
CHAMBERS GLOBAL PRACTICE GUIDES

Patent Litigation 2024


Definitive global law guides offering
comparative analysis from top-ranked lawyers

USA: Law & Practice

Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds,
Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock
Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

USA: Trends & Developments

Steven Lieberman and
Nicole (Nikki) DeAbrantes
Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC





Law and Practice

Contributed by:

Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington
and Jennifer P Nock

Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

Contents

1. Intellectual Property Rights and Granting Procedure p.6

- 1.1 Types of Intellectual Property Rights p.6
- 1.2 Grant Procedure p.6
- 1.3 Timeline for Grant Procedure p.7
- 1.4 Term of Each Intellectual Property Right p.8
- 1.5 Rights and Obligations of Owners of Intellectual Property Rights p.8
- 1.6 Further Protection After Lapse of the Maximum Term p.8
- 1.7 Third-Party Rights to Participate in Grant Proceedings p.9
- 1.8 Remedies Against Refusal to Grant an Intellectual Property Right p.9
- 1.9 Consequences of Failure to Pay Annual Fees p.9
- 1.10 Post-grant Proceedings Available to Owners of Intellectual Property Rights p.9

2. Initiating a Lawsuit p.10

- 2.1 Actions Available Against Infringement p.10
- 2.2 Third-Party Remedies to Remove the Effects of Intellectual Property p.10
- 2.3 Courts With Jurisdiction p.10
- 2.4 Specialised Bodies/Organisations for the Resolution of Disputes p.11
- 2.5 Prerequisites to Filing a Lawsuit p.11
- 2.6 Legal Representation p.11
- 2.7 Interim Injunctions p.11
- 2.8 Protection for Potential Opponents p.11
- 2.9 Special Limitation Provisions p.12
- 2.10 Mechanisms to Obtain Evidence and Information p.12
- 2.11 Initial Pleading Standards p.12
- 2.12 Representative or Collective Action p.13
- 2.13 Restrictions on Assertion of an Intellectual Property Right p.13

3. Infringement p.13

- 3.1 Necessary Parties to an Action for Infringement p.13
- 3.2 Direct and Indirect Infringement p.13
- 3.3 Process Patents p.14
- 3.4 Scope of Protection for an Intellectual Property Right p.14
- 3.5 Defences Against Infringement p.15
- 3.6 Role of Experts p.15
- 3.7 Procedure for Construing the Terms of the Patent's Claim p.16
- 3.8 Procedure for Third-Party Opinions p.16

4. Revocation/Cancellation p.16

- 4.1 Reasons and Remedies for Revocation/Cancellation p.16
- 4.2 Partial Revocation/Cancellation p.16
- 4.3 Amendments in Revocation/Cancellation Proceedings p.16
- 4.4 Revocation/Cancellation and Infringement p.17

5. Trial and Settlement p.17

- 5.1 Special Procedural Provisions for Intellectual Property Rights p.17
- 5.2 Decision-Makers p.18
- 5.3 Settling the Case p.19
- 5.4 Other Court Proceedings p.19

6. Remedies p.19

- 6.1 Remedies for the Patentee p.19
- 6.2 Rights of Prevailing Defendants p.20
- 6.3 Types of Remedies p.20
- 6.4 Injunctions Pending Appeal p.20

7. Appeal p.20

- 7.1 Special Provisions for Intellectual Property Proceedings p.20
- 7.2 Type of Review p.20

8. Costs p.21

- 8.1 Costs Before Filing a Lawsuit p.21
- 8.2 Calculation of Court Fees p.21
- 8.3 Responsibility for Paying the Costs of Litigation p.21

9. Alternative Dispute Resolution p.21

- 9.1 Type of Actions for Intellectual Property p.21

10. Assignment and Licensing p.22

- 10.1 Requirements or Restrictions for Assignment of Intellectual Property Rights p.22
- 10.2 Procedure for Assigning an Intellectual Property Right p.22
- 10.3 Requirements or Restrictions to License an Intellectual Property Right p.22
- 10.4 Procedure for Licensing an Intellectual Property Right p.22

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock,
Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC brings to every patent litigation a team of seasoned, strategic, and highly successful litigators who are skilled in the law, have deep technical expertise, and consistently prevail when going up against some of the biggest firms in the country. The firm devotes more than half its work to intricate, multi-party patent litigation involving complex scientific and legal issues in district courts and the US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, as well as before the International Trade Commission and the Patent Trial and Appeal Board

(PTAB). Rothwell Figg sees patent litigation not just as a legal challenge, but also as business and strategic challenges. Through an approach that addresses all three angles, it provides clients with representation, even in the most complex disputes, that minimises risk, maximises opportunities, and most importantly, aggressively represents their interests. In addition to patent litigation, Rothwell Figg provides a comprehensive range of IP, litigation, and technology services for US and international clients in jurisdictions across the globe.

Authors



Steven Lieberman is a trial lawyer, counsellor, and shareholder at Rothwell Figg, whose practice encompasses the spectrum of IP law, including patent litigation, post-grant

proceedings, privacy, and e-commerce for high-profile clients such as The New York Times, NBCUniversal, HBO, ViacomCBS, and Bloomberg. He has been lead counsel on over 100 patent infringement suits in US District Court. Steven's public service is equally distinguished: he is an accomplished First Amendment litigator with a strong devotion to issues of constitutional law and religious liberties. He is a member of the Sedona Conference Working Group 10 on patent litigation best practices in the pharmaceutical and biologics areas and the Intellectual Property & Technology Law Advisory Board of The George Washington University Law School.



Joseph A Hynds is a shareholder and first-chair patent litigator at Rothwell Figg, with over three decades of experience achieving successful outcomes for clients that span

the technical gamut, including pharmaceuticals, biotechnology, medical devices, agricultural equipment, security systems, telecommunications, and e-commerce. While the majority of Joe's work concentrates on representing clients in federal courts around the country and appeals to the US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, he also has substantial experience handling post-grant proceedings before the PTAB, providing pivotal counsel on a variety of IP issues, and managing complex patent portfolios. He has particular expertise in Hatch-Waxman litigation. Joe is a former patent examiner with the USPTO.

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock,
Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC



Danny Huntington is a shareholder at Rothwell Figg, whose IP practice includes covers litigation, US and foreign prosecution, licensing, and general client counselling, with a

focus on biotechnology and pharmaceuticals. A former chemist for The Gillette Research Institute, Danny was one of the few knowledgeable in both interferences and biotechnology when the US Patent and Trademark Office started declaring patent interferences involving biotechnology. He has handled more than 200 interferences, allowing him to seamlessly transition to handling other post-grant proceedings before the PTAB. Among other organisations, Danny is a member of the Fédération Internationale des Conseils en Propriété Intellectuelle (FICPI), of which he is a president of honour and a member of the Biotechnology Committee.



Jennifer P Nock is a shareholder at Rothwell Figg and focuses her practice on patent matters including litigation, prosecution, post-grant proceedings, licensing, opinions, and

counselling. Her work also encompasses trade secrets, FDA regulatory strategy, and other FDA issues, including compliance reviews for pharmaceutical marketing. With a Master's degree in Chemistry from Harvard University and a deep background in pharmaceuticals and biotechnology, Jen is particularly experienced in working with pharmaceutical companies, including brand and generic small molecule products, and innovator biologics and biosimilar companies. Jen also has experience working with clients in a variety of other industries, including consumer electronics, online education, and cosmetics.

Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

901 New York Avenue
NW
Suite 900 East
Washington, DC 20001
USA

Tel: +1 202 783 6040
Fax: +1 202 783 6031
Email: slieberman@rfem.com
Web: www.rothwellfigg.com



Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock, Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

1. Intellectual Property Rights and Granting Procedure

1.1 Types of Intellectual Property Rights

The USA offers protection of inventions through the intellectual property rights associated with patents or trade secrets. Patents provide broad, time-limited rights to the patentee in exchange for public disclosure of the invention. In contrast, trade secrets are not publicly known; have narrower rights; and, in principle, an indefinite duration.

Patents arise from federal law. Congress created the US patent system based on its authority in the US Constitution, which grants Congress power “to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries”. Title 35 of the US Code contains the federal laws related to patents.

Trade secret law is primarily based on state law. Specific definitions vary but, generally, a trade secret must not be known to the public, must confer economic benefit on its holder because it is not publicly known, and the trade secret-holder must take reasonable measures to keep such information secret. Most states have adopted the Uniform Trade Secrets Act (1979) as amended, or a variation of it, so there is a measure of uniformity among the state laws. In addition to state law causes of action, the Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016 provides a federal cause of action for trade secret misappropriation.

The statutory language creates a foundation for patents and trade secrets, but the law continues to evolve through case law as courts interpret legal terms and concepts.

1.2 Grant Procedure

Provisional and Non-provisional Applications

The US Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) conducts the patent approval process and grants any resulting patents. Applicants file either a provisional or non-provisional patent application with the USPTO.

Provisional applications provide a quick and inexpensive way for inventors to establish a US filing date for their invention, which can be claimed in a non-provisional application that is filed later. A provisional application must contain a description of the invention and may include drawings necessary to understand the invention. A provisional application has fewer requirements than a non-provisional application but cannot develop into a patent without a corresponding non-provisional application filed within 12 months.

A non-provisional patent application must include both a description of the invention and claims describing the scope of the protections sought in the patent. A non-provisional application may be filed without a prior provisional application. However, a non-provisional application may gain the benefit of the earlier filing date of a corresponding provisional application if filed within 12 months of the provisional application.

Non-provisional applications undergo substantive examination by the USPTO to ensure compliance with the legal requirements for a patent. As a preliminary matter, a patent must claim patent-eligible subject matter. At a minimum, the US Supreme Court has stated that laws of nature, natural phenomena and abstract ideas are not patentable. Patents must also describe an invention that is novel and non-obvious with sufficient detail that a person of ordinary skill in

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock,
Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

the art of the invention can make and use the invention without undue experimentation.

Patent Prosecution

The interaction between patent applicants (or their representatives) and the USPTO is called patent prosecution. During patent prosecution, an examiner at the USPTO will review the patent application and information already available to the public to determine whether the patent application meets the requirements for patenting based on the laws found in Title 35 of the US Code, the regulations listed in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations and the guidance provided in the USPTO Manual of Patent Examining Procedure. If the examiner finds evidence that the invention has already been publicly disclosed or discovers another reason that the application does not comply with the patent requirements, the examiner may issue a rejection describing the deficiencies of the patent application. The applicant has an opportunity to respond to the rejection, which may include amending the claims in the application, having a phone conference with the examiner and presenting arguments that the rejection was improper. This process may be repeated until a final rejection or allowance of the application. If the patent application is allowed, the USPTO issues a patent creating enforceable rights for the patentee.

Trade Secrets

By their nature, trade secrets are not disclosed publicly or registered with any agency. Information becomes a trade secret when the holder takes affirmative action to keep the information secret. This can include physical protection of the information, use of non-disclosure agreements or lawsuits to recover for misappropriation of the trade secrets.

1.3 Timeline for Grant Procedure

The time required to obtain a patent can vary greatly depending on many factors, including the subject matter of a patent, the number of rejections and appeals during patent prosecution and the type of USPTO examination programme. The USPTO has several patent application initiatives that can expedite patent applications meeting the respective programme requirements. For example, applications qualifying for Accelerated Examination may have a final disposition within 12 months. According to statistics provided by the USPTO, the average time for a final decision on a patent application is about two years, but some take several years.

Patent applicants are not obliged to be represented by a lawyer. However, the USPTO cautions that the patent application process is an undertaking requiring knowledge of patent law and rules, USPTO practices and procedures, as well as knowledge of the scientific or technical matters involved in the particular invention. Because of the complexities involved, most inventors employ the services of registered patent lawyers or patent agents.

The cost associated with obtaining a patent varies based on many factors. Administrative fees imposed by the USPTO depend on the type of entity (large, small or micro), the number of claims in the application, the amount of time taken to respond to the USPTO rejections, the use of patent application initiative programmes and other procedural details. Lawyers' fees in connection to the application may also vary depending on the complexity of the application and patent prosecution.

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock, Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

1.4 Term of Each Intellectual Property Right

Generally, a patent expires 20 years after its filing date, but this term can vary depending on the timing of the patent application and patent prosecution. Patents issued and applications filed before 8 June 1995 expire either 20 years from filing or 17 years from issue, whichever is later.

Patent applications filed after 8 June 1995 expire 20 years after the earliest effective US filing date. This may be earlier than the filing date of the patent application if it claims priority to an earlier provisional or international application.

Under limited circumstances, a patent term may be extended to account for administrative delays when acquiring the patent. For example, if the USPTO does not issue a patent within three years after its filing date, the patent holder may obtain an extension of patent term equal to the period in excess of three years. For certain drug products and medical devices, a patent may be extended for up to five years to account for the regulatory review conducted by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA).

1.5 Rights and Obligations of Owners of Intellectual Property Rights

The USPTO website provides general information about all US patents. Furthermore, the FDA maintains publications identifying patents applicable to certain approved pharmaceutical products. For drug products, the FDA publication is Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic Equivalence Evaluations (more commonly known as the “Orange Book”). Similarly, the FDA has the List of Licensed Biological Products with Reference Product Exclusivity and Biosimilarity or Interchangeability Evaluations (known as the “Purple Book”) with information about approved biological products. The FDA maintains elec-

tronic databases on its website with the information contained in both the Orange Book and Purple Book.

A patent gives its owner the right to exclude others from making, using, selling and importing the patented invention. To maintain the enforceability of the patent, the USPTO must receive maintenance fees for the patent, due 3.5, 7.5 and 11.5 years after the date of issue.

The remedies available to the patent holder vary depending on the chosen forum of enforcement. In a district court, a patent holder may seek equitable remedies in the form of a preliminary or permanent injunction and may seek monetary damages for both past and future infringement.

At the US International Trade Commission (ITC), a patent holder may seek cease-and-desist orders and exclusion orders to prevent the importation of patent-infringing goods. The exclusion orders direct US Customs and Border Protection to exclude articles from entry into the USA. A limited exclusion order prevents specified entities from importing the articles and a general exclusion order prevents any entity from importing the articles. The ITC cease-and-desist orders can direct infringers to stop importing infringing articles and to stop sales of infringing articles in US inventory. The ITC cannot award monetary damages.

1.6 Further Protection After Lapse of the Maximum Term

The USA allows certain extensions of patent terms for administrative delays. Delays by the USPTO in the issue of patents can lead to patent-term extensions for the time of the delay. This extension does not apply to delays resulting from the patent applicant’s actions, including requests for continued examination or appeals.

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock, Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

The possible extension for USPTO delays is unlimited.

Certain drug products and medical devices can receive annual patent term extensions if the product is undergoing administrative review by the FDA. These extensions are renewable for up to five years.

1.7 Third-Party Rights to Participate in Grant Proceedings

Any third party may submit patents, published patent applications or other printed publications as part of a third-party pre-issuance submission. The submission must include a concise description of the asserted relevance of each submitted document. These submissions may be made online at the USPTO website. Submissions must be made before the later of six months after publication of the patent application or the date of a USPTO communication rejecting any claims in the application. However, a notice of allowance for the patent application immediately terminates the timeframe for third-party submissions.

1.8 Remedies Against Refusal to Grant an Intellectual Property Right

During patent prosecution, the USPTO may issue a final rejection of the patent claims. If the applicant wishes to challenge the final rejection, the applicant may request continued examination or may file an appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB). The applicant may appeal PTAB decisions to the US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Further review may be sought from the US Supreme Court through a petition for a writ of certiorari.

1.9 Consequences of Failure to Pay Annual Fees

Patent holders must pay maintenance fees to keep patents in force. The payments are due 3.5,

7.5 and 11.5 years after the date of issue. The USPTO allows payment of each fee six months before the due date, but does not allow any other pre-payment of the maintenance fees. Payments that are less than six months past the due date have a surcharge of USD125–500 in addition to the normal fee.

Under some circumstances, a patent can be reinstated after not paying the maintenance fee in a timely manner. The USPTO requires a statement that the delay in payment was unintentional and submission of a petition fee of USD525–2,100 in addition to the required maintenance fees.

1.10 Post-grant Proceedings Available to Owners of Intellectual Property Rights

During some post-grant proceedings before the USPTO, the patent holder can amend claims of an issued patent. During *ex parte* re-examination, the patent holder may amend claims to respond to the USPTO's findings of substantially new questions of patentability. In an *inter partes* review (IPR) proceeding, if the challenged claims are determined to be invalid, the patent owner may seek to add substitute claims.

At any time before the expiration of the patent, a patent holder may seek reissue of the patent to correct certain errors, such as errors in the drawings or specification, or errors in the claimed scope of the invention. No new matter can be added during a reissue. If the reissue is sought within two years of the grant of the original patent, the scope of the claims can be narrowed or enlarged. Otherwise, only amendments that narrow the scope of the claims are permitted.

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock, Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

2. Initiating a Lawsuit

2.1 Actions Available Against Infringement

A patent holder has several options when seeking enforcement of patent rights. District court litigation can provide injunctions, monetary remedies for infringement and declaratory judgments. As discussed at **1.5 Rights and Obligations of Owners of Intellectual Property Rights**, the ITC can issue exclusion orders and cease-and-desist orders. If an applicable contract provides for alternative dispute resolution proceedings, such as mediation or arbitration, or the parties agree to alternative dispute resolution proceedings, they may be used in lieu of litigation. Alternative dispute resolution proceedings can allow more flexible solutions and a final resolution can often be reached faster and less expensively. Additionally, the ITC and many courts offer mediation programmes.

2.2 Third-Party Remedies to Remove the Effects of Intellectual Property

A third party may challenge the validity of an issued patent through district court litigation or through post-grant proceedings at the USPTO. A party with standing may seek a declaratory judgment of patent invalidity in a district court. As a defendant in a patent infringement lawsuit, a party may argue patent invalidity as a counterclaim or affirmative defence. Patent invalidity may also be raised as a defence in an ITC investigation.

Challenges to patent validity at the USPTO take the form of post-grant review (PGR), IPR, ex parte re-examination and covered business method review (CBM). The timing and type of patent affect which of these proceedings is available to a third party.

PGR

PGR is available during the first nine months after the issue of a patent. Any party that is not the patent holder and has not challenged the patent validity in a civil action may request PGR. PGR allows the broadest grounds for challenging patent validity.

IPR

After the nine-month window of PGR, a third party may challenge validity through an IPR proceeding. As is the case with PGR, the IPR petitioner must not be the patent holder and must not have challenged the patent in civil litigation, but there is an additional requirement that the petitioner must not have been served a complaint alleging infringement more than one year prior to the IPR petition. The IPR also has more limited grounds to challenge patent invalidity, only allowing arguments of obviousness and lack of novelty based on patents and printed publications.

CBM

A CBM review has the most restrictive requirements: at least nine months must have elapsed since the patent was issued; the patent must be a financial product or service patent, excluding technological inventions; the CBM petitioner must have been sued or charged with patent infringement; and the CBM review petition must have been filed before 16 September 2020. The grounds for challenging patent validity in a CBM review are similar to those of PGR.

There are no actions available in the USA for a compulsory licence.

2.3 Courts With Jurisdiction

Federal district courts have original jurisdiction over patent matters. Parties may appeal district court decisions to the US Court of Appeals for

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock, Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

the Federal Circuit. Decisions of the Federal Circuit are subject to discretionary appeal to the US Supreme Court through a petition for certiorari.

In certain circumstances involving importation of patent-infringing articles, the ITC may have jurisdiction. In an ITC investigation, an administrative law judge makes an initial determination on liability. A party may petition the ITC to review the administrative law judge's initial determination. After the ITC's final decision, a party may appeal the decision to the Federal Circuit, with further discretionary appeal to the US Supreme Court.

2.4 Specialised Bodies/Organisations for the Resolution of Disputes

Two administrative agencies provide a review of patents before administrative law judges. The USPTO has the PTAB, which provides a review of patent application rejections and several post-grant proceedings discussed above. The ITC conducts investigations related to importation of patent-infringing articles. Both PTAB and ITC decisions may be appealed to the US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, with further review available from the US Supreme Court.

2.5 Prerequisites to Filing a Lawsuit

There are no prerequisites to filing a lawsuit in a district court, unless the parties' contract provides otherwise. Lack of pre-filing notice may, however, limit recovery of monetary damages in certain instances.

2.6 Legal Representation

While individuals are not required to be represented by a lawyer, all federal courts require corporations to have legal representation. It is generally viewed as exceedingly unwise for an individual to pursue patent litigation without experienced counsel. In proceedings before the

PTAB, at least one representative of each party must be a registered practitioner of the USPTO.

2.7 Interim Injunctions

A patent holder may seek a preliminary injunction to protect the rights of the parties while litigation is pending. Preliminary injunctions require a demonstration:

- of a reasonable probability of success on the merits;
- of irreparable harm to the party if the preliminary injunction is denied;
- that the balance of the hardships favour issuing a preliminary injunction; and
- that the impact on the public interest favours the party bringing the motion.

If a court determines that a preliminary injunction is appropriate, such an order will only be issued if the party seeking it posts a bond in an amount that the court considers proper to compensate the other party should the injunction be determined to have been improperly granted.

Although rarely granted, a patent holder could seek earlier relief through a temporary restraining order. In addition to meeting the requirements for a preliminary injunction, the patent holder must demonstrate that immediate and irreparable injury will result to the movant before the adverse party can be heard in opposition, and certify in writing any efforts made to give notice and the reasons why it should not be required. An ex-parte temporary restraining order may be granted only in the very limited circumstances where providing notice will itself prevent, or interfere with, the ability to obtain relief.

2.8 Protection for Potential Opponents

The potential opponent may oppose the preliminary injunction by arguing against the fac-

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock, Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

tors described above for granting a preliminary injunction – most particularly that monetary relief at the end of the case will adequately compensate the plaintiff for any injury it incurs. Alternatively, a potential infringer could seek a declaratory judgment of patent invalidity or non-infringement in a federal district court. A party could also seek to challenge patent validity through one of the post-grant proceedings available through the USPTO.

2.9 Special Limitation Provisions

US law limits patent infringement damages to six years prior to the filing of the complaint or counterclaim for infringement. Additionally, the patent holder cannot recover damages for infringement prior to the point the infringer had notice of the infringement. Filing the lawsuit is notice of infringement, but the infringer could have earlier notice based on communications from the patent holder detailing the infringement, or from constructive notice by marking the patented articles with their patent numbers. Injunctive relief is available for any period the court finds appropriate up to the expiration of the patent rights.

2.10 Mechanisms to Obtain Evidence and Information

In general, a party cannot obtain relevant information and evidence from another party or any third parties before commencing a proceeding in a district court. However, once a lawsuit has commenced, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure require the parties to exchange initial disclosures of information, including:

- the identity of each individual likely to have discoverable information;
- copies of all documents a party may use to support its case;
- a computation of claimed damages; and

- any insurance agreement that may satisfy all or part of a judgment.

Parties may then obtain non-privileged information that is relevant to any party's claim or defence and is proportional to the needs of the case, considering:

- the importance of the issues at stake in the action;
- the amount in controversy;
- the parties' relative access to relevant information;
- the parties' resources;
- the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues; and
- whether the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit.

Parties may obtain discoverable information through depositions, requests for production of documents, written interrogatories or requests for admission.

Parties may subpoena third parties to provide discoverable information in the form of depositions or production of documents. Procedures are also available to obtain discovery from third parties located outside the USA through applicable treaties or letters rogatory (formal requests for assistance sent to foreign courts).

A party or any person from whom discoverable information is sought may seek a protective order from the court to limit the scope or use of the information.

2.11 Initial Pleading Standards

Patent litigation follows the same pleading standards as other civil cases. A complaint filed in district court must allege facts that state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face. At a mini-

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock, Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

mum, a patent infringement complaint should identify the patent holder, the relevant patent(s), the accused infringer and the requested relief sought. For claims of indirect infringement, more details are typically required. Preferably, the complaint will provide additional information about the accused infringement, including the claims and elements infringed.

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure govern amended and supplemental pleadings. A party may amend its pleadings once as a matter of course within 21 days of serving. Other amendments require the opposing party's written consent or the court's permission. To account for occurrences after a pleading, a party may supplement its pleadings with the court's permission.

2.12 Representative or Collective Action

There are no class actions available in intellectual property cases. However, a patent holder may join multiple accused infringers in a single federal lawsuit if the actions arise out of the same transaction, occurrence or series of transactions. It is not sufficient to have unrelated defendants infringe the same patent.

In situations where joining all defendants in a single case is not possible, there are other options to gain the advantages of consolidated actions. Cases across several districts that share a common question of fact may be co-ordinated for pre-trial proceedings before a Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation. Similarly, multiple cases in the same district may be consolidated to promote judicial efficiency when there is a common question of law or fact.

ITC investigations of patent-infringing articles often involve multiple respondents. Because the ITC only needs jurisdiction over the imported

articles and not the infringers, it can be easier for a patent holder to proceed against multiple infringers simultaneously.

2.13 Restrictions on Assertion of an Intellectual Property Right

Some patent holder actions can limit the ability to enforce a patent against others. Under patent exhaustion – also referred to as the first-sale doctrine – the patent holder's right to control an individual article ends after an authorised sale. If the patent was procured through improper conduct before the USPTO, it could be unenforceable under the doctrine of inequitable conduct. A patent holder that expands its rights beyond the statutory patent grant may commit patent misuse. Finally, when the patent holder uses its patent impermissibly to gain market share or engages in other anti-competitive behaviour, antitrust laws may limit the enforceability of the patent.

3. Infringement

3.1 Necessary Parties to an Action for Infringement

Generally, the party bringing an infringement action must be the patent holder, although an exclusive licensee that owns "all substantial rights" in the patent may bring an infringement action in its own name without joining the patent holder. An ITC investigation requires the party filing the petition to have an interest in the patent and an injury to a domestic industry.

3.2 Direct and Indirect Infringement

Direct infringement occurs when a person makes, uses, offers to sell, sells or imports in the USA a patented invention without authority. Usually, the patent holder demonstrates this by showing every claim element, or its equivalent, is

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock, Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

present in the accused article. When more than one party infringes the patent, there can still be direct infringement if one party directs or controls the actions of another.

A party induces infringement when it actively and knowingly aids and abets another's direct infringement. The inducer must have knowledge of the patent and actively encourage the acts that result in direct infringement. Induced infringement can result in both parties being jointly and severally liable for the infringement.

Contributory infringement involves supplying a component of a patented invention to another party that performs the direct infringement. The component must not be a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for non-infringing use, nor can it have substantial non-infringing uses.

There are also rules primarily directed to the pharmaceutical industry. A party may engage in activities (such as testing) to support an Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) for a generic version of an FDA-approved drug – even if that drug is patented – without incurring patent infringement liability. However, filing an ANDA is considered an act of “artificial” infringement if the ANDA applicant seeks approval to engage in the commercial manufacture, use or sale before the patent expiration.

The available remedies for patent infringement are discussed in **6. Remedies**.

3.3 Process Patents

An additional potential form of infringement applies to process patents. If a person makes, uses, offers to sell, sells or imports in the USA a product made by a process patented in the USA during the term of the patent, the person com-

mits infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(g). This includes instances where the patented process occurs outside of the USA.

3.4 Scope of Protection for an Intellectual Property Right

The scope of protection of a patent is determined by its claims, which describe the extent of the protection sought in a patent application. Often, significant dispute arises when determining the precise meaning of terms or phrases in the patent claims.

In 2018, the standard for claim interpretation became more uniform, whether in a district court, the ITC or in a post-grant proceeding at the USPTO. The “Phillips” standard seeks to interpret the claims from the perspective of a person having skill in the relevant art of the invention based on intrinsic and extrinsic evidence. Intrinsic evidence includes the patent's description of the invention, including the claims themselves, and the patent prosecution history. This means arguments and statements made to the USPTO during patent prosecution may limit how claims are interpreted later. Extrinsic evidence includes dictionaries, treatises and expert testimony. Extrinsic evidence can aid the decision-maker's understanding of how a skilled person would have understood the claims at the time of the invention.

During patent prosecution, the USPTO uses a slightly different standard for analysing patent application claims. Generally, the USPTO uses the same types of information described above, but seeks to determine the “broadest reasonable interpretation” of the claims for purposes of issuing patents.

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock, Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

3.5 Defences Against Infringement

An accused patent infringer may seek to avoid liability by proving that no infringement occurred, the patent is invalid or the patent is unenforceable.

Several defences to patent infringement do not require challenging the patent itself, either by showing the accused article does not infringe or showing the use of the patent was lawful. For example, direct infringement requires all the elements of the patent claim be present, so demonstrating missing elements in the article can avoid liability by direct infringement. Showing an implied or express licence can negate the infringement requirement of unauthorised use of a patented invention. In the medical field, gathering data to support an ANDA for a generic version of a patented and FDA-approved drug does not create patent infringement liability – although the filing of the ANDA may. The courts also recognise a more general experimental use exception to liability, but it is a very narrow exception, requiring no commercial motive in the experimental use. Under certain circumstances, prior commercial use of an invention occurring more than a year before the patent application can avoid infringement liability. Finally, infringement damages are limited by law to the six years prior to the filing of the complaint, so infringement before this period would not incur liability.

The accused infringer may also challenge the validity of the patent because there will be no liability for an invalid patent. The grounds for challenging the patent may include lack of patent-eligible subject matter, lack of novelty, lack of enablement or written disclosure, obviousness of the invention, public knowledge or prior offers to sell.

The patent holder's actions can also be the basis of a defence against infringement. Inequitable conduct can result from improper conduct before the USPTO. Relying on a patent holder's conduct and representations may create equitable estoppel if the patent holder later acts inconsistently with the reliance. A patent holder that impermissibly expands its rights beyond the statutory patent grant may commit patent misuse. Under patent exhaustion – also referred to as the first sale doctrine – the patent holder's right to control an individual article ends after an authorised sale. In some circumstances, a patent holder's failure to keep patents together that are subject to a terminal disclaimer may be used as a defence to patent infringement.

That an accused infringer has its own patent does not, by itself, provide a defence to an infringement claim.

Standard-Essential Patents

Some patent holders may have standard-essential patents (SEPs). An SEP is a patent that covers technology that is considered essential to an industry standard. These SEP holders generally have an obligation to license these patents on fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory (FRAND) terms. If the SEP holder fails to offer a potential infringer FRAND terms, the accused infringer can assert the breach of FRAND obligations as an affirmative defence in a subsequent infringement action.

3.6 Role of Experts

Parties may submit expert reports in connection with the claim construction process to assist the court in construing disputed terms. Parties almost always rely on expert reports and expert testimony in connection with infringement, invalidity and damages issues. Experts are especially effective when a case involves a jury because a

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock,
Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

good expert can explain complicated information in a clear and understandable fashion.

Under the Federal Rules of Evidence, the court has authority to appoint an expert witness. However, this rule is rarely invoked. Generally, a party relying on expert testimony chooses and retains its own expert. In rare cases a district court judge faced with a technology with which they are unfamiliar, may appoint their own expert (the cost of which is typically split between the parties) to assist the court in understanding the technology. When this happens, it is often in the context of claim construction proceedings.

3.7 Procedure for Construing the Terms of the Patent's Claim

Courts use specialised claim construction hearings called “Markman” hearings to examine evidence from the parties on the appropriate meaning of the relevant terms in a patent claim. In a district court, patent claim interpretation is performed by the judge, even if there is a jury trial.

3.8 Procedure for Third-Party Opinions

Amicus briefs are very rarely (almost never) submitted at the trial court (district court) level. It is extraordinarily rare for a district court judge to solicit amicus participation in a patent case. Amicus participation at the Federal Circuit level is more common. A third party (typically an industry organisation, public interest group or group of academics) may seek permission from the court to submit an amicus brief, and such permission is typically granted. Once a patent case reaches the United States Supreme Court, amicus participation is the rule rather than the exception. In addition, the Supreme Court will often ask the Office of the Solicitor General (which represents the interests of the US government before the Supreme Court) to file a brief with its views either as to whether the Supreme Court should

hear the appeal at all or, if the Supreme Court has already accepted the case for appeal, on the merits.

4. Revocation/Cancellation

4.1 Reasons and Remedies for Revocation/Cancellation

In the federal court system, a final judgment of invalidity effectively revokes the invalidated claims of the patent. A decision that the patent holder committed some other actions that prevents liability for patent infringement, such as equitable estoppel or antitrust violations, may make a patent unenforceable.

The ITC makes similar decisions about patents, but its decisions are not binding on district courts. For example, an ITC decision of patent invalidity does not require a district court to treat the patent as invalid, but the district court may reach the same decision based on the persuasive influence of the ITC decision.

In post-grant proceedings, the USPTO may cancel some or all of the claims of a patent. A party challenging a patent in a post-grant proceeding does not need to have the standing necessary in a federal court. However, the ability to appeal the USPTO's decision to the Federal Circuit may be limited by a lack of standing.

4.2 Partial Revocation/Cancellation

Patent invalidity is examined on a claim-by-claim basis. The remaining claims of a patent remain valid, even if some claims are found invalid.

4.3 Amendments in Revocation/Cancellation Proceedings

During some post-grant proceedings before the USPTO, the patent holder can amend claims, but

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock, Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

may not enlarge the scope of the claims. During *ex parte* re-examination, the patent holder may amend claims to respond to the USPTO's findings of substantially new questions of patentability. In the adversarial proceedings – IPR, PGR and CBM – the patent-owner may file a motion to amend claims.

4.4 Revocation/Cancellation and Infringement

In district court actions, patent infringement claims and defences may be heard together. Courts have broad discretion to control proceedings to promote judicial efficiency and avoid prejudice to the parties, so some issues may be “stayed”. Typically, a judge rather than a jury will determine equitable defences such as inequitable conduct or laches.

ITC investigations hear all infringement and defences together. The ITC has a shorter timeline than district courts and no juries to consider.

Proceedings challenging patent validity must be heard separately from infringement claims at the USPTO because the USPTO does not determine infringement. Often, there is a related district court case claiming infringement during post-grant proceedings at the USPTO. The district court may stay its proceeding to await the patent invalidity decision of the USPTO.

5. Trial and Settlement

5.1 Special Procedural Provisions for Intellectual Property Rights District Courts

In district court proceedings, patent litigation is subject to the same rules as other civil litigation: the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Federal Rules of Evidence. Most courts (and

some individual judges) that hear a large number of patent cases, such as the District of Delaware or the Northern District of California, have their own supplemental procedures that apply in patent cases.

The time to resolve patent litigation in district court varies widely and may take several years. Courts that are unusually efficient in getting cases to trial are often referred to as having “rocket dockets”. Examples of such courts are the Eastern and Western Districts of Texas, the Eastern District of Virginia, and the Western District of Wisconsin. Courts have broad discretion to control proceedings to promote judicial efficiency and avoid prejudice to the parties, and a case may be presented as a single trial or be bifurcated or staged to have successive trials on issues such as infringement, wilfulness or damages. However, it is extremely rare for a patent case in front of a jury (almost all patent cases involving claims for money damages) to be bifurcated. Witnesses (fact and expert) presenting testimony in a hearing (eg, on claim construction or preliminary injunction motions) are subject to questioning by the judge and cross-examination by the opposing party.

Unless the issue of damages has been bifurcated by the court (which is rare), infringement, validity and damages are typically decided at the end of a single trial by the jury or by the judge (in a bench trial). Injunctive relief is typically determined later, and that issue is always decided by the judge.

ITC

ITC investigations have their own procedures, but many of the rules are similar to those in district courts. One notable exception is the right to a jury. Unlike district court proceedings, there is no jury at the ITC or the USPTO. ITC investiga-

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock, Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

tions are almost always faster than district court proceedings, with trial-like evidentiary hearings taking place within nine to twelve months from the filing of a complaint. Witnesses at an ITC trial are subject to cross-examination by the opposing party, and by the judge.

IPR

IPR proceedings are quicker than district court litigation and follow a more regimented schedule. The process begins with the filing of an IPR petition that includes the patent claims challenged and the supporting evidence. Following this, the patent owner may optionally provide a preliminary response within three months. No more than three months following the patent owner preliminary response, the PTAB will make an institution decision on the IPR petition. If instituted, the IPR proceeds and the patent owner has three months to file its response and any motion to amend the patent claims. The petitioner has three months to reply to the patent owner response and oppose the claim amendments. The patent owner has an additional month to file a sur-reply. After the completion of briefing, an oral hearing is scheduled and the PTAB issues a final written decision no more than 12 months after the institution decision (except the PTAB may extend the time up to an additional six months for good cause).

In an IPR proceeding, direct witness testimony, including expert testimony, is presented in the form of an affidavit or declaration. The party presenting the witness will need to make the witness available for cross-examination by the opposing side, usually in the form of a deposition. Live testimony during the oral hearing is exceedingly rare, but the PTAB may permit it when the demeanour of the witness is critical to assessing credibility.

5.2 Decision-Makers

With respect to federal district court litigation, beyond choosing the particular forum in which to file suit, parties have little ability to influence who will be the decision-maker – unless they agree to waive their rights to a jury trial (which patentees almost never do). In a district court, unless a judge decides an issue in a pre-trial (eg, a summary judgment) or post-trial motion, issues of infringement, invalidity and damages are decided by a jury. Juries do not have technical expertise. There is no requirement that a judge have a technical background to preside over a patent case in district court, and most district court judges do not have technical backgrounds.

In 2011, 14 district courts began a ten-year Patent Pilot Program to enhance expertise in patent cases. New patent cases in those districts are assigned to a random judge. If the randomly assigned judge is not a designated judge in the Program, the judge may transfer the case to a participating judge in the district.

ITC investigations proceed before an administrative law judge. Because a large proportion of ITC investigations involve patents, many administrative law judges have developed substantial experience with patent cases, and many also have technical expertise. The ITC randomly assigns an administrative law judge to new investigations, and assignment is not based on any particular technical background of the administrative law judge.

The USPTO has administrative patent judges. These judges are typically experienced patent lawyers with technical backgrounds. If possible, the USPTO assigns cases to judges based on their technical background.

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock, Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

Appeals from all patent cases at the district courts, ITC or USPTO go to the US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. The judges in the Federal Circuit have significant patent law experience from the many patent-related appeals, but do not necessarily have a technical background.

5.3 Settling the Case

Settlement of patent disputes is quite common (except in certain types of pharmaceutical patent cases, where antitrust consideration can make settlement difficult or impossible). Parties may reach a settlement through a variety of possibilities, such as negotiation, alternative dispute resolution or mediation. Some courts require parties to attempt a resolution before proceeding with a trial. Settlement agreements can terminate the proceedings in a district court, usually without disclosure of the settlement details to the court.

The ITC has a non-mandatory mediation programme to aid resolution of disputes before pursuing a full investigation. After the investigation begins, parties may request termination of the investigation upon reaching a settlement, but a copy of any agreement will be submitted to the ITC in the process. Procedures are available to protect information within the settlement from public disclosure.

Post-grant proceedings before the USPTO follow similar settlement disclosure procedures as the ITC when seeking termination of a trial. The USPTO may continue a proceeding despite the parties' settlement agreement. This is more likely if the proceeding is nearly completed when the settlement occurs.

5.4 Other Court Proceedings

Federal courts have inherent authority to control their dockets, including the power to stay proceedings when there are co-pending mat-

ters in another forum. The courts may consider several factors when deciding to stay, including the progress of the court proceeding, whether the stay will simplify issues before the court or whether a stay would unduly prejudice a party. When there is a co-pending post-grant proceeding (such as an IPR), courts are more likely to stay proceedings if the USPTO proceeding has been instituted.

Generally, decisions reached in different fora are not binding on each other, except when a patent has been cancelled by the PTO in a post-grant proceeding or where a final, non-appealable judgment of invalidity has been entered in the district court litigation. This means a district court is not obliged to agree with a USPTO decision on patent validity, but the court may find the USPTO decision very persuasive because of its perceived expertise on patents. Similarly, the USPTO may consider the progress and findings of district court litigation or ITC investigations in its own proceedings. The law regarding the effect of a foreign anti-suit injunction is still unsettled and the decision in a particular case is likely to turn on the particular facts (and timing) involved.

6. Remedies

6.1 Remedies for the Patentee

In federal district courts, the patent holder may seek damages for patent infringement and injunctions to prevent ongoing infringement. By statute, damages for infringement should be adequate to compensate for the infringement, but not less than a reasonable royalty. A jury verdict will typically include a damages award, which is then reviewed by the district court judge (if a party files a motion requesting such a review) for compliance with certain legal

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock, Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

standards regarding damages. Patent damages are limited to no more than six years before commencement of the lawsuit. In cases of wilful infringement, the courts may award three times the damages. Generally, each party pays its own lawyers' fees, but in "exceptional" cases, courts may impose fee-shifting to the losing party. In addition to monetary damages, a party may seek an injunction to prevent continued infringement.

Primary responsibility for enforcing a district court judgment lies with the patent owner, who has at its disposal a wide array of enforcement mechanisms, including seeking to execute the judgment against the debtor's assets. If a party fails to comply with an injunction, the other party may seek sanctions from the district court originally ordering the injunction.

The ITC cannot impose monetary damages for infringement, but can issue exclusion and cease-and-desist orders. The exclusion orders direct US Customs and Border Protection to exclude infringing articles from entry into the US. The ITC cease-and-desist orders can direct infringers to stop importing infringing articles and to stop sales of infringing articles in US inventory. The ITC retains broad authority to enforce any of its orders and a complainant in the original investigation can request a formal enforcement proceeding.

6.2 Rights of Prevailing Defendants

In the US legal system, each party typically pays its own lawyers' fees and costs. Similar to the description in **6.1 Remedies for the Patentee** for successful patent holders, a prevailing defendant may request lawyers' fees and costs if the case is determined to be "exceptional". Under US Supreme Court precedent, "an 'exceptional' case is simply one that stands out from others with respect to the substantive strength of a

party's litigating position (considering both the governing law and the facts of the case) or the unreasonable manner in which the case was litigated".

6.3 Types of Remedies

The available remedies do not vary based on the technical area of a patent.

6.4 Injunctions Pending Appeal

A successful patent holder in an infringement proceeding does not automatically get an injunction against the infringing party. Similarly, if the district court issues an injunction, its effect is not automatically stayed during appeal. Ordinarily, a permanent injunction is effective upon issue, but a court has broad equitable authority to modify relief. The defendant may seek a stay of the injunction by filing a motion with the issuing court or the appellate court – the US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. In the absence of a stay, the injunction is enforceable pending appeal. When deciding to stay an injunction, the courts balance the likelihood of success on the merits against the equities of the parties and the public.

7. Appeal

7.1 Special Provisions for Intellectual Property Proceedings

The appellate procedure for patent litigation is the same as for other civil litigation, except that all appeals in patent cases go to the US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. This includes patent cases from district courts, ITC investigations and USPTO proceedings.

7.2 Type of Review

The Federal Circuit can review factual and legal determinations of the proceedings in a lower

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock, Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

court, if the errors were properly preserved in its record. The level of deference given to the decision-maker in a lower court varies depending on the type of error. For purely legal issues, such as statutory interpretations and judgments as a matter of law, the Federal Circuit applies a “de novo” standard where the court examines the record to form its own opinion, with no deference to the previous decision-maker. Factual determinations receive more deference, either “clearly erroneous” if the judge made factual determinations, or “substantial evidence” if the jury was the fact-finder. Equitable determinations, such as inequitable conduct, injunctions, or lawyers’ fees, are left to the discretion of the trial court judge, so a review of these decisions gets the highest deference, only being reversed for “abuse of discretion”.

8. Costs

8.1 Costs Before Filing a Lawsuit

Pre-litigation costs vary depending on the complexity of the issues and the amount in controversy between the parties. A patent holder may require legal and technical research for claim charts, warning letters to potential infringers and analysis of potential enforcement options. An accused infringer may accrue legal fees to weigh its options for challenging the alleged infringement through an affirmative defence in a lawsuit, a declaratory judgment of invalidity or non-infringement, or a USPTO proceeding challenging patent validity.

8.2 Calculation of Court Fees

In district courts, the fee for filing a federal civil complaint is fixed by statute, but the Judicial Conference of the United States may prescribe additional fees. Currently, the filing fee is USD350, plus a USD52 administrative fee.

The fee to file an IPR at the USPTO is USD41,500, and a PGR or CBM request is USD47,500.

8.3 Responsibility for Paying the Costs of Litigation

The traditional rule in the USA is that each party bears its own costs, but there are limited exceptions to this default rule. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure allow a party to seek reasonable expenses, including lawyers’ fees, incurred when an opposing party makes improper representations to the court or commits discovery misconduct. These sanctions do not award all costs and lawyers’ fees, only the expenses associated with the violation. In patent litigation, a court may award all costs and reasonable lawyers’ fees to the prevailing party if the case is determined to be “exceptional”, that is “one that stands out from others with respect to the substantive strength of a party’s litigating position (considering both the governing law and the facts of the case) or the unreasonable manner in which the case was litigated.”

9. Alternative Dispute Resolution

9.1 Type of Actions for Intellectual Property

Alternative dispute resolution is common in civil cases, and its use in intellectual property disputes is becoming increasingly common. Parties may use alternative dispute resolution as an alternative to litigation either by mutual agreement, contractual agreement or court order (although a court cannot force the parties to agree to a mediator’s ruling). Some courts offer mediation or special masters for settlement purposes. Parties may prefer alternative dispute resolution to take advantage of its greater flexibility, confidentiality and cost effectiveness.

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman, Joseph A Hynds, Danny Huntington and Jennifer P Nock,
Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

Additionally, a patent owner can avoid the risk of a court's judgment of patent invalidity.

10. Assignment and Licensing

10.1 Requirements or Restrictions for Assignment of Intellectual Property Rights

Assignment of all or part of the rights in a patent must be in writing. The assignee or assignor may record the assignment with the USPTO, but recordation is not required to enforce the assignment.

10.2 Procedure for Assigning an Intellectual Property Right

Generally, the procedure to assign patent rights involves the same type of negotiations as other contract rights. The parties negotiate the terms of the agreement and execute a written assignment contract. An employer's employment contract may require its employees to assign rights to the employer for inventions developed during employment. Although not required, any assignments should be recorded with the USPTO.

10.3 Requirements or Restrictions to License an Intellectual Property Right

An intellectual property licence must describe the terms of the licence agreement in writing and clearly identify all parties and the intellectual property involved. The licence may be exclusive or non-exclusive. In an exclusive licence, the licensee receives all rights in the patent except ownership of title. This allows an exclusive licensee broader rights, such as the ability to sue for patent infringement. A non-exclusive licence can be granted to more than one party, but a licensee cannot enforce the patent against others. For public policy reasons, a patent licence cannot require payment of royalties beyond the term of the patent. The USPTO allows recording of licences, but recording is not required for a licence to be valid. No approval from the USPTO is necessary for a licence.

10.4 Procedure for Licensing an Intellectual Property Right

Licence agreements are contractual rights; the parties agree to the terms and execute the agreement in writing. Unlike an assignment of a patent, the rights assigned by licence revert to the licensor after the agreed time period.

Trends and Developments

Contributed by:

Steven Lieberman and Nicole (Nikki) DeAbrantes
Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC

Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC brings to every patent litigation a team of seasoned, strategic, and highly successful litigators who are skilled in the law, have deep technical expertise, and consistently prevail when going up against some of the biggest firms in the country. The firm devotes more than half its work to intricate, multi-party patent litigation involving complex scientific and legal issues in district courts and the US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, as well as before the International Trade Commission and the Patent Trial and Appeal Board

(PTAB). Rothwell Figg sees patent litigation not just as a legal challenge, but also as business and strategic challenges. Through an approach that addresses all three angles, it provides clients with representation, even in the most complex disputes, that minimises risk, maximises opportunities, and most importantly, aggressively represents their interests. In addition to patent litigation, Rothwell Figg provides a comprehensive range of IP, litigation, and technology services for US and international clients in jurisdictions across the globe.

Authors



Steven Lieberman is a trial lawyer, counsellor, and shareholder at Rothwell Figg, whose practice encompasses the spectrum of IP law, including patent litigation, post-grant proceedings, privacy, and e-commerce for high-profile clients such as The New York Times, NBCUniversal, HBO, ViacomCBS, and Bloomberg. He has been lead counsel on over 100 patent infringement suits in US District

Court. Steven's public service is equally distinguished: he is an accomplished First Amendment litigator with a strong devotion to issues of constitutional law and religious liberties. He is a member of the Sedona Conference Working Group 10 on patent litigation best practices in the pharmaceutical and biologics areas and the Intellectual Property & Technology Law Advisory Board of The George Washington University Law School.

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman and Nicole (Nikki) DeAbrantes, **Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC**



Nicole (Nikki) DeAbrantes is an associate at Rothwell Figg and provides vital support to clients worldwide in matters involving patent litigation, trade secret litigation, freedom to operate and patentability analyses and post-grant proceedings, particularly inter partes review (IPR) proceedings. Nikki executes the essential, foundational legal work necessary to support clients, including the examination of the technological landscape, which is critical for developing an overall dispute strategy. She works with clients spanning several different industries, including biotechnology, pharmaceuticals, video streaming, farm equipment, and light emitting technology.

Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck, PC

901 New York Avenue NW
Suite 900 East
Washington, D.C 20001
USA

Tel: +1 202 783 6040
Fax: +1 202 783 6031
Email: slieberman@rfem.com,
ndeabrantes@rfem.com
Web: www.rothwellfigg.com



Trends and Developments in US Patent Litigation

The world of US patent litigation saw several important legal and procedural developments in 2023. There were major decisions handed down by the United States Supreme Court and the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit relating to enablement and obviousness-type double patenting that have implications not only for patent litigation, but for patent prosecution and pharmaceutical product development as well.

There were also developments with respect to the requirements for disclosing third-party funders of patent lawsuits. While the requirements for disclosure of such information in a particular case continue to be determined on a court-by-court (and sometimes on a judge-by-judge) basis, recent orders issued by the Chief Judge for the United States District Court for the District of Delaware – the district court that handles approximately 17% of patent cases in the United States – requiring more rigorous disclosures, could set off a ripple effect amongst other district courts. If that occurs, not only will parties need to be more transparent with respect to third-party funders, but companies contemplating the use of litigation financing will be faced with strategic decisions concerning where and how to enforce their patents – as well as whether and how to fund such enforcement efforts.

Third-Party Litigation Funding Developments

Third-party litigation funding continues to be a growing practice in US patent litigation. Many judges are wary of the role played by third-party funders as there is little transparency into the control and influence they may exercise in a particular litigation. For example, there are concerns that such funding may result in persons or entities other than the actual “client” making key

strategic decisions – such as if, or when, to settle a case. See *Nimitz Techs. LLC v CNet Media, Inc.*, No 21-1247, Dkt. 43 at 93-96 (D. Del. Nov. 27, 2023). Judges have also expressed the concern that third-party funding allows companies to shield themselves from liability in the event of an award of attorneys’ fees or other sanctions against a patentee-plaintiff. It is principally for these reasons that Chief Judge Connolly of the United States District Court for the District of Delaware has adopted extensive disclosure requirements for cases assigned to him.

While the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not require disclosure of third-party funders, at least twelve federal district courts – and at least Judge Connolly – have incorporated broad disclosure requirements into their local rules or standing orders. (See – eg, [C.D. Cal. L.R. 7.1-1](#); [N.D. Cal. Civ. L.R. 3-15](#); [N.D. Ga. L.R. 3.3](#); [S.D. Ga. L.R. 7.1.1](#); [N.D. Iowa L.R. 7.1](#); [S.D. Iowa L.R. 7.1](#); [D. Md. L.R. 103.3\(b\)](#); [D. Nev. L.R. 7.1-1](#); [D.N.J. Civ. R. 7.1.1\(a\)](#); [M.D.N.C. L.R. 7.7](#); [N.D. Tex. Civ. L.R. 3.1\(c\)](#); [W.D.N.Y. L.R. Civ. P. 7.1](#)).

Of these disclosure requirements, only two appear to specifically refer to third-party funders. Judge Connolly’s April 2022 Standing Order requires disclosure of a third-party funder’s identity, address, and place of formation if the third-party funder is funding some or all of a party’s expenses for the litigation in exchange for a financial interest in the litigation or a non-monetary result. See [Standing Order Regarding Third-Party Litigation Funding Arrangements \(D. Del. Apr. 18, 2022\)](#). The party must also disclose whether the third-party funder must approve of any litigation and settlement decisions in the case, the nature of the conditions of the approval, and a description of the third-party funder’s financial interest. *Id.* Similarly, Local Civil Rule 7.1.1(a) of the United States District Court for the

District of New Jersey requires parties to file a statement containing information regarding any person or entity that is “providing funding for some or all of the attorneys’ fees and expenses for the litigation on a non-recourse basis in exchange for (1) a contingent financial interest based upon the results of the litigation or (2) a non-monetary result that is not in the nature of a personal or bank loan, or insurance”. [D.N.J. Civ. R. 7.1.1\(a\)](#).

The remaining courts have more relaxed approaches and generally require parties to disclose any person or entity with a financial interest in the outcome of the case. For example, Local Rule 7.1-1 in the United States District Court for the Central District of California requires parties to file at the outset of the case a Notice of Interested Parties which must list all persons that “may have a pecuniary interest in the outcome of the case including any insurance carrier that may be liable in whole or in part (directly or indirectly) for a judgment in the action or for the cost of defense”. [C.D. Cal. L.R. 7.1-1](#). Similarly, the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina requires any party to “file a statement if any publicly held corporation or other public entity has a direct financial interest in the outcome of the litigation”. [M.D.N.C. L.R. 7.7\(b\)](#).

Recently, some courts have also allowed discovery into third-party funding. For example, in *Electrolysis Prevention Sols. LLC v Daimler Truck N. Am. LLC*, No 21-171, 2023 WL 4750822, at *5 (W.D.N.C. July 24, 2023), the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina held that litigation financing agreements and other documents are discoverable to the extent that they reflect valuations placed on the patent prior to litigation as such valuations may be useful for calculating a reasonable royalty.

Although Judge Connolly’s disclosure requirements have yet to be widely adopted by other courts, they have survived scrutiny from the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (“Federal Circuit”). In *In re: Nimitz Techs. LLC*, No 23-103, Dkt. 44 at 5 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 8, 2022), the Federal Circuit denied a petition for writ of mandamus, holding that Judge Connolly had identified four concerns as the basis for his information demand and “[a]ll are related to potential legal issues in the case”. The Federal Circuit held that Judge Connolly “did not seek information simply in order to serve an interest in public awareness, independent of the adjudicatory and court-functioning interests reflected in the stated concerns”. *Id.* at 5.

A 105-page opinion issued by Judge Connolly on 27 November 2023 in *Nimitz Techs. LLC v CNET Media, Inc.* illustrated the severe consequences parties face for failing to strictly adhere to his disclosure requirements. See No 21-1247, Dkt. 43 (D. Del. Nov. 27, 2023). Judge Connolly conducted an investigation into the accuracy of the patentee-plaintiffs’ disclosures after he became concerned that the plaintiffs (all organized as LLCs) had undisclosed financial relationships with IP Edge LLC (“IP Edge”) and its affiliate Mavexar LLC (“Mavexar”) and had failed to make the required disclosures. Following evidentiary hearings and requests for in camera document productions, Judge Connolly issued a scathing decision holding that IP Edge, the de facto owner of the asserted patents, had attempted to shield itself from liability and had perpetuated a fraud by arranging for the patents to be assigned to LLCs it formed under the names of individuals recruited by counsel. *Id.* at 101. Judge Connolly concluded that counsel chose to use separate LLCs to insulate themselves, IP Edge, and Mavexar from the potential liabilities of patent litigation. *Id.* at 101-102. As a

result of these actions, Judge Connolly referred the attorneys of record to the disciplinary counsel of their respective bars, referred some attorneys associated with IP Edge and Mavexar to the Texas Supreme Court's Unauthorized Practice of Law Committee, and referred the matters to the United States Department of Justice and the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO"). *Id.* at 1.

Judge Connolly's opinion demonstrates the drastic repercussions parties and counsel could face if they neglect to comply with disclosure requirements. When filing litigation, parties should pay close attention to the rules of the court (or judge) relating to third-party funding disclosures. If other courts and judges follow Judge Connolly's lead, parties will need to be more vigilant and forthcoming about any third-party funders in a case. Outside counsel should work closely with their clients to determine how these disclosure requirements could affect litigation decisions and enforcement of their clients' patent portfolios.

Legal Changes in Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Analysis

This year, the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit ("Federal Circuit") dealt with a case of first impression relating to obviousness-type double patenting and patent term adjustment.

Patent Term Extension (PTE) and Patent Term Adjustment (PTA) are two ways that the life of a patent may be extended beyond the statutory term of 20 years. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 154(b), PTA is granted to compensate a patentee for loss of patent term due to administrative delays by the USPTO in prosecuting the application. By contrast, PTE can be granted to a patentee to restore patent term lost due to delays in obtain-

ing regulatory approval of a patented product, method of manufacturing, or use. See 35 U.S.C. § 156.

In *In re: Collect, LLC*, 81 F.4th 1216 (Fed. Cir. 2023), the Federal Circuit addressed for the first time how PTA impacts the analysis of whether a patent is invalid under obviousness-type double patenting. Obviousness-type double patenting is a judicially created doctrine that limits the term of a patent and prevents a patentee from extending its patent term by obtaining later-filed patents on obvious variations of the claimed invention. Concerns regarding obviousness-type double patenting can arise when a grant of PTA results in a later-expiring claim that is patentably indistinct from an earlier-expiring claim.

Collect, LLC ("Collect") filed suit against Samsung Elecs., Co. ("Samsung") alleging infringement of four patents, all of which claimed priority to the same reference patent and were each granted PTA for the USPTO's delay during prosecution. None of the four patents were subject to a terminal disclaimer and but for the grants of PTA, the four patents would have all expired on the same day. Samsung then filed *ex parte* re-examinations of the patents on obviousness-type double patenting grounds. The examiner agreed with Samsung and rejected the claims on those grounds. The United States Patent Trial and Appeal Board sustained the rejections and *Collect* appealed.

In its opinion, the Federal Circuit held that obviousness-type double patenting for a patent that has received PTA "must be based on the expiration date of the patent after PTA has been added" – ie, the patent's adjusted expiration date. (In *re: Collect, LLC*, 81 F.4th at 1229 (emphasis added)). The Federal Circuit explained that this rule applies "regardless whether or not a terminal

disclaimer is required or has been filed” because Congress intended that, “when a terminal disclaimer has been entered in a patent subject to PTA, no patent (or claim) may be extended beyond the disclaimed expiration date”. *Id.* at 1228-29 (citing 35 U.S.C. § 154(b)(2)(B)).

This contrasts with how courts treat PTE in the context of an obviousness type-double patenting analysis. The Federal Circuit’s prior precedent provided that the obviousness-type double patenting analysis for a patent that has received PTE must be based on the expiration date before the PTE is added. *Id.* at 1227.

While Cellect argued that PTE and PTA should be applied in the same way in an obviousness-type double patenting analysis, the Federal Circuit disagreed. The Federal Circuit explained: “[e]ven though both PTA and PTE are statutorily authorized extensions, and each serves to recover lost term, each has its own independent framework”. *Id.* at 1227.

The Federal Circuit concluded that because Cellect’s patents claim priority to the same application, claim overlapping subject matter and only have varying expiration dates due to PTA, obviousness-type double patenting “still applies to ensure that the applicant is not receiving an unjust extension of time”. *Id.* at 1228.

The *In re: Cellect, LLC* opinion emphasises the strategic decisions patent owners face not only during litigation but during prosecution as well. Moving forward, patentees should expect that patent challengers will attempt to use an earlier-expiring patent in a patent family as the basis for challenging the validity of other patents in the same family on obviousness-type double patenting grounds. This opinion put patentees in a tough position, requiring them to decide

between terminally disclaiming challenged patents or fighting an obviousness-type double patenting challenge and hoping that their patents will be found to be patentably distinct from the earlier-expiring patents.

Furthermore, given that applicants filing a terminal disclaimer on a later patent will no longer receive the additional time granted by PTA, applicants now face the important strategic decision during prosecution of whether and when to file a terminal disclaimer to overcome an obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

When a patent portfolio contains multiple continuation applications, applicants also need to pay close attention when drafting claims and may wish to avoid claiming patentably indistinct subject matter in order to avoid the possibility of an obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Applicants should also consider drafting claims in such a way that the claimed inventions fall into patentably distinct categories that could be captured through the filing of divisional applications.

Reinforcement of Enablement Requirements

This year, in *Amgen Inc. v Sanofi*, 598 U.S. 594 (2023), the United States Supreme Court issued a unanimous opinion addressing the legal standard for enablement – ie, that a patent must enable persons skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention.

Amgen Inc. (“Amgen”) had filed suit against Sanofi alleging infringement of two patents that claim a genus of antibodies that bind to specific amino acid residues on PCSK9 and that block PCSK9 from binding to low-density lipoprotein receptors. Sanofi asserted that the patents were invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112, arguing that the claims were not enabled because Amgen’s claims cover more antibodies than the specifi-

cation taught a person skilled in the art how to make. The district court determined, based on the factors in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1988), that the claims lacked enablement because they required undue experimentation. See *Amgen Inc. v Sanofi*, No 14-1317, 2019 WL 4058927, at *7-13 (D. Del. Aug. 28, 2019). Applying those same factors, the Federal Circuit agreed with the district court and found that undue experimentation would be required to practice the full scope of the claims. See *Amgen Inc. v Sanofi*, 987 F.3d 1080 (Fed. Cir. 2021). Amgen appealed.

Relying on *O'Reilly v Morse*, 56 U.S. 62 (1854), *Consol. Elec. Light Co. v McKeesport Light Co.*, 159 U.S. 465 (1895); and *Holland Furniture Co. v Perkins Glue Co.*, 277 U.S. 245 (1928), the Supreme Court explained that these decisions reinforce the statutory instructions for enablement: “If a patent claims an entire class of processes, machines, manufactures, or compositions of matter, the patent’s specification must enable a person skilled in the art to make and use the entire class”. (*Amgen Inc.*, 598 U.S. at 610). This means that the specification must enable “the full scope of the invention as defined by its claims”. *Id.* As the Supreme Court noted, the “more one claims, the more one must enable”. *Id.*

This does not mean that the specification must always disclose how to make and use every embodiment within the claimed class. *Id.* at 610-11. In some instances, providing a few examples may be sufficient if the specification describes a “general quality” of the claimed class that allows a person skilled in the art to make and use all of the class. *Id.* at 611. Further, a specification remains sufficient even when it requires a person skilled in the art to engage in “a reasonable amount of experimentation”. *Id.* at 612. However, what is reasonable under the circumstances

will depend on the technological field at issue and the nature of the invention. *Id.*

In applying these principles, the Supreme Court affirmed the Federal Circuit’s decision and concluded that Amgen had not enabled all of the antibodies covered by the claims. While the specification described 26 antibodies, the Supreme Court held that the record reflects that the claimed class “does not include just the 26 that Amgen has described by their amino acid sequences but a ‘vast’ number of additional antibodies”. *Id.* at 613. The Supreme Court did not address the Federal Circuit’s application of the *Wands* factors but held that the specification’s disclosures were insufficient to enable the claims, noting that the disclosed methods for making other antibodies still required persons skilled in the art to engage in experimentation and amounted to more of “a hunting license”. *Id.* at 614 (internal citations and quotations omitted).

While the precise impact of the Supreme Court’s decision is not yet known, generic and biosimilar applicants seeking early regulatory approval of a product will look to this decision in their assessment of which patents to challenge. On the flip side, patentees must consider how this decision could impact their patent portfolios to the extent any patents claim a broad genus. To the extent patentees seek to file infringement lawsuits, patentees should anticipate enablement challenges and carefully strategize which patents to assert in litigation.

The Supreme Court’s decision is also critically relevant with respect to the claiming of inventions in pending and future patent applications. On 10 January 2024, the USPTO issued guidelines for assessing enablement in utility applications and patents in light of the Supreme Court’s decision. See [Guidelines for Assessing Enable-](#)

Contributed by: Steven Lieberman and Nicole (Nikki) DeAbrantes, **Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck PC**

[ment in Utility Applications and Patents in View of the Supreme Court Decision in Amgen Inc. et al. v. Sanofi et al., 89 Fed. Reg. 1563 \(Jan. 10, 2024\)](#). The USPTO explained that consistent with the Supreme Court’s decision and the Federal Circuit’s post-Amgen decisions, when examining whether claims are enabled, “regardless of the technology, USPTO personnel will continue to use the Wands factors to ascertain whether the experimentation required to enable the full scope of the claimed invention is reasonable”. *Id.*

Patentees seeking to patent genus claims should look closely at the Wands factors and the Federal Circuit’s post-Amgen decisions. Patentees should also consider including more examples in the specification and/or identifying a common characteristic or structural quality for the genus that would enable a person skilled in the art to identify the species. To the extent experimentation is required to enable the genus, patentees should consider providing greater guidance and direction on the experimentation.

CHAMBERS GLOBAL PRACTICE GUIDES

Chambers Global Practice Guides bring you up-to-date, expert legal commentary on the main practice areas from around the globe. Focusing on the practical legal issues affecting businesses, the guides enable readers to compare legislation and procedure and read trend forecasts from legal experts from across key jurisdictions.

To find out more information about how we select contributors, email Katie.Burrington@chambers.com