

No. 16-712

---

---

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

---

OIL STATES ENERGY SERVICES, LLC, PETITIONER

*v.*

GREENE'S ENERGY GROUP, LLC, ET AL.

---

*ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT*

---

**BRIEF FOR THE FEDERAL RESPONDENT**

---

SARAH T. HARRIS  
*General Counsel*  
NATHAN K. KELLEY  
*Solicitor*  
THOMAS W. KRAUSE  
*Deputy Solicitor*  
FARHEENA Y. RASHEED  
MARY BETH WALKER  
*Associate Solicitors  
United States Patent  
and Trademark Office  
Alexandria, Va 22313*

NOEL J. FRANCISCO  
*Solicitor General  
Counsel of Record*  
CHAD A. READLER  
*Acting Assistant Attorney  
General*  
MALCOLM L. STEWART  
*Deputy Solicitor General*  
RACHEL P. KOVNER  
*Assistant to the Solicitor  
General*  
DOUGLAS N. LETTER  
MARK R. FREEMAN  
WILLIAM E. HAVEMANN  
*Attorneys  
Department of Justice  
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001  
SupremeCtBriefs@usdoj.gov  
(202) 514-2217*

---

---

MYLAN - EXHIBIT 1167

**QUESTION PRESENTED**

Whether inter partes review comports with Article III and the Seventh Amendment.

(1)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Opinions below ..... 1

Jurisdiction ..... 1

Constitutional and statutory provisions involved..... 2

Statement ..... 2

Summary of argument ..... 10

Argument:

    I. Inter partes review is consistent with Article III ..... 15

        A. Congress may authorize the USPTO to reconsider its own decision to grant a patent..... 16

            1. Congress has permissibly authorized USPTO patent examiners within the Executive Branch to determine in the first instance whether patents should be granted..... 16

            2. Inter partes review resolves a matter of public right that is integrally connected to the federal patent scheme..... 19

            3. The AIA provisions that govern inter partes review do not intrude on or diminish the authority of Article III courts..... 30

            4. Inter partes review satisfies even the standards this Court has articulated for the imposition of monetary liability by non-Article III adjudicators..... 32

        B. The longstanding treatment of patents as revocable privileges confirms that Congress may authorize the USPTO to reconsider its patent grants ..... 36

    II. Inter partes review is consistent with the Seventh Amendment ..... 51

Conclusion ..... 54

Appendix — Constitutional and statutory provisions ..... 1a

(III)

IV

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:	Page
<i>Atlas Roofing Co. v. Occupational Safety &amp; Health Review Comm'n</i> , 430 U.S. 442 (1977) .....	27, 34, 47, 51
<i>Bakelite Corp., Ex parte</i> , 279 U.S. 438 (1929) .....	23
<i>Block v. Hirsh</i> , 256 U.S. 135 (1921).....	34, 47, 51
<i>Bloomer v. McQuewan</i> , 55 U.S. (14 How.) 539 (1853) .....	38
<i>Blonder-Tongue Laboratories, Inc. v. University of Ill. Found.</i> , 402 U.S. 313 (1971).....	31
<i>Boesche v. Graff</i> , 133 U.S. 697 (1890) .....	38
<i>Boesche v. Udall</i> , 373 U.S. 472 (1963).....	22, 26, 27, 50, 51
<i>Bruno Indep. Living Aids, Inc. v. Acorn Mobility Servs., Ltd.</i> , 394 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	3, 28
<i>Cardinal Chem. Co. v. Morton Int'l, Inc.</i> , 508 U.S. 83 (1993) .....	20
<i>Cleveland Bd. of Educ. v. Loudermill</i> , 470 U.S. 532 (1985).....	21
<i>Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 1920 (2015) .....	20
<i>Crowell v. Benson</i> , 285 U.S. 22 (1932) .....	17, 24, 27, 32, 33, 36
<i>Crown Die &amp; Tool Co. v. Nye Tool &amp; Mach. Works</i> , 261 U.S. 24 (1923) .....	19
<i>Cuozzo Speed Technologies, LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Curtis v. Loether</i> , 415 U.S. 189 (1974) .....	52
<i>Deepsouth Packing Co. v. Laitram Corp.</i> , 406 U.S. 518 (1972).....	17
<i>Dickinson v. Zurko</i> , 527 U.S. 150 (1999).....	35
<i>eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L. L. C.</i> , 547 U.S. 388 (2006).....	20, 22

V

Cases—Continued:	Page
<i>Ethicon, Inc. v. Quigg</i> , 849 F.2d 1422 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	30
<i>Gayler v. Wilder</i> , 51 U.S. (10 How.) 477 (1851) .....	17, 18
<i>Goldberg v. Kelly</i> , 397 U.S. 254 (1970).....	21
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966) .....	17, 19, 37
<i>Granfinanciera S. A. v. Nordberg</i> , 492 U.S. 33 (1989) .....	16, 17, 34, 46, 50, 51
<i>Grant v. Raymond</i> , 31 U.S. (6 Pet.) 218 (1832) .....	38
<i>Iron Silver Mining Co. v. Campbell</i> , 135 U.S. 286 (1890).....	50
<i>Joy Technologies, Inc. v. Manbeck</i> , 959 F.2d 226 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 506 U.S. 829 (1992) .....	44
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	20
<i>Kappos v. Hyatt</i> , 566 U.S. 431 (2012) .....	3, 35, 43, 44
<i>Kendall v. Winsor</i> , 62 U.S. (21 How.) 322 (1859) .....	19
<i>Lear, Inc. v. Adkins</i> , 395 U.S. 653 (1969).....	28
<i>Livingston v. Van Ingen</i> , 9 Johns. 507 (N.Y. 1812) .....	41
<i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife</i> , 504 U.S. 555 (1992).....	18
<i>MCM Portfolio LLC v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 812 F.3d 1284 (2015), cert. denied, 137 S. Ct. 292 (2016).....	9, 10, 23, 35, 52
<i>Marbury v. Madison</i> , 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803).....	18
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996).....	39
<i>McCormick Harvesting Mach. Co. v. Aultman</i> , 169 U.S. 606 (1898).....	14, 43, 48, 49
<i>McCormick Harvesting Mach. Co. v. C. Aultman &amp; Co.</i> :	
58 F. 773 (N.D. Ohio 1893).....	48
69 F. 371 (6th Cir. 1895) .....	48, 49
<i>McKart v. United States</i> , 395 U.. 185 (1969) .....	30

# 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.