

## Wegner's Top Ten Supreme Court Patent Cases

### TOP TEN SUPREME COURT PATENT CASES\*

[updated November 28, 2005]

#### Harold C. Wegner

**(1) The KSR Obviousness Case:** *KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, Supreme Court No. 04-1350: Order outstanding asking the Solicitor General for the opinion of the United States whether to grant *certiorari*.

**(2) The eBay Injunctive Relief Case:** *eBay, Inc. v. MercExchange, LLC*, Supreme Court No. 05-130: *Certiorari* was granted November 28, 2005.

**(3) The Schering-Plough Reverse Payments Antitrust Case:** *Federal Trade Comm'n v. Schering-Plough Corp.*, Supreme Court No. 05-273: Order outstanding asking the Solicitor General for the opinion of the United States whether to grant *certiorari*.

**(4) Tamoxifen Reverse Payments Antitrust Case [future]:** *In re Tamoxifen Citrate Antitrust Litigation*, \_\_ F.3d \_\_, 2005 WL 21 864654 (2nd Cir. 2005). This case mirrors the issues in *Schering-Plough*.

**(5) The Metabolite Patent-Eligibility Case:** *Laboratory Corp. of America Holdings v. Metabolite Laboratories, Inc.*, Supreme Court No. 04-607: Briefing schedule through January 2005; hearing February-April 2006; decision by June 2006.

**(6) The Unitherm Patent Fraud Case:** *Unitherm Food Systems, Inc. v. Swift Eckrich, Inc.*, Supreme Court No. 04-597: A decision is expected before the end of 2005. (Oral argument took place on November 2, 2005).

**(7) The Illinois Tool Market Share Case:** *Illinois Tool Works, Inc. v. Independent Ink, Inc.*, Supreme Court No. 04-1329: Argument is scheduled for November 29, 2005; a decision is likely by the end of January 2006 (but in any event by June 2006).

**(8) BlackBerry Extraterritoriality Case [future]:** *Research In Motion, Ltd. v. NTP, Inc.*, *certiorari* petition due January 5, 2006, *opinion below*, *NTP, Inc. v. Research In Motion, Ltd.*, 418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

**(9) SmithKline Paroxetine Case:** *SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.*, No. 05-489. Briefing stage for *certiorari*.

**(10) Lemelson Prosecution Laches Case [future]:** *Lemelson Med., Ed. & Res. Found. v. Symbol Technologies*, petition due Feb,14, 2006.

**[Unlisted] AWH v. Phillips Claim Construction Deference:** *AWH Corp. v. Phillips*, App. No. 05-602.

## Wegner's Top Ten Supreme Court Patent Cases

### **New: eBay Granted; Lemelson on the list, Phillips Off...**

The *KSR* case continues atop the list ahead of *eBay*, even though *certiorari* has now been granted in *eBay*. This is due to the fundamental importance for the obviousness standard that is challenged in *KSR*.

Since the last Top Ten listing, the *AWH v. Phillips* claim construction case has dropped off the Supreme Court radar screen (last listed as No. 9)(see p. 15), which is based upon a review of the question raised and the overall *certiorari* petition. New to the list at No. 10 is the *Lemelson* case (see pages 14-15); there, the latest development is the decision on rehearing that broadens the holding of prosecution laches to cover claims that were outside the decision of Chief Judge Pro.

### **Suddenly, its 1965 Again...**

The current term of the Court is likely to have *at least* four patent cases with grants of *certiorari*, which represents the highest level of patent activity at the Court in forty years: In 1965, stimulated by both a patent antitrust and patent misuse case as well as two patent preemption cases in the previous two years – all with rulings against the intellectual property rights holder – the Court granted *certiorari* in seven (7) patent cases, including the *Walker Process* patent fraud case as well as six cases involving interpretation of the 1952 Patent Act – *Adams Battery*, *Graham v. Deere*, *Calmar v. Cook*, *Colgate-Palmolive v. Cook*, *Hazeltine v. Brenner* and *Brenner v. Manson*.

Leading off the October 2005 term are two patent antitrust cases. The first is *Unitherm*, another *Walker Process* patent fraud case where there is no dispute on the existence of the patent fraud; it is not even contested: The sole issue is whether the procedural failure of the patentee to have made a timely motion ruined its successful appeal to the Federal Circuit on market share. The *Unitherm* case has already been argued and provides the Court with a background primer on patent fraud in a very simple and easy to understand technology – a method of imparting a “golden brown” color to precooked turkey. On November 29, 2005, the Court will hear the *Illinois Tool* case where the Court is expected to honor the implicit invitation of the Federal Circuit to reverse what that court considers outdated case law.

## Wegner's Top Ten Supreme Court Patent Cases

The surprise grant of *certiorari* is found in the *Metabolite*, a seemingly garden variety pharmaceutical method obviousness case which has been transformed into an issue of patent-eligibility under 35 USC § 101. Beyond bringing back to life the “secrets of nature” issue of *Funk v. Kalo* the case also opens the door a crack to a consideration of patent-eligibility for business method patents under the never-tested *State Street Bank*.

The big three cases by far, however, are cases where *certiorari* has *not* so far been granted. In two – *Schering-Plough* and *KSR* – the Solicitor General has been invited by the Court to file *amici* briefs to advise whether to grant *certiorari*. In the third – *eBay* – the Court has *thrice* scheduled a conference to determine whether to grant *certiorari*. The *Schering-Plough* and *KSR* briefs from the Solicitor General may not be forthcoming for several months, while a decision from the Court whether to grant *certiorari* in *eBay* may come as early as November 14, 2005. (Or, the Court could issue yet another order inviting the views of the Solicitor General on this case.)

Of the three cases, *Schering-Plough* seems to have the greatest chance of grant of *certiorari*. It implicates the “reverse payment” pharmaceutical ANDA settlement practice that stems from the landmark approval of this practice by the Federal Circuit in the tamoxifen litigation – where as part of that settlement the Federal Circuit agreed to vacatur of a trial court decision that had held the tamoxifen patent unenforceable for inequitable conduct. In essence, the patentee bought vacatur by paying the generic \$ 20 million for the settlement. In *Schering-Plough*, the patentee paid \$ 60 million and as part of the consideration the generic agreed to stay off the market to preserve the exclusive position of Schering-Plough. With a clear inter-circuit split with the Sixth Circuit (where a reverse payment settlement was found to represent a *per se* antitrust violation), *certiorari* seems likely. Additionally, the recent Second Circuit finding that the same tamoxifen settlement is not an antitrust violation adds fuel to the *certiorari* fire.

The *KSR* case is less likely to be granted, but would pack the biggest punch of any of the cases, by far: It reopens the split between the Federal Circuit which *sub silentio* abrogated the Supreme Court *Anderson's-Black Rock* and *Sakraida* case law line in *Stratoflex*. If a tough patentability standard under *Anderson's-Black Rock* is imposed by the Court, this would represent a seismic shock to the current *status quo* of the patent system.

## Wegner's Top Ten Supreme Court Patent Cases

Finally, the *eBay* case asks for nothing less than a literal interpretation of the statute to provide a case by case equitable determination whether to grant injunctive relief as the prize for winning a patent infringement case, as opposed to the default injunctive relief that has been the law ever since the landmark 1908 *Continental Paper Bag* case. This case would, if the position of the petitioner is adopted, create great difficulties for the pharmaceutical and chemical industries.

*Metabolite* may be argued in March or April 2006, while it is expected that *eBay* will be argued in April 2006; a decision is expected by the end of June 2006 in both cases.

Assuming grant of *certiorari*, *KSR* and *Schering-Plough* may not reach the current argument calendar: If the Solicitor General takes several months to issue his *amici* briefs on invitation from the Court in *KSR* and *Schering-Plough*, it is possible that oral argument may not be scheduled until October 2006.

Assuming that cases are assigned for oral argument in the order that *certiorari* is granted, as of November 9, 2005, there remain about twenty hours of argument left in late March as well as April 2006. As of information on the Court's website on November 9, 2005, the Court has already granted *certiorari* in 68 cases for a total of 59 argument hours; already, 16 cases (15 hours) of argument have taken place. Oral arguments have already been scheduled through January 2006; argument is yet to be scheduled for 17 cases where *certiorari* has been granted that would fill the argument calendar through the first days of the March 2006 arguments.

### (1) The *KSR* Obviousness Case

*KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, Supreme Court No. 04-1350, *opinion below sub nom Teleflex Inc. v. KSR Intern. Co.*, 119 Fed.Appx. 282 (Fed. Cir. 2005)(Schall, J.)(non-precedential), *appeal from trial court opinion*, 298 F.Supp.2d 581 (E.D.Mich. 2003).

**Issue:** The Court has before it a petition for *certiorari* to review the issue of the standard of patentability for a combination claim; does a combination claim survive a validity challenge where the invention is nonobvious in the sense that there is no teaching, suggestion or motivation to create the

## Wegner's Top Ten Supreme Court Patent Cases

combination, but where the invention does not meet the test of synergy in *dictum* in *Sakraida*.

**Importance:** For inventions which reside in a combination of elements (i.e., many inventions other than in chemistry and biotechnology) the *KSR* case has the potential to suddenly elevate the standard of nonobviousness by an order of magnitude which would be a serious setback for individual inventors of mechanical combinations but welcomed by major electronics and software concerns. *KSR* is ranked Number One on the list of cases because even if *certiorari* is denied, the *KSR* case has drawn immense attention to the issue and is certain to spark further petitions for review in future terms of the Court. Should *certiorari* be denied, it will be of great interest to see whether the Federal Circuit, *for the first time*, attempts to reconcile its body of case law with the Supreme Court precedent cited in the *certiorari* petition.

**Status:** On October 3, 2005, the Court invited the Solicitor General to express the views of the United States whether to grant *certiorari*; if an *amicus curiae* brief from the Solicitor General is filed by early December, a *certiorari* vote conceivably could be taken early enough to permit placement of this case on the current Court calendar with a hearing in March or April 2005; a much later filing by the *Solicitor* General would end up putting the *KSR* case on the October 2006 term of the Court (if *certiorari* is granted).

**Outcome:** A decision whether to grant *certiorari* may be influenced by whatever position the Solicitor General takes in his brief *amicus curiae*.

**Implications:** (1) Even though *certiorari* may well be denied, the petition and filings of *amici* present a blueprint for future petitions to the Court for every combination patent where the Federal Circuit sustains patent validity; (2) absent a Federal Circuit exposition of the law of obviousness that fully deals with *Sakraida*, it may be expected that at some point in the next few years review *will* be granted in a *KSR*-like petition; (3) should the *dicta* from *Sakraida* become the law, this would move the United States closer to the synergy standard set by the House of Lords (Lord Hoffman) in the 2004 *SABAF* case; it would very sharply tighten up patent granting standards in the mechanical and electronics arts and threaten the validity of literally hundreds of thousands of existing patents still in force; (4) if *certiorari* is granted, mainstream research-based companies, particularly pharma and biotechnology, will surely weigh in against petitioner, yet – as was the case

## Wegner's Top Ten Supreme Court Patent Cases

amongst the *amici* in the *Festo* briefing four years ago – a large segment of industry may be expected to part company, particularly in the heavy manufacturing and software fields.

### (2) The *eBay* Injunctive Relief Case:

*eBay, Inc. v. MercExchange, LLC*, Supreme Court No. 05-130, *proceedings below sub nom MercExchange, LLC v. eBay, Inc.*, 401 F.3d 1323, 1338-39 (Fed. Cir. 2005)(Bryson, J.).

**Issues** – (1) [asked in the *certiorari* petition]: “Whether the Federal Circuit erred in setting forth a general rule in patent cases that a district court must, absent exceptional circumstances, issue a permanent injunction after a finding of infringement.”

(2) [added by the Court in its Order granting *certiorari*]: “Whether this Court should reconsider its precedents, including *Continental Paper Bag Co. v. Eastern Paper Bag Co.*, 210 U.S. 405 (1908), on when it is appropriate to grant an injunction against a patent infringer.”

**Importance:** This may be the single most important patent case in several years. The fight between big pharma and the electronics and software industries that had been center stage before Congress now shifts immediately to a judicial solution. In June 2006, after the Court issues its opinion, there may be continued efforts to overrule existing case law as part of the patent reform debates now taking place in the Congress.

**Status:** *Certiorari* was granted November 28, 2005. It is expected to issue an opinion by the last week of June 2006; an oral hearing will take place not later than April 2006. Briefs for the many *amici* who are in support of petitioner who are seeking a change in the standards for injunctive relief or who are neutral are due **January 14, 2006**. Assuming that the brief of petitioner is filed on that date, then the briefs of the many *amici* supporting the current standard will be due **February 18, 2006**.

**Outcome:** The issue is a prime matter on the agenda of the Business Software Alliance (BSA) that was successful in having a legislative provision included in HR 2795 as SEC. 7 as introduced on June 8, 2005, that would accomplish the same result as sought judicially in this case. In essence, eBay seeks an end to the nearly automatic grant of permanent

## Wegner's Top Ten Supreme Court Patent Cases

injunctions against infringers that would overrule *Continental Paper Bag Co. v. Eastern Paper Bag Co.*, 210 U.S. 405, 423 (1908). Congratulations to Professor Mark Lemley of Stanford University Law School for masterful briefing as *amicu curiae* on behalf of “35 Intellectual Property Professors” as *amici*; other *amici* briefs were also filed on behalf of America Online, Inc.; Qualcomm Incorporated, et al.; the BSA et al.; Computer & Communications Industry Association; and the Electronic Frontier Foundation.

***Conflict with the TRIPS:*** It may be assumed that one of the goals of petitioner in the *eBay* case is that injunctive relief should be denied to a “patent troll”. The “patent troll” indication has been coined to describe the patent owner who has no plan to practice the invention but only hold up manufacturers for high royalties at the threat of an injunction to shut down commercial operations. Indeed, petitioner’s stance is completely antithetical to *Continental Paper Bag Co. v. Eastern Paper Bag Co.*, 210 U.S. 405, 423 (1908), and to the position taken by the United States in the creation of Article 30 of the Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property (TRIPS). The treaty provides that a country “may provide limited exceptions to the exclusive rights conferred by a patent, provided that such exceptions ... do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the patent owner, taking account of the legitimate interests of third parties.” TRIPS Art. 30. It is absolutely clear that a blanket right to license an invention for the class of “patent trolls” is completely at odds with TRIPS Art. 30. While there is wiggle room to take exception to this position from Art. 30, the enumeration of *when* a compulsory license may be granted in Art. 31 is clear. (See the *appendix* to this section that includes the text of TRIPS Arts. 30 and 31.)

### (3) **The Schering-Plough Reverse Payments Antitrust Case**

*Federal Trade Comm’n v. Schering-Plough Corp.*, Supreme Court No. 05-273, *proceedings below sub nom Schering-Plough Corp. v. F.T.C.*, 402 F.3d 1056, 1075 (11th Cir. 2005).

***Issue:*** Whether an agreement between a pharmaceutical patent holder and a would-be generic competitor, in which the patent holder makes a substantial payment to the challenger for the purpose of delaying the challenger’s entry into the market, is an unreasonable restraint of trade.

## Wegner's Top Ten Supreme Court Patent Cases

**Importance:** If *certiorari* is granted, *Schering-Plough* may be the most important patent antitrust case in some time; it opens the door to antitrust challenges to the settlement of patent litigation that is an outgrowth of an early 1990's Federal Circuit practice of vacatur of trial court invalidity or unenforceability rulings where this is a condition of settlement.

**Status:** *Certiorari* grant is pending. On October 3, 2005, the Court issued an order inviting the Solicitor General to file a brief *amicus curiae* expressing the position of the United States whether to grant *certiorari*. If the Solicitor General files his brief before Christmas, it is possible that a *certiorari* decision may be reached early enough to permit briefing and argument during this term to permit a decision by the end of June 2006. It is more likely, however, that a vote will not be taken in time to place the case on the schedule of the Court until the October 2006 term.

**Discussion:** In essence the case poses the question whether there be an antitrust violation where an accused infringer is paid tens of millions of dollars to drop a validity challenge to a patent and stay off the market for a period of time keyed to that payment? In the setting of pharmaceutical Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) litigation, this is a "reverse payment" settlement that became popular when it was sanctioned by the Federal Circuit in *Imperial Chemical Industries, PLC v. Heumann Pharma GmbH & Co.*, 991 F.2d 811 (Table), 1993 WL 118931 (Fed. Cir. 1993)(Michel, J.).

**Second Certiorari Question:** In addition to the main question (quoted above), a second question raised in the *certiorari* petition is "[w]hether the [Eleventh Circuit] grossly misapplied the pertinent 'substantial evidence' standard of review, by summarily rejecting the extensive factual findings of an expert federal agency regarding matters within its purview."

**Inter-Circuit Conflict:** The potential for the grant of *certiorari* is high because of the split amongst the several circuits. At one extreme is the Eleventh Circuit that has sanctioned the reverse payment of several tens of millions of dollars by a patentee to buy off a generic competitor from early entry into the market – whereas the Sixth Circuit at the other extreme has found a reverse payment settlement to be a *per se* antitrust violation.

## Wegner's Top Ten Supreme Court Patent Cases

***Merck v. Integra: Putting Flesh on the Antitrust Bones:*** What breathes great life into the *certiorari* petition is that the reverse payments system has the potential to cost elderly America that seeks the purchase of generic drugs potentially billions of dollars in added health costs, a point that is stressed in the *certiorari* petition. Less than six months ago the Supreme Court was given an education at oral argument in the *Merck* case about the importance of new research in the search for cancer cures which was clearly an underlying basis for the sweeping reversal of the Federal Circuit in *Merck KGaA v. Integra Lifesciences I, Ltd.*, 125 S.Ct. 2372 (2005), as discussed in Wegner, *Post-Merck Experimental Use and the "Safe Harbor"*, 15 Fed. Cir. Bar. J. 1 (2005). The remarkable reactions of the members of the Court to the policy aspects of the argument underscore the generational reaction to patent policy concerns relating to pharmaceuticals. This past Spring, the Court was faced with the policy concerns relating to *encouraging research* while the current *certiorari* petition focuses upon the health care costs that result if patents are not challenged.

***Federal Circuit Case Law – Genesis for the "Reverse Payment":*** The *Schering-Plough*, reverse payments" scenario stems from the early 1990's *vacatur* practice of the Federal Circuit where settlement of patent disputes was given a status of priority in *Philips Corp. v. Windmere Corp.*, 971 F.2d 728 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The ultimate extension of *Phillips v. Windmere* led to *vacatur* of an *unenforceability* ruling based upon inequitable conduct where the settlement involved the reverse payment of over \$ 20,000,000.00 from the patentee to the generic market entrant. See *Imperial Chemical Industries, supra* ("The parties to the district court proceeding have entered into a settlement agreement resolving the entire dispute. They ask us to vacate and remand in accordance with their agreement and this court's practice. See *Smith International, Inc. v. Hughes Tool Co.*, 839 F.2d 663 (Fed.Cir.1988; *U.S. Philips Corp. v. Windmere Corp.*, 971 F.2d 728 (Fed.Cir.1992), *cert. granted.*"). Indeed, the Eleventh Circuit cited the tamoxifen settlement with approval. See *Schering-Plough*, 402 F.3d at 1075 (citing *In re Tamoxifen Citrate Antitrust Litig.*, 277 F.Supp.2d 121, 133 (E.D.N.Y.2003)), which has now been *affirmed* and where a *certiorari* petition is expected – as discussed as the next case below. What has not been fully appreciated is that the Federal Circuit's policy of *Phillips v. Windmere* was *overruled* the following year in *Cardinal Chemical Co. v. Morton Intern., Inc.*, 508 U.S. 83 (1993). Indeed, there had been an essentially unanimous voice in the scholarly community that had criticized the Federal Circuit practice. See *Cardinal Chemical*, 508 U.S. at 102 n.25.

## Wegner's Top Ten Supreme Court Patent Cases

### (4) Tamoxifen Reverse Payments Antitrust Case [future case]

*In re Tamoxifen Citrate Antitrust Litigation*, \_\_ F.3d \_\_, 2005 WL 2864654 (2nd Cir. 2005).

This case closely parallels – and reaches the same result – as the *Schering-Plough* case. If the *Tamoxifen Citrate* case is accelerated and/or if the *Schering-Plough* case remains pending for some time before a decision on *certiorari* (due to the length of time it takes for the Solicitor General to file his *amicus curiae* brief), then it is conceivable that *certiorari* would be granted for *both* cases and the two would be consolidated for oral argument in the October 2006 term.

This case echoes the same “reverse payments” issues that are found in the *Schering-Plough* case that has now been referred to the Solicitor General for his opinion whether to grant *certiorari*. A petition for *certiorari* is expected in February 2006 (or earlier). The *Tamoxifen Citrate* case may be traced to the original “reverse payments” settlement that received judicial approval by the Federal Circuit. While the Second Circuit reaches the same result as the Eleventh Circuit in *Schering-Plough*, the Second Circuit reached its decision in a split 2-1 opinion.

The dissent is of interest: “Holding that a Hatch-Waxman settlement agreement cannot violate antitrust laws unless the underlying litigation was a sham ... ill serves the public interest in having the validity of patents litigated. *See United States v. Glaxo Group Ltd.*, 410 U.S. 52, 57 (1973). This interest exists because ‘[i]t is as important to the public that competition should not be repressed by worthless patents, as that the patentee of a really valuable invention should be protected in his monopoly.’ *Id.* at 58. Litigating the validity of drug company patents is critically important to the general well being in light of the recent trend toward capping the maximum amounts insurers and public benefit plans will spend on medications.” *In re Tamoxifen Citrate Antitrust Litigation*, \_\_ F.3d \_\_, \_\_ (Pooling, J., dissenting).

The dissent quotes several scholars with approval who “propose that a Hatch Waxman Act settlement that includes a reverse payment be presumed illegal with the patent holder being allowed to rebut this presumption ‘by showing both (1) that the ex ante likelihood of prevailing in its infringement

## Wegner's Top Ten Supreme Court Patent Cases

lawsuit is significant, and (2) that the size of the payment is no more than the expected value of litigation and collateral costs attending the lawsuit.” *Id.*, quoting Herbert Hovenkamp, Mark Janis & Mark A. Lemley, *Anticompetitive Settlement of Intellectual Property Disputes*, 87 Minn. L.Rev. 1719, 1759 (2004). The opinion also cites Daniel A. Crane, *Ease Over Accuracy in Assessing Patent Settlements*, 88 Minn. L.Rev. 698, 709 (2004); and Thomas F. Cotter, *Refining the "Presumptive Illegality" Approach to Settlements of Patent Disputes Involving Reverse Payments: A Commentary on Hovenkamp, Janis and Lemley*, 87 Minn. L.Rev. 1789, 1795-97, 1802 (2003).

### **(5) The Metabolite Patent-Eligibility Case:**

*Laboratory Corp. of America Holdings v. Metabolite Laboratories, Inc.*, Supreme Court No. 04-607, 125 S.Ct. 1413, 1413-14 (2005), *opinion below*, 370 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2004)(Rader, J.).

**Issue:** “Whether a method patent ... directing a party simply to ‘correlat[e]’ test results can validly claim a monopoly over a basic scientific relationship used in medical treatment such that any doctor necessarily infringes the patent merely by thinking about the relationship after looking at a test result.” *Sub silentio issue not formally before the Court* (from an Order, 125 S.Ct. 1413, 1413-14 (2005)): “Is the patent invalid because one cannot patent ‘laws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract ideas’?” (quoting *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 185 (1981)). *Certiorari* was *not* granted in this second issue.

**Status:** Briefs favoring the accused infringer and neutral *amici* briefs are due in mid-December; briefs favoring the patentee are due in late January; a hearing is expected in the February-April 2006 time fram; and a decision is expected before the end of June 2006.

## Wegner's Top Ten Supreme Court Patent Cases

### (6) Unitherm Patent Fraud Case

*Unitherm Food Systems, Inc. v. Swift Eckrich, Inc.*, Supreme Court No. 04-597, *opinion below*, 375 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2004)(Gajarsa, J.).

**Issue:** “Whether, and to what extent, a court of appeals may review the sufficiency of evidence supporting a civil jury verdict where the party requesting review made a motion for judgment as a matter of law under Rule 50(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure before submission of the case to the jury, but neither renewed that motion under Rule 50(b) after the jury's verdict, nor moved for a new trial under Rule 59.”

**Importance:** Just as the *Walker Process* “patent fraud” case was the first act amongst the seven Supreme Court patent cases dating back to the 1965 October term of the court, the *Unitherm* “patent fraud” case provides the Court with its opening act on the patent scene this term.

It would be difficult to imagine a factual scenario any uglier nor more easy to understand – both factually and legally – than the *uncontested* patent fraud of the *Unitherm* case. Unitherm's David Howard disclosed his company's method for browning pre-cooked turkeys to ConAgra; ConAgra then patented Unitherm's discovery as its own. The patent fraud is not in dispute at the Court but provides a less than flattering picture of the operation of the patent system to judges who have had little or no experience with PTO issues. *Unitherm*, 375 F.3d at 1361 (“[I]t is reasonable for the jury to have concluded that [ConAgra's inventor] was fully aware that his ‘invention’ was precisely the Unitherm process that David Howard had been trying to sell to ConAgra since 1993. The jury could also have concluded reasonably that [ConAgra's inventor] intended to deceive the PTO by claiming that he was ‘the original and first inventor or inventors of the subject matter which is claimed and for which a patent is sought,’ [as required by PTO Rule,] 37 C.F.R. § 1.63, when he knew that he was not.”).

**Status:** A decision is expected by the end of December 2005 or January 2006. (Oral argument took place on November 2, 2005.).

**Outcome:** Reversal is likely for the reasons expressed by the United States as *amicus curiae* in a merits brief.

## Wegner's Top Ten Supreme Court Patent Cases

**Briefs:** The United States *amicus curiae* brief which is available at <http://www.usdoj.gov/osg/briefs/2004/3mer/1ami/2004-0597.mer.ami.pdf>; the parties' briefs are available at <http://www.abanet.org/publiced/preview/briefs/nov05.html>.

### **(7) The Illinois Tool Market Share Case**

*Illinois Tool Works, Inc. v. Independent Ink, Inc.*, Supreme Court No. 04-1329, *proceedings below sub nom Independent Ink, Inc. v. Illinois Tool Works, Inc.*, 396 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2005)(Dyk. J.).

**Issue:** “Whether, in an action under the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C., section 1, alleging that the defendant engaged in unlawful tying by conditioning a patent license on the licensee's purchase of a non-patented good, the plaintiff must prove as part of its affirmative case that the defendant possessed market power in the relevant market for the tying product, or market power instead is presumed based solely on the existence of the patent of the tying product?”

**Importance:** The expected reversal of the Court of Appeals will bring patent antitrust law into line with current thinking.

**Status:** Oral argument is scheduled for 10:00 AM November 29, 2005. A decision is likely in Winter 2006, but in any event before the end of June 2006.

**Outcome:** Reversal of the Federal Circuit opinion is anticipated.

### **(8) BlackBerry Extraterritoriality Case [future case]**

*Research In Motion, Ltd. v. NTP, Inc.*, *certiorari* petition due January 5, 2006, *opinion below*, *NTP, Inc. v. Research In Motion, Ltd.*, 418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

Unless there is a settlement of the litigation, a *certiorari* petition is expected to contrast the finding of infringement of a claim to a combination of elements where one is outside the United States with the rule on extraterritoriality of *Deepsouth Packing Co. v. Laitram Corp.*, 406 U.S. 518, 531 (1972), and the “all elements” rule of *Warner-Jenkinson* that “[i]t is of course axiomatic that ‘[e]ach element contained in a patent claim is deemed

## Wegner's Top Ten Supreme Court Patent Cases

material to determining the scope of the patented invention.”” *Odetics, Inc. v. Storage Technology Corp.*, 185 F.3d 1259, 1268 (Fed. Cir. 1999)(Clevenger, J.)(quoting *Warner-Jenkinson Co., Inc. v. Hilton Davis Chemical Co.*, 520 U.S. 17, 29 (1997)(Thomas, J.).

### (9) SmithKline Paroxetine Case

*SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.*, No. 05-489, *opinion below*, 403 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2005)(Rader, J.), *aff'g on different grounds*, 247 F.Supp.2d 1011 (N.D.Ill. 2003)(Posner, J.).

(No analysis has been made of this case which is in the briefing stage for grant of certiorari.)

### (10) Lemelson Prosecution Laches Case [future]:

*Lemelson Medical, Education & Research Foundation v. Symbol Technologies*, petition for certiorari expected from *Symbol Technologies, Inc. v. Lemelson Medical, Education & Research Foundation*, \_\_\_ F.3d \_\_\_ (Fed. Cir. Nov. 16, 2005)(order)(*en banc*), *supplementing earlier panel opinion*, 422 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2005)(Lourie, J.).

**Status:** Unless extended, the certiorari petition is due February 14, 2006.

**Discussion:** The petition for *en banc* rehearing suggests a variety of procedural issues from which petitioner may choose in crafting a certiorari petition – in addition to challenging the “prosecution laches” holding that is supported by *dicta* in Supreme Court decisions finding unenforceability that date back more than eighty (80) years each. The panel opinion discusses *Woodbridge v. United States*, 263 U.S. 50 (1923), as the first of two cases “wherein the Supreme Court applied the doctrine of prosecution laches to render patents unenforceable.” 422 F.3d at 1385; emphasis added. Yet, the *Woodbridge* case did not involve a patent law but instead a private law for compensation keyed to a statutory laches bar. Thus, the *Woodbridge* case involved a statutory compensation act for private relief for an unpatented invention of Woodbridge. *Woodbridge*, 263 U.S. at 51.

The *en banc* order *sub silentio* denies the various procedural points raised by the patentee in his petition for reconsideration, paving the way for Supreme Court review on procedural issues. Unique is the *en banc sua sponte* holding

## Wegner's Top Ten Supreme Court Patent Cases

of unenforceability of a group of claims *that were not held unenforceable by the trial court.*

Like the *KSR* case that has an experienced Supreme Court petition that involves a sophisticated appellate team, the *Lemelson* case features one of a handful of star Supreme Court appellate lawyers. Unlike other cases where Supreme Court pros are brought in at the final stage, here, the Lemelson Foundation obviously recognized that it would have to go to the Supreme Court: It brought in its new Supreme Court specialist *at the Federal Circuit level* to help in the preparation of the case at that stage – and to argue the appeal on Madison Place.

### [Unlisted] *AWH v. Phillips Claim Construction Deference*

*AWH Corp. v. Phillips*, App. No. 05-602, *proceedings below, Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed.Cir.2005) (*en banc*).

**Issue:** Whether the Federal Circuit is correct in holding that all aspects of a district court's patent claim construction may be reviewed *de novo* on appeal. **Status:** *AWH v. Phillips* and any *amici* face a December 14, 2005, filing deadline for expressing their views on the *certiorari* petition.

**Outcome for the Near Term:** Unlike *KSR*, *eBay*, *Lemelson* and other recent cases where an appellate team has quarterbacked the quest for *certiorari*, the petition here is from trial counsel that focuses upon an issue that was neither decided by the Federal Circuit nor one necessary to its holding.

Unlike the *KSR* petition – which has been successful insofar as gaining the referral of the case to the Solicitor General as a CVSG – and *eBay* petition, the current petition has no *amicus* effort from the academic community but appears to be an effort by a trial team to deal with the complexities of the Supreme Court.

To be sure, petitioner is correct that many *amici* at the Federal Circuit *did* support its current position at the Supreme Court. But, unstated in the *certiorari* petition is the fact that the question presented represents *dicta* unnecessary to the holding of the case. For example, while the Bar Association of the District of Columbia PTC Section in its *amicus curiae* brief in *Phillips* supported a reconsideration of the court's deference standard *in an appropriate case*, the Bar Association urged that this issue *not*

## Wegner's Top Ten Supreme Court Patent Cases

be taken up by the court, following the guidance of William Rooklidge to avoid “judicial hyperactivity”. (This same quotation is turned on its head in petitioner’s brief.)

***Outlook for the Long Term:*** Denial of *certiorari* in *this* case will not eliminate the question presented to the Court. If anything, this will give the Federal Circuit a reprieve to fashion a solution that gives the appropriate degree of deference to a trial court factually-based claim construction. Surely, if the Federal Circuit refrains from doing so, it is inevitable that at some point in time a *certiorari* grant *will* be given, when a Lemley or Duffey or other top academic joins the fray (as happened in *KSR* and *eBay*).

---

\* This paper represents the personal views of the writer and does not necessarily reflect the views of any organization or client. The writer is a partner with Foley & Lardner LLP. This paper was last updated November 19, 2005.