

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	III
TABLE OF CASES	XXI
TABLE OF STATUTES	XXXIX
TABLE OF RULES.....	XLIII
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
A. Overview of the Casebook.....	2
B. The Contents and Term of a Patent.....	3
Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 154(a)	3
C. Overview of the United States Patent System.....	5
1. Incentives Underlying the Patent Laws	5
2. Patent Prosecution—The Patent Application Process	5
D. Whose Law to Apply? Grappling with Procedural Issues.....	6
Biodex Corp. v. Loredan Biomedical, Inc.....	7
Notes	15
E. Whose Substantive Law to Apply?.....	17
1. Copyright Claims.....	17
2. Trademark or Trade Dress Issues.....	18
3. Antitrust Claims.....	18
4. State Law Claims as Preempted	19
Problems.....	20
Chapter 2. The Parties: Who Can Bring Suit?	23
A. Assignment Versus License	23
Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 261	24
1. Standing to Bring Suit—Exclusive and Non-Exclusive Licenses ...	24
Propat International Corp. v. RPost, Inc.	24
Notes.....	30
2. Limits on Validity Challenges by Licensees and Assignors	35
Lear, Inc. v. Adkins	36
Note	42
Diamond Scientific Co. v. Ambico, Inc.	42
Notes.....	46
B. Declaratory Judgment Actions	49
Statutory Provision—28 U.S.C. § 2201(a)	49
1. Declaratory Judgment Action Brought by Infringer.....	49
MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.	52
Notes.....	58
Sandisk Corp. v. STMicroelectronics, Inc.	59
Notes.....	70
EMC Corp. v. Norand Corp.....	71

Notes.....	77
C. Pre-Suit Investigations	81
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 11	81
Judin v. United States	83
Notes	86
Problems	87
Chapter 3. The Proper Court: Where Can You Bring Suit?	89
A. Forum Shopping in Patent Cases.....	91
1. Procedural Variations: How Patent Cases Are Resolved by District Courts	93
a. Speed of Adjudication	93
b. Procedural Progress at Termination	93
c. Method of Disposition.....	94
2. Substantive Variation: How Win Rates Differ by District	94
B. Jurisdiction of Patent Cases	94
1. Subject Matter Jurisdiction	94
Statutory Provision—28 U.S.C. § 1338	94
2. Personal Jurisdiction	95
Beverly Hills Fan Co. v. Royal Sovereign Corp.	96
Genetic Implant Systems, Inc. v. Core-Vent Corp.	104
Notes.....	108
C. Venue in Patent Cases	115
Statutory Provision—28 U.S.C. § 1391	115
Statutory Provision—28 U.S.C. § 1400(b)	116
TC Heartland LLC v. Kraft Foods Group Brands LLC	117
Notes	121
In re TS Tech USA Corp.	122
Note	128
D. The Issue of Multiple Parties: Joinder and Multi-District Litigation	128
1. Joinder.....	129
Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 299	129
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 20	129
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 21	130
In re EMC Corporation	131
Notes.....	137
2. Multidistrict Litigation	137
Statutory Provision—28 U.S.C. § 1407	137
Problems.....	140
Chapter 4. The Pleadings	143
A. The Patent Infringement Complaint	143
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 8	143
1. Procedural Requirements	144
a. Jurisdictional Statement.....	144
b. Statement of the Claim in a Patent Case	144

c.	Demand for Judgment.....	145
d.	Demand for Jury.....	146
2.	Jury Trial Versus Bench Trial.....	146
3.	Sufficiency of the Complaint.....	147
	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 12	148
	Robern, Inc. v. Glasscrafters, Inc.	148
	In re Bill of Lading Transmission and Processing Sys. Patent Lit.	154
	Notes.....	164
B.	Answering the Complaint: Motions, Answers, Counterclaims.....	166
1.	Motions to Dismiss	166
2.	The Answer	166
	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 12	166
	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 8	167
3.	Affirmative Defenses.....	168
	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 8	168
	Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 282(b).....	168
4.	Counterclaims and Cross-Claims	169
	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 13	169
	Vivid Technologies, Inc. v. American Science & Engineering, Inc.	171
	Notes.....	175
C.	Amending the Pleadings.....	175
	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 15	175
	Chapter 5. Discovery.....	185
A.	The Scope of Discoverable Material in a Patent Litigation.....	185
	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 26	185
	Prism Technologies, LLC v. Adobe Systems, Inc.	190
	Notes	198
B.	Discovery Mechanisms.....	198
1.	Party Discovery Mechanisms—Optional	198
a.	Interrogatories	199
b.	Requests for Production	200
c.	Requests for Admissions	202
d.	Depositions.....	202
	Notes.....	203
2.	Party Discovery Mechanisms—Mandatory	203
a.	Initial Disclosures.....	204
	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 26.....	204
b.	Local Patent Rules.....	205
	United States District Court for the Northern District of California—Local Patent Rules (December 1, 2009, Revised January 17, 2017)	206
	United States District Court for the Northern District of California—Local Patent Rules (December 1, 2009, Revised January 17, 2017)	209

	O2 Micro Intern. Ltd. v. Monolithic Power Systems, Inc.....	209
	Notes.....	216
	3. Third Party Discovery.....	216
C.	Planning for Discovery.....	217
	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 26.....	218
	Note.....	221
D.	Bases for Opposing Discovery.....	222
	1. Mechanisms for Opposing Discovery.....	223
	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 26(c).....	223
	2. Attorney Client Privilege or Work Product Immunity.....	226
	In re Seagate.....	227
	Notes.....	236
	3. Business Confidential Information and Trade Secrets.....	238
	In re Deutsche Bank Trust Cos.	240
	Notes.....	246
E.	Sample Document Request.....	247
	Chapter 6. Experts.....	263
A.	Inventors.....	264
B.	Selection of Experts.....	264
C.	Types of Experts.....	265
	1. Technical Experts.....	265
	2. Patent Lawyers.....	266
	Sundance, Inc. v. DeMonte Fabricating Ltd.....	267
	Note.....	273
	3. Damages Experts.....	273
D.	Discovery of Expert's Work.....	275
	Federal Rule of Civil Procedure—Rule 26.....	275
	1. Testifying Versus Non-Testifying Experts.....	277
	2. Reports.....	278
E.	Proper Role of Expert Testimony.....	281
	Federal Rule of Evidence—Rule 702.....	281
	Federal Rule of Evidence—Rule 703.....	281
	Federal Rule of Evidence—Rule 704.....	281
	Federal Rule of Evidence—Rule 705.....	282
	Notes.....	282
	Problems.....	287
	Chapter 7. Post-Discovery Strategies and Preparation for Trial.....	289
A.	Dispositive Motions.....	290
	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 56.....	290
	National Presto Indus., Inc. v. West Bend Co.	292
	Notes.....	296
B.	Motions in Limine.....	298
C.	Bifurcation, Trifurcation and the Order of Trial.....	299
	Federal Rule of Civil Procedure—Rule 42.....	299
	Laitram Corp. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.	299

Notes	304
Elf Atochem N. Am., Inc. v. Libbey-Owens-Ford Co.	306
Notes	307
D. Final Pretrial Conference	308
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure—Rule 16	308
C. Van Der Lely N.V. v. F. Lli Maschio S.n.c.	309
Notes	315
Chapter 8. Claim Construction	317
A. Who Construes Patent Claims?—A Question of Law	318
Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.	318
Teva Pharms. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.	323
Notes	328
Phillips v. AWH Corp.	334
Notes	345
B. Local Rules and Standing Orders	350
C. Canons of Claim Interpretation	351
1. Claims Should Be Interpreted Such That the Preferred Embodiment Falls Within Their Scope	352
2. A Patent Claim Is Not Necessarily Limited to the Preferred Embodiment/Limitations from the Written Description or Prosecution History Should Not Be Read into the Claims	352
Retractable Technologies, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson and Co.	353
Notes	360
3. Two Claims in the Same Patent Should Be Interpreted as Having Different Scope—The Doctrine of Claim Differentiation	363
4. Claims Should Be Interpreted So as to Preserve Their Validity	364
5. When There Is an Equal Choice Between a Broad and a Narrow Claim Construction, the Narrow One Should Always Be Adopted	366
6. A Term Used Repeatedly in the Patent Claims Should Be Construed Consistently Throughout	366
7. A Preamble Is a Limitation When It Breathes Life and Meaning into the Claims	367
American Med. Sys., Inc. v. Biolitec, Inc.	370
8. A Patentee Can Be His Own Lexicographer	380
9. Prosecution Disclaimer—“Claim Construction” Estoppel?	382
Problems	383
Chapter 9. Proving Infringement	395
A. Literal Infringement	396
Fujitsu Ltd. v. LG Electronics, Inc.	397
Notes	402
B. Doctrine of Equivalents	402
Warner-Jenkinson Co. v. Hilton Davis Chem. Co.	403

Notes	411
C. Acts Constituting Infringement	413
1. Direct Infringement.....	413
Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 271(a).....	413
Notes.....	414
Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Contractors USA, Inc.	417
Notes.....	421
Centillion Data Systems, LLC v. Qwest Communications Int’l, Inc.	424
Akamai Technologies, Inc. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.	431
Notes.....	434
2. Indirect Infringement: Induced and Contributory Infringement.....	436
Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 271(b).....	436
Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.	436
Notes.....	444
Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 271(c).....	445
Notes.....	446
3. Patent Infringement for Filing an Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA).....	449
Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 271(e).....	449
Warner-Lambert Company v. Apotex Corp.	452
Allergan, Inc. v. Alcon Laboratories, Inc.	462
Notes.....	470
Caraco Pharmaceutical Labs., Ltd. v. Novo Nordisk A/S	472
Notes.....	474
Merck KGaA v. Integra Lifesciences I, Ltd.	479
Notes.....	484
4. Export of Components of a Patented Invention	486
Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 271(f)	486
Microsoft Corp. v. AT & T Corp.	487
Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Med., Inc.	499
Notes.....	500
5. Importation of the Product of a Patented Process.....	502
Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 271(g).....	502
Bayer AG v. Housey Pharms., Inc.	502
Notes.....	510
6. State Immunity	513
D. Means-plus-Function Claims.....	514
Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 112(f)	514
Chiuminatta Concrete Concepts, Inc. v. Cardinal Indus., Inc.	516
Noah Systems, Inc. v. Intuit Inc.....	523
Notes	528
Epcor Gas Systems, Inc. v. Bauer Compressors, Inc.	535
Problems	536

Chapter 10. Proving Noninfringement	539
A. The All Elements/Limitations Rule	539
Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Space Sys./Loral, Inc.	540
Notes	547
B. Prosecution History Estoppel	550
1. Rebutting the Festo Presumption—Unforeseeability	556
Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.	556
2. Rebutting the Festo Presumption—Tangential Relationship	569
Insituform Technologies, Inc. v. CAT Contracting, Inc.	569
Notes.....	573
C. Practicing the Prior Art	575
Wilson Sporting Goods Co. v. David Geoffrey & Assocs.	575
Notes	582
D. Disclosure in Specification Is Dedicated to the Public if Not Claimed	587
Johnson & Johnston Assoc., Inc. v. R.E. Serv. Co.	587
Notes	593
E. The All Advantages Rule	595
Vehicular Tech. Corp. v. Titan Wheel Int’l, Inc.....	595
Notes	602
F. Prior User Rights	604
G. License/Exhaustion	604
Impression Products, Inc. v. Lexmark International, Inc.	606
Notes	617
Problems	617
Chapter 11. Proving Invalidity	621
A. Overcoming the Presumption of Validity	622
Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 282	622
B. Identifying Prior Art	624
C. Patentable Subject Matter and Utility—§ 101	625
Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 101	625
D. Anticipation—§ 102.....	630
1. § 102(a)—Known or Used by Others	631
Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 102	631
Patentee’s Rebuttal Evidence: Corroboration Is Required	632
2. Other Patents or Printed Publications—§§ 102(a) & (b)	635
Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 102	635
Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.	636
Notes.....	641
Patentee’s Rebuttal Evidence: Antedating a Reference.....	643
3. On-Sale and Public Use Statutory Bars—§ 102(b).....	643
Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 102	643
The Medicines Company v. Hospira, Inc.	645
Notes.....	651
Helsinn Healthcare S.A. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.	653
Notes.....	659

	Invitrogen Corp. v. Biocrest Manufacturing, L.P.	660
	Notes.....	664
	Patentee’s Rebuttal Evidence: Experimental Use.....	666
	Electromotive Div. of General Motors Corp. v. Trans. Sys. Div. of General Elec. Co.	667
	Notes.....	674
4.	102(d)—Foreign Prior Art.....	675
5.	102(e)—Disclosure in an Earlier Filed US Application	675
6.	102(f)—Derivation (Taking the Invention from Someone Else)	676
	Patentee’s Cure: Correction of Inventorship	676
7.	102(g)—Priority of Invention.....	677
	Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 102(g).....	677
8.	The America Invents Act of 2011 and Shift to a “First Inventor to File” Regime.....	677
	Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 102(a)(1) and (b)(1)	678
	Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 102(a)(2) and (b)(2)	681
	Helsinn Healthcare S.A. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.	685
	Note	688
E.	Obviousness—§ 103.....	688
	Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 103.....	688
1.	Defendant’s <i>Prima Facie</i> Case.....	689
a.	The Scope and Content of the Prior Art.....	690
i.	What Qualifies as Prior Art for Obviousness?	690
ii.	Hindsight Is Not Permitted.....	691
iii.	Analogous Arts.....	691
iv.	Hypothetical Person Knows All the Art	691
v.	Patentee’s Rebuttal Evidence	692
	(a) Motivation to Combine	692
	Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	694
	Notes	700
	(b) Reference Teaches Away from the Claimed Invention.....	701
	(c) Section 103(c)	702
b.	The Differences Between the Prior Art and the Claimed Invention	703
i.	If an Invention Is “Obvious to Try” in Light of the Prior Art, It Is Obvious.....	703
ii.	Common Sense Can Be Used in Performing the Obviousness Analysis	703
	Perfect Web Technologies, Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.....	704
c.	The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	709
d.	Objective Evidence of Obviousness.....	710
	Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Drilling USA, Inc.	711
	Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.....	719
	Notes.....	726
	Problems.....	727

F.	The Specification Is Inadequate—§ 112	729
	Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 112	729
1.	Lack of Enablement.....	730
	Automotive Techs. Int'l, Inc. v. BMW of N. Am., Inc.	731
	Notes.....	737
2.	Failure to Satisfy the Written Description Requirement	739
	Ariad Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Co.	739
	Notes.....	753
3.	Definiteness	756
	Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.	756
	Notes.....	762
	Problems.....	763
Chapter 12. Proving Unenforceability		765
A.	Inequitable Conduct.....	765
	Regulatory Provision—37 C.F.R. § 1.56.....	765
1.	Intent.....	766
	Kingsdown Med. Consultants, Ltd. v. Hollister Inc.	766
	Notes.....	772
2.	Materiality	773
	Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson and Co.	773
	Notes.....	784
	Patentee's Rebuttal Evidence: Reference Is Cumulative.....	789
	Patentee's Rebuttal Evidence: Good Faith Defense	789
	Problems.....	790
B.	Patent Misuse	791
	Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 271(d)	791
	Princo Corporation v. International Trade Commission	793
	Notes	806
C.	Antitrust Counterclaims	808
	Nobelpharma AB v. Implant Innovations, Inc.	808
	Notes	817
D.	Laches and Equitable Estoppel.....	819
	A.C. Aukerman Co. v. R.L. Chaides Construction Co.	820
	Notes	827
	SCA Hygiene Products Aktiebolag v. First Quality Baby Products, LLC.....	828
	Notes	835
E.	Prosecution Laches.....	835
	Symbol Tech., Inc. v. Lemelson Med., Educ. & Research Found., LP	836
	Notes	840
	Problems	842
Chapter 13. Injunctive Relief.....		847
	Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 283.....	847

A.	Preliminary Injunctions.....	847
1.	Practical Considerations.....	847
2.	Factors for Consideration.....	848
	H.H. Robertson, Co. v. United Steel Deck, Inc.	849
	Notes.....	854
B.	Permanent Injunctions.....	863
	Federal Rule of Civil Procedure—65(d).....	863
	eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C.	863
	Note.....	867
	Active Video Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Communications, Inc.	867
	Notes.....	874
C.	Contempt Proceedings.....	878
	TiVo, Inc. v. EchoStar Corp.	878
	Notes.....	891
	Additive Controls & Measurement Systems, Inc. v. Flowdata, Inc.	892
	Notes.....	902
	Problems.....	903
	Chapter 14. Damages.....	905
	Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 284.....	905
	Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 286.....	905
A.	Lost Profits—The Panduit “But For” Test.....	906
	Rite-Hite Corp. v. Kelley Co.	906
	Notes.....	918
	BIC Leisure Prods. v. Windsurfing Int’l, Inc.	923
	Notes.....	929
B.	Reasonable Royalty.....	931
	Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.	933
	Notes.....	952
C.	Enhanced Damage Awards.....	966
1.	Willful Infringement.....	966
	Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 284.....	966
	Halo Electronics, Inc. v. Pulse Electronics, Inc.	966
	Notes.....	975
	Problems.....	982
2.	Attorney Fees.....	983
	Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 285.....	983
	Octane Fitness, LLC v. ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.	983
	Notes.....	988
3.	Interest.....	991
	Allen Archery Inc. v. Browning Mfg. Co.	991
	Notes.....	993
4.	Costs.....	994
D.	Marking.....	994
	Statutory Provision—35 U.S.C. § 287.....	994
1.	Marking by the Patent Owner.....	995
	Lans v. Digital Equipment Corp.	995

American Med. Systems, Inc. v. Medical Eng’g Corp.....	998
Notes.....	1005
2. Marking by Licensees.....	1006
Maxwell v. J. Baker, Inc.	1006
Note	1008
Problems.....	1009
Chapter 15. Jury Instructions, Special Verdict Forms, Post-Trial	
Motions, and Final Judgements.....	1011
A. Special Verdict and Jury Instructions	1011
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 49	1011
American Hoist & Derrick Co. v. Sowa & Sons, Inc.	1012
Notes	1025
Notes	1037
Problems	1037
B. Post-Trial Motions.....	1038
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 50	1038
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Rule 59	1039
Delta-X Corp. v. Baker Hughes Production Tools Inc.	1041
Notes	1045
Problems	1045
C. Impact of Final Judgment—Issue and Claim Preclusion (Collateral	
Estoppel and Res Judicata)	1046
Blonder-Tongue Laboratories, Inc. v. University of Illinois	
Foundation.....	1046
Note	1058
Mycogen Plant Science, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.	1058
Transclean Corp. v. Jiffy Lube Int’l, Inc.	1060
Notes	1067
Chapter 16. The Appeal.....	1069
Statutory Provision—28 U.S.C. § 1292.....	1069
Statutory Provision—28 U.S.C. § 1295.....	1070
A. Appeal Procedures.....	1070
Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure—Rule 4	1070
Federal Circuit Rules—Rule 4.....	1073
B. What Can Be Appealed.....	1074
C. The Standards of Review on Appeal	1075
D. Cross-Appeal.....	1078
Federal Circuit Rules—Rule 28.1.....	1078
E. Petition for the Writ of Mandamus	1079
Statutory Provision—28 U.S.C. § 1651.....	1079
Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure—Rule 21	1079
F. Beware the Frivolous Appeal	1081
G. Federal Circuit Mediation Program.....	1082

Chapter 17. Post-Issuance Proceedings at the PTO	1085
A. <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	1088
Statutory Provisions—35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319	1088
Notes	1093
Cuozzo Speed Technologies, LLC v. Lee	1094
Notes	1104
B. Post-Grant Review	1105
Statutory Provisions—35 U.S.C. §§ 321–329	1105
Notes	1107
C. <i>Ex Parte</i> Reexamination	1109
Statutory Provisions—35 U.S.C. §§ 301–305	1109
In re Recreative Technologies Corp.	1111
Notes	1115
D. Strategic Considerations for Seeking Post-Issuance Review at the PTO	1119
1. The Patentee’s Perspective	1119
a. Advantages of Review.....	1119
i. Flexibility to Amend	1119
ii. Limits on Participation by Accused Infringer.....	1119
iii. Courts Give Extra Deference to Reviewed Patents	1120
iv. Potential to Cure Inequitable Conduct.....	1120
b. Disadvantages of Review	1120
i. No Presumption of Validity.....	1120
ii. Delays the Litigation	1120
iii. Infringer Could Acquire Intervening Rights.....	1121
2. The Accused Infringer’s Perspective	1122
a. Advantages of Requesting Review.....	1122
i. No Presumption of Validity.....	1122
ii. Stalls Litigation	1122
iii. Accused Infringer Could Acquire Intervening Rights.....	1122
iv. Confidentiality	1122
b. Disadvantages of Review	1122
i. Estoppel.....	1123
ii. Limited Scope.....	1123
Notes	1123
E. Reissue	1129
Statutory Provisions—35 U.S.C. § 251	1129
Notes	1132
F. Damages and Intervening Rights	1133
Marine Polymer Techs., Inc. v. HemCon, Inc.	1133
Notes	1141
Problems	1142
INDEX.....	1145