

Detailed Table of Contents*

Mueller on Patent Law Vol. II: Enforcement

(Last revised Jan. 15, 2018; Incorporates 2018 Annual Update for Vol. II)

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

[1] Patent-Specific Statute: 28 U.S.C. §1400(b)

[2] *Fourco Glass* (U.S. 1957)

[3] *VE Holding* (Fed. Cir. 1990) Greatly Expands Patent Venue

[4] *TC Heartland* (U.S. 2017) Drastically Narrows Patent Venue

[5] Suing Where Accused Infringer has “Committed Acts of Infringement” and has a “Regular and Established Place of Business”

[a] *In re Cordis* (Fed. Cir. 1985)

[b] Representative Post-*TC Heartland* (U.S. 2017) District Court Decisions

[c] Post-*TC Heartland* (U.S. 2017) Federal Circuit Decisions

[6] Venue for Infringement Actions Against Foreign Corporations

[7] Venue for Patent-Related Actions Not Asserting Infringement

[a] Correction of Inventorship

* Full-text access of this treatise is via electronic subscription to the Wolters Kluwer CHEETAH digital research platform, available at <http://rus.wolterskluwer.com/product-family/cheetah>.

[b] Declaratory Judgement Actions

[D] Pleading Requirements

[1] Elimination of Form Pleading

[2] *Bill of Lading* (Fed. Cir. 2012)

[3] Pleading Joint Infringement

[E] Evidentiary Privileges

[1] Attorney-Client Privilege

[2] Patent Agent-Client Privilege

§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
- [E] “Offer[] to Sell” 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 II* (Fed. Cir. 2012) (*en banc*)
- [C] *Akamai III* (U.S. 2014)
- [D] *Akamai IV* (Fed. Cir. 2015) (*en banc*)
 - [1] “Directs or Controls” Liability
 - [a] Service Provider-Customer Relationship
 - [b] Physician-Patient Relationship
 - [c] “Partnership-Like” Relationship
 - [2] Joint Enterprise Liability
 - [3] Subsequent History
- [E] Pleading Joint (or “Divided) Direct Infringement

§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

[D] Must a District Court Always Expressly Interpret Claim Terms?

§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
 - [1] Decisions Permitting Only “Stringent” Exceptions to Ordinary Meaning
 - [2] Decisions Rejecting “Stringent” Exceptions Rule
- [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
 - [1] Foundational Case
 - [2] Disavowal of Scope Must be Clear and Unmistakable

[3] Disclaimer by Statements in USPTO Post-Issuance Reviews

§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* (Fed. Cir. 1998) (*en banc*)
- [C] Criticism of *De Novo* Standard of Review
- [D] Federal Circuit Revisits *Cybor* in *Lighting Ballast* (2014)
- [E] Deference for Fact Finding: *Teva* (U.S. 2015)
- [F] Federal Circuit’s Application of *Teva*
 - [1] Limited Impact to Date
 - [2] Federal Circuit Must Not Consider Extrinsic Evidence in First Instance
- [G] 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
 - [a] Generally
 - [b] Adequate Expert Testimony

- [c] Inadequate Expert Testimony
- [d] Determination of “Function” Not Limited to Extrinsic Evidence
- [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/Ensnarement
 - [a] Generally
 - [b] Illustrative Cases
 - [c] Scope of Hypothetical Claim
 - [i] Does Not Encompass All Possible Equivalents
 - [ii] Cannot Add Any Narrowing Limitations
- [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] Pre-2011 Federal Circuit Decisions
 - [a] Knowledge of the Patent Requirement; “Deliberate Disregard” Standard
 - [b] Good Faith Belief of Invalidity
 - [i] *Commil I* (Fed. Cir. 2013)
 - [ii] *Commil II* (Fed. Cir. 2013) (*en banc*)
 - [2] Supreme Court Decisions
 - [a] “Willful Blindness” Standard: *Global-Tech* (U.S. 2011)
 - [b] Good Faith Belief of Invalidity Rejected as Defense: *Commil III* (U.S. 2015)
 - [3] Federal Circuit Application of *Global-Tech* and *Commil III*
 - [D] Rejection of Inducing Liability for Divided Infringement
 - [1] Introduction
 - [2] *Akamai II* (Fed. Cir. 2012) (*en banc*)
 - [3] *Akamai III* (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)
 - [1] Facts of *Promega v. Life Techs.*
 - [2] “Self Inducement” Can Create Liability
- [E] “Substantial Portion of the Components” Under §271(f)(1)
 - [1] Federal Circuit View: Evaluate Qualitatively
 - [2] Supreme Court Reverses: “Substantial Portion” Must Be Evaluated Quantitatively

§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
 - [a] *Aukerman* (Fed. Cir. 1992) (*en banc*)
 - [b] *Petrella* (U.S. 2014)
 - [c] *SCA Hygiene I* (Fed. Cir. 2014)
 - [d] *SCA Hygiene II* (Fed. Cir. 2015) (*en banc*)
 - [e] Supreme Court Eviscerates Patent Laches Defense in *SCA Hygiene III* (U.S. 2017)
 - [2] Laches
 - [a] Elements
 - [i] Unreasonable Delay by Patentee
 - [ii] Material Prejudice to Accused Infringer
 - [b] “Should Have Known”
 - [3] Equitable Estoppel
 - [a] Introduction
 - [b] Elements
 - [c] Privity
 - [d] Misleading Communication
 - [e] Reasonable Reliance

- [F] State Sovereign Immunity
- [G] Temporary Presence Exemption
- [H] Patent Exhaustion
 - [1] Generally
 - [2] Unconditional Sale of Patented Product
 - [3] Conditional Sale of Patented Product
 - [a] Federal Circuit Position
 - [1] *Mallinckrodt* (Fed. Cir. 1992)
 - [2] *Lexmark Int'l* (Fed. Cir. 2016) (*en banc*)
 - [b] Supreme Court Reversal: *Impression Prods. v. Lexmark Int'l* (2017)
 - [4] Application to Method Claims: *Quanta* (U.S. 2008)
 - [5] Self-Replicating Technology
- [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
 - [i.1] No Allowance if USPTO Had Been Aware of Undisclosed Information
 - [i.2] Nondisclosure of Inconsistent Statements or Positions
 - [i.3] Nondisclosure of Prior Art
 - [i.4] Nondisclosure of Corroborating Evidence
 - [ii] “Affirmative Egregious Misconduct” Exception

- [iii] Cumulative Information
 - [3] Intent to Deceive
 - [a] Generally
 - [b] Inferring Intent
 - [i] Generally
 - [ii] Adverse Inference of Intent to Deceive USPTO as Sanction for Litigation Misconduct
 - [c] Clear and Convincing Evidence Lacking
 - [d] Clear and Convincing Evidence Present
 - [e] “Gross Negligence” Insufficient
 - [f] Knowledge of Materiality Alone Insufficient
 - [g] Intentionally Selective or Partial Withholding
 - [h] Unreasonable Explanation for Withholding
 - [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
 - [9] Impact on Related Patents
- [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
 - [1] Generally
 - [2] *Microsoft v. i4i* (U.S. 2011) Confirms “Clear and Convincing Evidence” 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
 - [i] *Apple III* (Fed. Cir. 2013)
 - [ii] *Apple IV* (Fed. Cir. 2015)
- [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
 - [d] Territoriality Issues
- [2] Apportionment, Entire Market Value Rule, and Conveyed Sales
 - [a] Conveyed/Accessory Sales
 - [b] Entire Market Value Rule versus Apportionment
 - [i] Apportionment in Lost Profits Damages
 - [ii] Apportionment in Reasonable Royalty Damages
- [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] *Seagate*'s Two-Part Standard for Willfulness
 - [a] Objective Recklessness Prong: High Likelihood of Infringement
 - [b] Subjective Prong: Infringer Knew or Should Have Known of Risk
 - [3] Scope of Waiver
- [E] Judge vs. Jury and Standard of Review for Willfulness
 - [1] Jury Question
 - [2] Appellate Standard of Review
 - [a] *Bard Peripheral* (Fed. Cir. 2012)
 - [b] *Halo* (U.S. 2016)
- [F] America Invents Act of 2011 Codification
- [G] Supreme Court Rewrites Law of Willful Infringement (*Halo* 2016)
 - [1] *Halo v. Pulse* (Fed. Cir. 2014)
 - [2] *Stryker v. Zimmer* (Fed. Cir. 2015)
 - [3] *Halo v. Pulse* (U.S. 2016)
 - [4] Post-*Halo* Federal Circuit Decisions on Willfulness
 - [a] *WBIP v. Kohler* (Fed. Cir. 2016)
 - [b] *Halo v. Pulse* (Fed. Cir. 2016)
 - [c] *Stryker v. Zimmer* (Fed. Cir. 2016)
 - [d] *Arctic Cat v. Bombardier* (Fed. Cir. 2017)

§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: *Octane Fitness*

- [a] *Octane Fitness I* (Fed. Cir. 2012)
- [b] *Octane Fitness II* (U.S. 2014)
- [2] Attorney Fees Imposed Against Infringers
- [3] Federal Circuit Attorney Fee Decisions After Supreme Court’s Decisions in *Octane Fitness II/Highmark III*
- [D] Burden of Proof
- [E] Standard of Review
 - [1] *Highmark I* (Fed. Cir. 2012)
 - [2] *Highmark II* (Fed. Cir. 2012) (*en banc*)
 - [3] *Highmark III* (U.S. 2014)
- [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
- [F] Burdens of Proof and Production When Patentee Assertedly Failed to Mark

§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

[1] Two-Year Time Bar

[2] What Constitutes Broadening

[3] Claim-by-Claim Analysis Required

[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)

[D] Intervening Rights in Reexamination

§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

- [1] “Reasonable Likelihood” of Prevailing
 - [2] Claim Interpretation for Institution Decision
 - [3] Non-Appealability of Institution Decision
 - [a] Statutory Basis
 - [b] *In re Cuozzo* (Fed. Cir. 2015)
 - [c] *Cuozzo v. Lee* (U.S. 2016)
 - [d] Post-*Cuozzo* Federal Circuit on Non-Appealability of PTAB Institution Determinations
 - [1] Are §315 Time Bar Determinations Appealable to Federal Circuit?
 - [i] *Achates Reference Publishing* (Fed. Cir. 2015)
 - [ii] *Wi-Fi One I* (Fed. Cir. 2016)
 - [iii] *Wi-Fi One II* (Fed. Cir. 2018) (en banc)
 - [2] Assignor Estoppel Not a Bar to Seeking IPR
- [D] Estoppel Effect
- [E] Timing Issues
 - [1] Time Bars to Filing an IPR in the USPTO
 - [2] Stays of Parallel District Court Litigation
 - [a] Automatic Stay
 - [b] Discretionary Stay
- [F] Broadest Reasonable Construction Rule for IPRs
 - [1] Propriety of BRC
 - [a] Generally
 - [b] *In re Cuozzo* (Fed. Cir. 2015)
 - [c] *Cuozzo v. Lee* (U.S. 2016)
 - [2] Limits on BRC
- [G] Motions to Amend Claims
 - [1] Legal Framework
 - [2] Prior Art Not Relied on to Institute

- [3] Prior Art in Original Prosecution
- [4] Burden of Proof for Substitute Claims: *In re Aqua Products* (Fed. Cir. 2017) (en banc)
 - [a] Introduction
 - [b] *Aqua Prods.* (Fed. Cir. 2016) (Vacated Panel Decision)
 - [c] Grant of Rehearing En Banc in *Aqua Prods.*
 - [d] En Banc Decision in *Aqua Prods. v. Matal* (Fed. Cir. Oct. 2017)
 - [i] Opinion of Judge O’Malley
 - [ii] Opinion of Judge Taranto
 - [iii] Opinion of Judge Reyna
 - [iv] Opinion of Judge Moore
 - [v] Opinion of Judge Hughes
- [5] Federal Circuit Standard of Review
- [H] Burdens of Proof
 - [1] Generally
 - [2] Institution Decision Does Not Shift Burdens
- [I] Constitutionality
 - [1] Federal Circuit View
 - [2] Supreme Court Reviews Constitutionality of IPR in *Oil States v. Greene’s Energy*
- [J] Board’s Final Written Decision Limited to Instituted Claims

§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
 - [1] Generally
 - [2] Federal Circuit’s Interpretation of “Covered Business Method Patent”
- [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) (*en banc*)
- [D] Illustrative Decisions after *Egyptian Goddess*
- [E] Doctrine of Equivalents and Prosecution History Estoppel

§23.04 Remedies for Infringement of Design Patents

- [A] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §289
- [B] Apportionment of Infringer’s Profits for Multicomponent Products: *Samsung v. Apple* (U.S. 2016)
- [C] Requirement to Elect §284 or §289
- [D] No Enhancement for Willful Infringement under §289

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
 - [1] Generally
 - [2] Federal Circuit Rejection of International Exhaustion
 - [3] *Lexmark Int'l* (Fed. Cir. 2016) (en banc)
 - [4] Supreme Court Adopts International Exhaustion of U.S. Patent Rights in *Impression Prods.* (2017)

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

§25.09 Patent Protection in Europe

[A] Routes to Obtain Patent Protection

[B] Routes to Enforce Patents

[1] Unitary Patent System

[2] Unified Patent Court

Glossary

Table of Cases

Table of Authorities

Table of Statutes

Index