction
 - [B] Non-Staple Article or Commodity of Commerce
 - [C] Intent Standard for Contributory Infringement
 - [D] Pleading Contributory Infringement
 - [E] Relationship to Patent Misuse

Chapter 18 SPECIALIZED CATEGORIES OF INFRINGEMENT

§18.01 Drug Marketing Application Filings under 35 U.S.C. §271(e)

- [A] Introduction
- [B] Technical Infringement under §271(e)(2)
 - [1] Paragraph IV Certifications
 - [2] Automatic Stay
- [C] Safe Harbor under §271(e)(1)
 - [1] *Merck KgaA v. Integra Lifesciences* (U.S. 2005)
 - [2] Federal Circuit Decisions Post-*Merck*
- [D] Settlements of Hatch-Waxman Litigation

§18.02 Component Exports under 35 U.S.C. §271(f)

- [A] *Deepsouth Packing v. Laitram* (U.S. 1972)
- [B] “Supplying or Causing to Be Supplied”
- [C] “Components”
 - [1] *Microsoft v. AT&T* (U.S. 2007)
 - [2] Federal Circuit Decisions Post-*AT&T*
- [D] “Actively Induce the Combination” under §271(f)(1)

§18.03 Importation under 35 U.S.C. §271(g)

- [A] Process Patent Amendments Act of 1988
- [B] Product Made by a Patented Process
- [C] “Materially Changed” Product

Chapter 19 DEFENSES TO PATENT INFRINGEMENT

§19.01 Introduction

§19.02 Noninfringement

§19.03 Absence of Liability for Infringement

- [A] License
 - [1] Express License

- [2] Implied License
- [B] Prior User Rights
 - [1] Pre-America Invents Act of 2011
 - [2] Post-America Invents Act of 2011
- [C] Experimental/Research Use
- [D] Expiration of Damages Limitation Period of 35 U.S.C. §286
- [E] Laches and Equitable Estoppel in Initiating Patent Infringement Litigation
 - [1] Introduction
 - [2] Laches
 - [a] Elements
 - [b] “Should Have Known”
 - [3] Equitable Estoppel
- [F] State Sovereign Immunity
- [G] Temporary Presence Exemption
- [H] Patent Exhaustion
- [I] Lack of Standing to Sue

§19.04 Unenforceability

- [A] Introduction
- [B] Inequitable Conduct
 - [1] Acts or Omissions
 - [2] Materiality
 - [a] Materiality Standards Pre-*Therasense* (Fed. Cir. 2011)
 - [b] Materiality Standard Post-*Therasense* (Fed. Cir. 2011)
 - [i] “But For” Test
 - [ii] “Affirmative Egregious Misconduct” Exception
 - [iii] Cumulative Information
 - [3] Intent to Deceive
 - [4] Independence of Materiality and Intent Inquiries

- [5] Overall Equitable Balancing
- [6] Burden of Proof and Standard of Review
- [7] Pleading Inequitable Conduct with Particularity
- [8] Curing Inequitable Conduct
 - [a] Federal Circuit Decisions
- [C] Patent Misuse
 - [1] Generally
 - [2] Historical Development
 - [a] Tying
 - [b] Post-Patent Expiration Royalties
 - [3] Not Synonymous with Antitrust Liability
 - [4] Statutory Limitations on Patent Misuse: §271(d)
- [D] Prosecution History Laches

§19.05 Invalidity

- [A] Burden of Proof
- [B] Collateral Estoppel Effect of Invalidity Adjudication
- [C] Statutory Grounds for Invalidity
- [D] Limits on Accused Infringer's Standing to Assert Invalidity
 - [1] Licensee Repudiation
 - [2] Assignor Estoppel

§19.06 Antitrust Counterclaims in Patent Cases

- [A] Generally
- [B] Market Power
- [C] Anticompetitive Conduct
 - [1] *Walker Process* Fraud
 - [2] Sham Patent Litigation
 - [3] Refusals to Deal

Chapter 20 REMEDIES FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

§20.01 Introduction

§20.02 Injunctions

[A] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §283

[B] Permanent Injunctions

[1] Generally

[2] Federal Circuit Decisions Before *eBay v. MercExchange* (U.S.

2006)

[3] The *eBay v. MercExchange* (U.S. 2006) Standard

[4] Appellate Standard of Review

[5] Factor (1): Irreparable Harm

[a] Generally

[b] Causal Nexus Requirement

[c] Standard Essential Patents/FRAND Licensing

[6] Factor (2): Inadequate Remedies at Law

[7] Factor (3): Balance of Hardships

[8] Factor (4): Public Interest

[9] Contempt Proceedings for Violation of Permanent Injunction

[C] Preliminary Injunctions

[1] Generally

[2] Preliminary Injunction Factors

[3] Appellate Standard of Review

[4] Choice of Law

[5] Procedural Considerations

[6] Factor (1): Patentee Likely to Succeed on the Merits

[7] Factor (2): Patentee Likely to Suffer Irreparable Harm

[a] Generally

[b] Causal Nexus Requirement

[c] Disproving Irreparable Harm

[8] Factor (3): Balance of the Equities Tips in Patentee's Favor

[9] Factor (4): Injunction Is in the Public Interest

§20.03 Ongoing Royalties for Future Infringements

[A] Generally

[B] Illustrative Decisions

[C] Criticism of Ongoing Royalty Awards

§20.04 Damages for Past Infringements

[A] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §284

[B] Compensatory Damages

[1] Lost Profits

[a] The *Panduit* Analysis

[i] Demand for the Patented Product

[ii] Absence of Acceptable Noninfringing Substitutes

[iii] Manufacturing and Marketing Capability

[iv] Amount of Profit

[b] Federal Circuit Expansion of Lost Profits Justification

[c] Price Erosion Damages

[2] Entire Market Value Rule and Convoyed Sales

[a] Convoyed/Accessory Sales

[b] Entire Market Value Rule

[3] Established Royalty

[4] Reasonable Royalty

[a] Hypothetical Negotiation

[b] Date for Hypothetical Negotiation

[c] Analytical Approach

[d] Rejected 25% Rule of Thumb

[e] Rejected Nash Bargaining Solution

§20.05 Enhanced Damages and Willful Infringement

- [A] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §284
- [B] Enhancement Based on Willfulness
 - [1] Generally
 - [2] *Read* Factors for Enhancement
- [C] Willfulness Pre-*Seagate* (2007)
 - [1] Duty of Due Care
 - [2] Adverse Inference
- [D] The *Seagate* Standard: Objective Recklessness
 - [1] Objective Recklessness
 - [2] Two-Part Test
 - [a] Objective Prong: High Likelihood of Infringement
 - [b] Subjective Prong: Infringer Knew or Should Have Known of Risk
 - [3] Scope of Waiver
- [E] Standard of Review for Willfulness
- [F] America Invents Act of 2011 Codification

§20.06 Attorney Fees in Exceptional Cases

- [A] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §285
- [B] Discretionary with District Court
- [C] Categories of “Exceptional” Cases
 - [1] Attorney Fees Imposed Against Patentees
 - [2] Attorney Fees Imposed Against Infringers
- [D] Burden of Proof
- [E] Standard of Review
- [F] Prevailing Party
- [G] Reasonable Attorney Fees

§20.07 Rule 11 Sanctions

§20.08 Prejudgment Interest

§20.09 Costs

§20.10 Patent Marking

- [A] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §287
- [B] Notice
- [C] Marking Patented Articles versus Methods
- [D] “Patent Pending” Designations
- [E] False Marking
 - [1] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §292
 - [2] America Invents Act of 2011 Elimination of *Qui Tam* Actions

§20.11 Provisional Compensation Remedy

- [A] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §154(d)
- [B] “Substantially Identical” Inventions
- [C] Actual Notice
- [D] Statute of Limitations
- [E] Decisions

§20.12 Time Limitation on Damages Recovery

- [A] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §286
- [B] Six Year Pre-Filing Period
- [C] Claims against the U.S. Government

Chapter 21 CORRECTING ISSUED PATENTS IN THE USPTO (REISSUE AND REEXAMINATION)

§21.01 Introduction

§21.02 Certificates of Correction

- [A] USPTO at Fault
- [B] Applicant at Fault
- [C] No Change in Claim Scope Permitted
- [D] Effect of Certificate

§21.03 Reissue

- [A] Overview

- [B] Historical Development
- [C] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §251
 - [1] “Inoperative or Invalid”
 - [2] Timing
 - [3] New Matter Prohibition
 - [4] “Invention Disclosed in the Original Patent”
- [D] Broadening Reissues
- [E] Reissue Error
- [F] The Recapture Rule
- [G] Effect of Reissue: Intervening Rights
 - [1] Generally
 - [2] Statutory Basis
 - [3] Absolute Intervening Rights
 - [4] Equitable Intervening Rights
- [H] Strategic Considerations for Reissue

§21.04 Disclaimer under 35 U.S.C. §253

- [A] Disclaimer of Invalid Claims
- [B] Terminal Disclaimers
 - [1] Generally
 - [2] Unauthorized Filing of Terminal Disclaimers

§21.05 Reexamination

- [A] Overview
- [B] *Ex Parte* Reexamination
 - [1] Who Can Request
 - [2] Statutory Grounds for Reexamination
 - [3] Substantial New Question of Patentability
 - [4] Legislative Changes in Response to *Portola*
- [C] *Inter Partes* Reexamination (Pre-America Invents Act of 2011)

§21.06 Reexamination Compared to Reissue

Chapter 22 CHALLENGING PATENTS IN THE USPTO (AIA-IMPLEMENTED PROCEDURES)

§22.01 Introduction

§22.02 *Inter Partes* Review

- [A] Introduction
- [B] Scope
- [C] Standard to Grant Review
- [D] Estoppel Effect
- [E] Timing Issues
 - [1] Automatic Stay
 - [2] Discretionary Stay

§22.03 Post-Grant Review

- [A] Introduction
- [B] Effective Date
- [C] Nine-Month Window
- [D] Scope
- [E] Standard to Grant Review
- [F] Automatic Stay and Estoppel Effect

§22.04 Transitional Program for Covered Business Methods

- [A] Introduction
- [B] USPTO First TPCBM Final Decision
- [C] Discretionary Stay

Chapter 23 DESIGN PATENTS

§23.01 Introduction

§23.02 Requirements for Design Patentability

- [A] Primarily Ornamental

- [B] Novelty
- [C] Nonobviousness
 - [1] Designer of Ordinary Skill Perspective
 - [2] Two-Step Analysis for Combining Design Prior Art
 - [3] Secondary Considerations

§23.03 Enforcement of Design Patents

- [A] “Ordinary Observer” Test of *Gorham v. White* (U.S. 1871)
- [B] Discarded “Point of Novelty” Component
- [C] Modern Standard: *Egyptian Goddess* (Fed. Cir. 2008)
- [D] Illustrative Decisions after *Egyptian Goddess*
- [E] Doctrine of Equivalents and Prosecution History Estoppel

§23.04 Remedies for Infringement of Design Patents

Chapter 24 PLANT PATENTS

§24.01 Introduction

§24.02 Historical Development

- [A] Plant Patent Act of 1930
- [B] 1954 Amendments
- [C] Plant Variety Protection Act of 1970

§24.03 Requirements for Plant Patent Protection

- [A] Governing Statutes
- [B] Asexual Reproduction
- [C] Variety
- [D] Distinct and New
- [E] Cultivated
- [F] Nonobvious

§24.04 Enforcement of Plant Patents

§24.05 Utility Patent Protection for Plants

Chapter 25 INTERNATIONAL PATENTING ISSUES

§25.01 Introduction

- [A] Territorial Scope of Patents
- [B] Obtaining Foreign Patent Protection Prior to the Paris Convention

§25.02 The Paris Convention

- [A] Introduction
- [B] National Treatment
- [C] Right of Priority
- [D] U.S. Implementation of the Paris Right of Priority: 35 U.S.C. §119
- [E] The *Hilmer* Rule (Pre-America Invents Act of 2011)
- [F] Limitations of the Paris Convention

§25.03 The Patent Cooperation Treaty

- [A] Introduction
- [B] International Application Processing
- [C] National Phase

§25.04 The World Trade Organization's Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS)

- [A] Introduction
- [B] Dispute Settlement Procedures
- [C] Substantive Minimum Levels of Protection
- [D] Limitations on Compulsory Licensing

§25.05 Patent Harmonization Issues

- [A] Procedural Harmonization
- [B] Substantive Harmonization
 - [1] First-to-File versus First-to-Invent
 - [2] Prior User Rights
 - [3] Absolute versus Qualified Novelty: Grace Period

§25.06 Industrial Applicability Requirement of Foreign Patent Systems

[A] Definition of Industrial Applicability

[B] Morality/Public Policy Component

§25.07 Gray Market Patented Goods

[A] Domestic Exhaustion

[B] Regional (European Community-Wide) Exhaustion

[C] International Exhaustion

§25.08 Enforcement of Foreign Patents in U.S. Courts

§25.09 Patent Protection in Europe

Glossary

Table of Cases

Table of Authorities

Table of Statutes

Index