



Reexamination Practice with Concurrent District Court Litigation or Section 337 USITC Investigations

Robert Greene Sterne, Jon E. Wright, Lori
A. Gordon & Byron L. Pickard

[MIND + MUSCLE]

MIT EXHIBIT 2014
Micron v. MIT
IPR2015-01087

Reexamination Practice with Concurrent District Court Litigation or Section 337 USITC Investigations

By Robert Greene Sterne, Jon E. Wright, Lori A. Gordon & Byron L. Pickard¹

Authors' Note

Patent reexamination was first selected as a topic for presentation at the Sedona Patent Litigation Conference in 2006. Version 1 of this paper was first published as part of that conference. The Sedona Patent Litigation Conferences in 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010 each addressed reexamination and concurrent patent litigation, and subsequent versions of this paper accompanied those Sedona dialogues. Other versions accompanied presentations made at ACPC, IPO and PLI Conferences. Now in Version XII, it will accompany the Sedona dialogue on this topic that will take place on October 13, 2011, at the Sedona Patent Litigation Conference XII (2011).² In all versions, the authors address current procedure, process, and cutting-edge topics in reexamination practice and concurrent litigation. This paper subscribes to a neutral Swiss approach of presenting all sides of an issue and does not advocate for any particular view so that discussion may ensue. Many have provided comments and information for this article, including judges, senior officials from the PTO, Congressional staffers, patent owners, patent litigators, patent prosecutors, academics, bloggers and interested members of the public. Moreover, the authors devote substantial portions of their practices to reexaminations on behalf of patent owners and third party requesters and are on the editorial board of the foremost internet site on reexamination, The Reexamination Center (www.reexamcenter.com). However, the views expressed herein are for purposes of dialogue and do not necessarily reflect the individual views of the authors.

¹ Version 12. Copyright 2011 by The Sedona Conference® and Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox P.L.L.C., (SKGF). All Rights Reserved.

² <http://www.thesedonaconference.org/conferences/20111013>

Table of Contents

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| I. | Introduction | 4 |
| II. | Hot Topics and New Developments..... | 6 |
| A. | Impact of the America Invents Act on Post-Grant Proceedings..... | 6 |
| B. | Broadest Reasonable Interpretation after <i>Suitco Surface</i> and <i>NTP</i> | 7 |
| C. | The Impact of <i>Therasense</i> on Reexamination Practice | 9 |
| D. | Uniloc’s Potential Impact on Patent Reexamination and the AIA’s Post Grant Review and Inter Partes Review Proceedings | 11 |
| E. | Post-NIRC Reexamination Practice | 11 |
| F. | Discovery of Reexamination Counsel..... | 12 |
| G. | Reexamination Pendency | 13 |
| H. | Litigation Stays | 16 |
| I. | Protective Orders..... | 17 |
| J. | Substantial New Questions of Patentability | 18 |
| K. | Multiple PTO Proceedings Involving the Same Patent - Merger and its Impact on Reexamination Proceedings | 20 |
| L. | Appeals of Inter Partes Reexaminations to BPAI and Federal Circuit..... | 22 |
| M. | Impact of Reexamination on Remedies..... | 24 |
| N. | Impact of Reexamination and Court Decisions on Stock Price..... | 26 |
| O. | Impact of Settlement Agreements on Inter Partes Reexamination..... | 29 |
| P. | "Impact of Reexamination on Willfulness..... | 29 |
| Q. | Retained Reexamination Experts | 30 |
| III. | The Parallel Universes Examined | 31 |
| A. | Scope of Proceedings | 32 |
| B. | Standard of Review | 32 |
| C. | Claim Construction | 33 |
| D. | Decision Makers..... | 34 |
| E. | District Court v. Central Reexamination Unit..... | 34 |
| F. | Cumulative Effect | 34 |
| IV. | Reexamination Strategy Considerations When Litigation is Threatened or Pending..... | 35 |
| A. | Reexamination Pendency | 35 |
| 1. | Pendency before the CRU | 35 |
| 2. | Pendency before the BPAI | 37 |
| 3. | Pendency conclusion..... | 39 |
| B. | Settlement..... | 39 |

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| C. | Litigation Stays | 40 |
| D. | Protective Orders | 43 |
| | 1. Scope of the Duty of Disclosure in a Reexamination Proceeding | 43 |
| | 2. Considerations for Crafting a Protective Order | 44 |
| | 3. Handling Conflicting Duties | 45 |
| | 4. Submission of Evidence Supporting Patentability | 46 |
| E. | Impact on Trial | 46 |
| F. | Damages | 47 |
| G. | Potential risks for accused infringers | 49 |
| H. | Timing of Reexamination Requests – When to File? | 49 |
| I. | Multiple Ex Parte Reexamination Requests | 51 |
| J. | Additional Strategic Questions to Consider | 52 |
| | 1. Withholding of prior art | 52 |
| | 2. Experts' independence | 53 |
| | 3. Privilege issues | 53 |
| | 4. Fast courts versus slow courts | 54 |
| | 5. Cases with multiple defendants | 55 |
| | 6. The judge's perception of reexamination requests | 55 |
| | 7. Impact on laches | 56 |
| | 8. Duty of Disclosure | 56 |
| V. | Basic Reexamination Practice | 57 |
| A. | Generally | 57 |
| B. | The Request and the SNQ | 57 |
| | 1. The substantial new question ("SNQ") generally | 58 |
| | 2. In re Swanson and the SNQ | 59 |
| | 3. KSR and the SNQ | 59 |
| C. | Impact of KSR on Reexamination Practice | 61 |
| D. | Ex Parte Reexamination | 63 |
| E. | Director-Initiated Ex Parte Reexamination | 63 |
| F. | Inter Partes Reexamination | 64 |
| | 1. Generally | 64 |
| | 2. Estoppels in inter partes reexamination | 64 |
| | 3. Real Party in Interest | 65 |
| G. | Mergers of Concurrent Proceedings | 67 |

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| 1. | Merger of Co-Pending Reexaminations | 67 |
| 2. | Merger of Co-Pending Reissue Applications and Reexaminations | 68 |
| H. | Extensions of Time..... | 69 |
| I. | Page Limits For Inter Partes Reexamination Papers | 70 |
| J. | Evidence Considerations | 72 |
| VI. | Central Reexamination Unit (CRU) Improves Quality and Reduces Pendency | 72 |
| A. | Dedicated Examiners..... | 72 |
| B. | Interaction Between CRU and OPLA | 73 |
| C. | Practice Suggestions..... | 73 |
| D. | Recommendations That Are Circulating..... | 74 |
| 1. | Extensions of Time..... | 74 |
| 2. | Page Limit Waivers | 74 |
| 3. | Adopt an "Interference-type" Approach..... | 75 |
| E. | CRU Criticisms | 75 |
| F. | Practitioner Criticisms..... | 76 |
| VII. | Reexamination Statistics | 76 |

I. Introduction

This paper addresses the interplay between patent litigation before the Federal Courts or the United States International Trade Commission ("ITC") (collectively, "the courts") and co-pending reexamination proceedings involving the patent-in-suit before the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO"). As independent arbiters of patent validity and patentability³, each forum poses a distinct set of challenges and risks for those challenging or defending patent validity. These so-called parallel universes use different rules, standards, procedures, time lines, and results in cases involving the same patent. High-profile cases involving reexaminations and co-pending litigation include *NTP, Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd.*⁴ (patents found to cover the Blackberry), *TiVo v. Echostar*,⁵ (TiVo's DVR patents), *i4i v. Microsoft*, (patent covering XML functionality), *Uniloc v. Microsoft*, (patent covering anti-piracy protection), *Cordis v. Abbott*, (drug eluting stents). In another well-known case, Amazon's patent covering its "one-click" internet shopping method was recently confirmed in reexamination.⁶ These high-profile cases, some involving highly profitable products or large damage awards, highlight the critical interplay between the parallel universes of the courts and the PTO.

³ In reexamination, the PTO reviews an issued patent for unpatentability. The courts decide the issue of patent validity. This distinction is important. For convenience, the authorities refer to these distinct issues collectively as questions of validity.

⁴ *NTP, Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd.*, 418 F.3d 1282, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

⁵ *TiVo Inc. v. Echostar, et al*, 2-04cv-01 (EDTX).

⁶ Reexamination No. 90/007,946 for U.S. Patent No. 5,960,411.

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.