

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 & 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 & Tool Co. v. Nye Tool & 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 & 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.