

REVIEW OF RECENT JUDICIAL DECISIONS
ON PATENT LAW

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY,
COMPETITION, AND THE INTERNET
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

MARCH 10, 2011

Serial No. 112-20

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://judiciary.house.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

65-078 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2011

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

LAMAR SMITH, Texas, *Chairman*

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr., Wisconsin	JOHN CONYERS, JR., Michigan
HOWARD COBLE, North Carolina	HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
ELTON GALLEGLY, California	JERROLD NADLER, New York
BOB GOODLATTE, Virginia	ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT, Virginia
DANIEL E. LUNGREN, California	MELVIN L. WATT, North Carolina
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio	ZOE LOFGREN, California
DARRELL E. ISSA, California	SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
MIKE PENCE, Indiana	MAXINE WATERS, California
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia	STEVE COHEN, Tennessee
STEVE KING, Iowa	HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., Georgia
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona	PEDRO PIERLUISI, Puerto Rico
LOUIE GOHMERT, Texas	MIKE QUIGLEY, Illinois
JIM JORDAN, Ohio	JUDY CHU, California
TED POE, Texas	TED DEUTCH, Florida
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah	LINDA T. SANCHEZ, California
TOM REED, New York	DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Florida
TIM GRIFFIN, Arkansas	
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania	
TREY GOWDY, South Carolina	
DENNIS ROSS, Florida	
SANDY ADAMS, Florida	
BEN QUAYLE, Arizona	

SEAN MCLAUGHLIN, *Majority Chief of Staff and General Counsel*
PERRY APELBAUM, *Minority Staff Director and Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, COMPETITION, AND THE INTERNET

BOB GOODLATTE, Virginia, *Chairman*

HOWARD COBLE, North Carolina, *Vice-Chairman*

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., Wisconsin	MELVIN L. WATT, North Carolina
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio	JOHN CONYERS, JR., Michigan
DARRELL E. ISSA, California	HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
MIKE PENCE, Indiana	JUDY CHU, California
JIM JORDAN, Ohio	TED DEUTCH, Florida
TED POE, Texas	LINDA T. SANCHEZ, California
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah	DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Florida
TOM REED, New York	JERROLD NADLER, New York
TIM GRIFFIN, Arkansas	ZOE LOFGREN, California
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania	SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
SANDY ADAMS, Florida	MAXINE WATERS, California
BEN QUAYLE, Arizona	

BLAINE MERRITT, *Chief Counsel*
STEPHANIE MOORE, *Minority Counsel*

CONTENTS

MARCH 10, 2011

	Page
OPENING STATEMENTS	
The Honorable Bob Goodlatte, a Representative in Congress from the State of Virginia, and Chairman, Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition, and the Internet	1
The Honorable Melvin L. Watt, a Representative in Congress from the State of North Carolina, and Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition, and the Internet	2
The Honorable John Conyers, Jr., a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan, Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary, and Member, Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition, and the Internet	3
WITNESSES	
Dan L. Burk, Chancellor's Professor of Law, University of California, Irvine	
Oral Testimony	4
Prepared Statement	7
Andrew J. Pincus, Partner, Mayer Brown LLP	
Oral Testimony	14
Prepared Statement	16
Dennis Crouch, Associate Professor of Law, University of Missouri School of Law	
Oral Testimony	31
Prepared Statement	33
APPENDIX	
MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING RECORD	
Prepared Statement of the Coalition for Patent Fairness	63
Prepared Statement of John Boswell, Senior Vice President and General Counsel, SAS Institute	68
Prepared Statement of Lateef Mtima, Professor, on behalf of the Institute for Intellectual Property and Social Justice	73

REVIEW OF RECENT JUDICIAL DECISIONS ON PATENT LAW

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 2011

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY,
COMPETITION, AND THE INTERNET,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 1:06 p.m., in room 2141, Rayburn Office Building, the Honorable Bob Goodlatte (Chairman of the Subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Goodlatte, Coble, Sensenbrenner, Issa, Poe, Reed, Griffin, Adams, Quayle, Watt, Conyers, Chu, and Nadler.

Staff present: (Majority) Blaine Merritt, Subcommittee Chief Counsel; Olivia Lee, Clerk; and Stephanie Moore, Minority Counsel.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Good afternoon. The Subcommittee will come to order.

I have a statement. At the outset I want to express my surprise, as well as delight, that the other body has acted so expeditiously on their Patent Reform Bill. I look forward to continuing to work with Chairman Smith, Ranking Member Watt and other Members of the Judiciary Committee to fashion the House bill. This is the closest we have come in the past 6 years to enacting comprehensive patent reform and I am optimistic that we can get a bipartisan, bicameral bill on the President's desk in the near future.

Whatever the fate of patent reform in the coming weeks, we can all agree that Congress has found it difficult to enact a truly comprehensive reform bill. Why? The answer is twofold. First, different versions of the legislation have addressed many core provisions of the Patent Act. And second, a number of different stakeholders use the patent system in different ways. Businesses that devote significant resources on research and development have a greater financial need for patent protection than those spending less on R&D. In addition, some companies may generate one or two clearly understood patents that define an entire product while others, in the software or tech realms, may develop products that contain hundreds or even thousands of patents. In addition, many industries practice their patent portfolio defensively while other industries and patent-holding companies tend to go on the offensive to pursue their patent rights.

(1)

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.