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Chapter 13  JURISDICTION AND PROCEDURE

§13.01 U.S. District Courts

[A]  Subject Matter Jurisdiction over Patent Cases


[2]  “Arising under” Jurisdiction

[a]  “Creation” Test

[b]  “Serious Federal Interest” Test

[B]  Personal Jurisdiction

[C]  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


[6]  Venue for Infringement Actions Against Foreign Corporations


[a]  Correction of Inventorship

Declaratory Judgement Actions

Pleading Requirements

[1] Elimination of Form Pleading
[3] Pleading Joint Infringement

Evidentiary Privileges

[1] Attorney-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


§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


[D] Post-*MedImmune* Federal Circuit Decisions

[1] “All the Circumstances” Test


[4] Covenants Not to Sue

[E] Burden of Proof

Chapter 14 ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT


§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


  [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*
  [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


[1] Decisions Permitting Only “Stringent” Exceptions to Ordinary 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


[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
§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


[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”


[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

[b] Supreme Court’s Presumptive Bar Rule of Festo II (2002)


[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] Vitiation of Claim Limitations
   [1] Generally
   [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


[D] Rejection of Inducing Liability for Divided Infringement

[1] Introduction


[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

[C] Safe Harbor under §271(e)(1)

[D] Settlements of Hatch-Waxman Litigation

§18.02 Component Exports under 35 U.S.C. §271(f)
   [B] “Supplying or Causing to Be Supplied”
   [C] “Components”
   [D] “Actively Induce the Combination” under §271(f)(1)
      [2] Supreme Court Reverses: “Substantial Portion” Must Be Evaluated Quantitatively

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

[C] Experimental/Research Use


[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)

[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
      [a] Federal Circuit Position
   [5] Self-Replicating Technology

[I] Lack of Standing to Sue

§19.04 Unenforceability

[A] Introduction

[B] Inequitable Conduct
   [1] Acts or Omissions
      [a] Materiality Standards Pre-*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


[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


[D]  Prosecution History Laches

§19.05 Invalidity
[A] Burden of Proof

[1] Generally


[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


§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


[B] Permanent Injunctions

[1] Generally


[a] Generally
[b] Causal Nexus Requirement

[i] Apple III (Fed. Cir. 2013)

[ii] Apple IV (Fed. Cir. 2015)

[c] Standard Essential Patents/FRAND Licensing


[8] Factor (4): Public Interest

[9] Contempt Proceedings for Violation of Permanent Injunction

[C] Preliminary Injunctions

[1] Generally

[2] Preliminary Injunction Factors


[5] Procedural Considerations


[a] Generally

[b] Causal Nexus Requirement

[c] Disproving Irreparable Harm


§20.03 Ongoing Royalties for Future Infringements

[A] Generally

[B] Illustrative Decisions

[C] Criticism of Ongoing Royalty Awards

§20.04 Damages for Past Infringements


[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


[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


[B] Enhancement Based on Willfulness

[1] Generally

[2] Read Factors for Enhancement


[1] Duty of Due Care
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>[2] Adverse Inference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[D] The <em>Seagate</em> Standard: Objective Recklessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1] Objective Recklessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2] <em>Seagate</em>’s Two-Part Standard for Willfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[a] Objective Recklessness Prong: High Likelihood of Infringement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[b] Subjective Prong: Infringer Knew or Should Have Known of Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[3] Scope of Waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1] Jury Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[a] <em>Bard Peripheral</em> (Fed. Cir. 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[b] <em>Halo</em> (U.S. 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[F] America Invents Act of 2011 Codification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[G] Supreme Court Rewrites Law of Willful Infringement (<em>Halo</em> 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[a] <em>WBIP v. Kohler</em> (Fed. Cir. 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[b] <em>Halo v. Pulse</em> (Fed. Cir. 2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§20.06 Attorney Fees in Exceptional Cases

| 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


[F]  Prevailing Party

[G]  Reasonable Attorney Fees

§20.07 Rule 11 Sanctions

§20.08 Prejudgment Interest

§20.09 Costs

§20.10 Patent Marking


[B]  Notice

[C]  Marking Patented Articles versus Methods

[D]  “Patent Pending” Designations

[E]  False Marking


[F]  Burdens of Proof and Production When Patentee Assertedly Failed to Mark

§20.11 Provisional Compensation Remedy


[B]  “Substantially Identical” Inventions

[C]  Actual Notice
[D] Statute of Limitations

[E] Decisions

§20.12 Time Limitation on Damages Recovery


[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


[1] “Inoperative or Invalid”


[3] New Matter Prohibition


[D] Broadening Reissues

[1] Two-Year Time Bar


[3] Claim-by-Claim Analysis Required

[E] Reissue Error

[F] The Recapture Rule
[G] Effect of Reissue: Intervening Rights
   [1] Generally
   [2] Statutory Basis

[H] Strategic Considerations for Reissue

   [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
      [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


[a] Introduction

[b] *Aqua Prods.* (Fed. Cir. 2016) (Vacated Panel Decision)

[c] Grant of Rehearing En Banc in *Aqua Prods.*


[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


[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


[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


[3] Secondary Considerations

§23.03 Enforcement of Design Patents


[B] Discarded “Point of Novelty” Component


[D] Illustrative Decisions after Egyptian Goddess

[E] Doctrine of Equivalents and Prosecution History Estoppel

§23.04 Remedies for Infringement of Design Patents


[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

[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
[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


§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
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