

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

KAWASAKI RAIL CAR, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

SCOTT BLAIR,

Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2017-01036

Patent 6,700,602

**EXHIBIT 2004- A COMPLETE COPY OF “THE PROPOSED  
FRA RULES”**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Federal Railroad Administration**

**49 CFR Parts 216, 223, 229, 231, 232, and 238**

[FRA Docket No. PCSS-1, Notice No. 2]

RIN 2130-AA95

**Passenger Equipment Safety Standards**

**AGENCY:** Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

**SUMMARY:** FRA is proposing a rule establishing comprehensive Federal safety standards for railroad passenger equipment. The proposed rule contains requirements concerning equipment design and performance criteria related to passenger and crew survivability in the event of a passenger train accident; the inspection, testing, and maintenance of passenger equipment; and the safe operation of passenger train service. The proposed rule is designed to address the safety of passenger train service in an environment where technology is advancing, and equipment is being designed for operation at higher speeds. The rule would amend existing regulations concerning special notice for repairs, safety glazing, locomotive safety, safety appliances, and railroad power brakes as applied to passenger equipment.

The proposed rule does not apply to tourist and historic railroad operations. However, after consulting with the excursion railroad associations to determine appropriate applicability in light of financial, operational, or other factors unique to such operations, FRA may prescribe requirements for these operations that are different from those affecting other types of passenger operations.

**DATES:** (1) *Written comments:* Written comments must be received on or before November 24, 1997. Comments received after that date will be considered by FRA and the Passenger Equipment Safety Standards Working Group to the extent possible without incurring substantial additional expense or delay. The docket will remain open until the Working Group proceedings are concluded. Requests for formal extension of the comment period must be made by November 7, 1997.

(2) *Public hearing:* FRA intends to hold a public hearing to allow interested parties the opportunity to comment on

The date and location of the hearing will be set forth in a forthcoming notice that will be published in the *Federal Register*. Anyone who desires to make an oral statement at the hearing must notify the Docket Clerk by telephone (202-632-3198), and must submit three copies of the oral statement that he or she intends to make at the hearing. The notification should also provide the Docket Clerk with the participant's mailing address. FRA reserves the right to limit participation in the hearings of persons who fail to provide such notification. The date by which the Docket Clerk must be notified about the oral statement and receive copies of it will be set forth in the notice announcing the hearing.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should identify the docket number and must be submitted in triplicate to the Docket Clerk, Office of Chief Counsel, Federal Railroad Administration, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Mail Stop 10, Washington, D.C. 20590. Persons desiring to be notified that their comments have been received by FRA should submit a stamped, self-addressed postcard with their comments. The Docket Clerk will indicate on the postcard the date on which the comments were received and will return the card to the addressee. Written comments will be available for examination, both before and after the closing date for written comments, during regular business hours in Room 7051 of FRA headquarters at 1120 Vermont Avenue, N.W., in Washington, D.C.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Edward Pritchard, Acting Staff Director, Motive Power and Equipment Division, Office of Safety Assurance and Compliance, FRA, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Mail Stop 25, Washington, D.C. 20590 (telephone: 202-632-3362); Daniel Alpert, Trial Attorney, Office of Chief Counsel, FRA, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Mail Stop 10, Washington, D.C. (telephone: 202-632-3186); or Thomas Herrmann, Trial Attorney, Office of Chief Counsel, FRA, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Mail Stop 10, Washington, D.C. 20590 (telephone: 202-632-3167).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

To enhance rail safety, the Secretary of Transportation convened a meeting of representatives from all sectors of the rail industry in September, 1994. As one of the initiatives arising from this Rail Safety Summit, the Secretary announced that DOT would begin developing safety standards for rail passenger equipment over a five-year

period. The Secretary's schedule for implementing rail passenger equipment regulations and included it in the Federal Railroad Safety Authorization Act of 1994 (the Act), Pub. L. No. 103-440, 108 Stat. 4619, 4623-4624 (November 2, 1994). Section 215 of the Act, as now codified at 49 U.S.C. 20133, requires:

(a) **MINIMUM STANDARDS.**—The Secretary of Transportation shall prescribe regulations establishing minimum standards for the safety of cars used by railroad carriers to transport passengers. Before prescribing such regulations, the Secretary shall consider—

- (1) The crashworthiness of the cars;
- (2) Interior features (including luggage restraints, seat belts, and exposed surfaces) that may affect passenger safety;
- (3) Maintenance and inspection of the cars;
- (4) Emergency response procedures and equipment; and
- (5) Any operating rules and conditions that directly affect safety not otherwise governed by regulations.

The Secretary may make applicable some or all of the standards established under this subsection to cars existing at the time the regulations are prescribed, as well as to new cars, and the Secretary shall explain in the rulemaking document the basis for making such standards applicable to existing cars.

(b) **INITIAL AND FINAL**

**REGULATIONS.**—(1) The Secretary shall prescribe initial regulations under subsection (a) within 3 years after the date of enactment of the Federal Railroad Safety Authorization Act of 1994. The initial regulations may exempt equipment used by tourist, historic, scenic, and excursion railroad carriers to transport passengers.

(2) The Secretary shall prescribe final regulations under subsection (a) within 5 years after such date of enactment.

(c) **PERSONNEL.**—The Secretary may establish within the Department of Transportation 2 additional full-time equivalent positions beyond the number permitted under existing law to assist with the drafting, prescribing, and implementation of regulations under this section.

(d) **CONSULTATION.**—In prescribing regulations, issuing orders, and making amendments under this section, the Secretary may consult with Amtrak, public authorities operating railroad passenger service, other railroad carriers transporting passengers, organizations of passengers, and organizations of employees. A consultation is not subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), but minutes of the consultation shall be placed in the public docket of the regulatory proceeding.

The Secretary of Transportation has delegated these rulemaking responsibilities to the Federal Railroad Administrator. 49 CFR 1.49(m).

Consistent with the intent of Congress that FRA consult with the railroad industry in prescribing these regulations, FRA invited various

group to focus on the issues related to railroad passenger equipment safety and assist FRA in developing Federal safety standards. The Passenger Equipment Safety Standards Working Group (or the "Working Group") first met on June 7, 1995,<sup>1</sup> and continues to meet in support of this rulemaking. This proposed rule was developed by FRA in consultation with the Working Group, and FRA will again convene the Working Group to consider comments received in response to this Notice and develop the final rule. Notice of any Working Group meetings will be available through the FRA Docket Clerk.

The Working Group has evolved since its initial meeting, and its membership currently includes representatives from the following organizations:

American Association of Private Railroad Car Owners, Inc. (AAPRCO),  
 American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO),  
 American Public Transit Association (APTA),  
 Association of American Railroads (AAR),  
 Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers (BLE),  
 Brotherhood Railway Carmen (BRC),  
 FRA,  
 Federal Transit Administration (FTA) of DOT,  
 National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak),  
 National Association of Railroad Passengers (NARP),  
 Railway Progress Institute (RPI),  
 Safe Travel America (STA),  
 Transportation Workers Union of America (TWU), and  
 United Transportation Union (UTU).

The Working Group is chaired by FRA, and supported by FRA program, legal, and research staff, including technical personnel from the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center (Volpe Center) of the Research and Special Programs Administration of DOT. FRA has included vendor representatives designated by RPI as associate members of the Working Group. FRA has also included the AAPRCO as an associate Working Group member. The National Transportation Safety Board has designated staff members to advise the Working Group.

In developing proposed safety standards for passenger equipment operating at speeds greater than 125 mph but not exceeding 150 mph, FRA formed a subgroup (the "Tier II Equipment Subgroup") of Working Group members representing interests associated with the provision of rail passenger service at such high speeds. FRA invited representatives from organizations including Amtrak, the

BLE, BRC, RPI, and UTU to participate in this effort.

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 20133(d), the evolving positions of the Working Group members—as reflected in the minutes of the group's meetings and associated documentation, together with data provided by the members during their deliberations—have been placed in the public docket of this rulemaking.

On June 17, 1996, FRA published an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) concerning the establishment of comprehensive safety standards for railroad passenger equipment (61 FR 30672). The ANPRM provided background information on the need for such standards, offered preliminary ideas on approaching passenger safety issues, and presented questions on various topics including: system safety programs and plans; passenger equipment crashworthiness; inspection, testing, and maintenance requirements; training and qualification requirements for mechanical personnel and train crews; excursion, tourist, and private equipment; commuter equipment and operations; train make-up and operating speed; tiered safety standards; fire safety; and operating practices and procedures.

FRA's commitment to developing proposed regulations through the Working Group necessarily influenced the role and purpose of the ANPRM. FRA specifically asked that members of the Working Group not respond formally to the ANPRM. The issues and ideas presented in the ANPRM had already been placed before the Working Group, and the Working Group had commented on drafts of the ANPRM. As a result, FRA solicited the submission of written comments that might be of assistance in developing a proposed rule from interested persons not involved in the Working Group's deliberations.

FRA received 12 comments in response to the ANPRM, including a request from a member of the Working Group to extend the ANPRM's comment period. In addition, the United States Small Business Administration (SBA) commented that the length of the comment period was inadequate for the industry, especially small railways, to prepare a thorough response to the ANPRM. FRA had closed the comment period on July 9, 1996, so that all comments could be shared with the Working Group before its meeting on July 10, 1996.

Although FRA did not formally extend the comment period, comments received after the closing date of the comment period have been shared with

meetings. Such comments have been considered (and identified in this Notice) to the extent possible without incurring additional delay in preparing this Notice. Moreover, the Working Group is broadly representative of interests involved in the provision of intercity and commuter rail service nationwide, and its members had the opportunity to comment on the issues raised in the ANPRM before the document's publication, as noted above.

### Need for Safety Standards

Effective Federal safety standards for freight equipment have long been in place, but equivalent Federal standards for passenger equipment do not currently exist. The AAR sets industry standards for the design and maintenance of freight equipment that add materially to the safe operation of this equipment. Industry standards for the safety of railroad passenger equipment have been in place since the early part of this century, as noted by the AAPRCO in comment on the ANPRM. However, over the years, the AAR has discontinued the development and maintenance of passenger equipment standards.

Passenger railroads do offer the traveling public one of the safest forms of transportation available. In the five-year period 1991–1995, there were 1.07 passenger fatalities for every billion miles a passenger was transported by rail. However, accidents continue to occur, often as a result of factors beyond the control of the passenger railroad. Further, the rail passenger environment is rapidly changing. Worldwide, passenger equipment operating speeds are increasing. Several passenger trainsets designed to European standards have been proposed for operation at high speeds in the United States. In general, these trainsets do not meet the structural or operating standards that are common practice for current North American equipment. FRA believes that adherence to such standards by the nation's passenger railroads has in large measure contributed to the high level of safety at which rail passenger service is currently operated. However, these standards do not have the force of regulation.

In general, the North American railroad operating environment requires passenger equipment to operate commingled with very heavy and long freight trains, often over track with frequent grade crossings used by heavy highway equipment. European passenger operations are intermingled with freight equipment of lesser weight than in North America. In many cases,

<sup>1</sup>This date was incorrectly identified as June 6, 1995, in the Advance Notice of Proposed

lesser hazards to passenger trains in Europe due to lower highway vehicle weight. European passenger equipment design standards may therefore not be appropriate for the North American rail environment.

FRA must become more active to ensure that passenger trains continue to be designed, built, and operated with a high level of safety. A clear set of Federal safety and design standards for passenger equipment tailored to the nation's operating environment is needed to provide for the safety of future rail operations and to facilitate sound planning for those operations.

### Passenger Train Safety Hazards

Passenger trains are exposed to a variety of safety hazards. Some of these hazards are endemic to the nation's rail passenger operating environment, as noted above, and result from the operation of passenger trains commingled with freight trains, often over track with frequent grade crossings used by heavy highway equipment.

Collisions with a wide range of objects may occur at various speeds under a number of different circumstances. In addition to freight trains and highway vehicles, these objects include maintenance-of-way equipment and other passenger trains. Although most of these collisions occur only in the normal running direction of the train, impact into the side of the train can occur, especially at the junction of rail lines and at highway-rail grade crossings.

A passenger train collision with another train concerns FRA because of the potential for significant harm demonstrated in actual accidents.

- On February 16, 1996, a near-head-on collision occurred between Maryland Rail Commuter Service (MARC) train 286 and Amtrak train 29 on track owned by CSX Transportation, Inc., (CSXT) at Silver Spring, Maryland. The MARC train was operating with a cab car (a car which provides passenger seating, as well as a location from which the train is operated) as the lead car in the train, followed by two passenger coaches and a locomotive pushing the consist. The collision separated the left front corner of the cab car from the roof to its sill plate, and tore off much of the forward left side of the car body. Three crewmembers and eight passengers were fatally injured, and 13 other occupants of the MARC train sustained injuries. (FRA Accident Investigation Report (Report) B-3-96.)

- On February 9, 1996, a near-head-on collision occurred between New Jersey Transit Rail Operations, Inc.,

of Secaucus and Jersey City, New Jersey. Two crewmembers and one passenger were fatally injured, and 35 other people sustained injuries. The passenger fatality and most of the nonfatal injuries to passengers occurred on train 1254, which was operating with the cab car forward, followed by four passenger coaches and a locomotive pushing the consist. (FRA Report B-2-96.)

- On January 18, 1993, Northern Indiana Commuter Transportation District (NICTD) trains 7 and 12 collided corner-to-corner in Gary, Indiana. The left front corners and adjacent car body sidewall structures were destroyed on both of the lead cars in each train. Seven passengers died, and 95 people sustained injuries. (NTSB/Railroad Accident Report (RAR)-93/03.)

The exposure of passenger trains to hazards associated with sharing common rights-of-way with freight trains has been demonstrated in recent accidents, and a past disastrous accident.

- On February 15, 1995, an Amtrak train traveling at 58 mph struck a shifted load of steel "I" beams extending from a Union Pacific Railroad Company freight train stopped in a siding at Borah, Idaho. The Amtrak train's six passenger coaches were raked with a steel beam which penetrated the outer layer of the car bodies at various points. Although no passengers were injured, the Amtrak train's two locomotives were significantly damaged, and two crewmembers were injured. (FRA Report C-14-95.)

- On May 16, 1994, an Amtrak train derailed after striking an intermodal trailer which had fallen or was falling from a CSXT freight train travelling northbound on an adjacent track at Selma, North Carolina. The lead locomotive of the Amtrak train rolled over, and the assistant engineer was killed. The engineer sustained serious injuries, and 120 other occupants of the Amtrak train reported injuries. (NTSB/RAR-95/02.)

- On January 4, 1987, an Amtrak train collided with the rear of a Consolidated Rail Corporation (Conrail) train near Chase, Maryland, when it unexpectedly entered the track ahead of the Amtrak train, which had been travelling between 120 and 125 mph only a few seconds earlier. The Amtrak train's two locomotives and three front passenger cars were destroyed in the collision. The engineer and 15 passengers aboard the Amtrak train were fatally injured, and 174 other persons aboard the train were injured. (NTSB/RAR-88/01.)

The exposure of passenger trains to hazards associated with operating over

used by heavy highway vehicles, has also been demonstrated in numerous accidents.

- On January 16, 1996, a Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) train being operated by Amtrak struck a loaded tractor-trailer which had become lodged in a grade crossing in Wakefield, Massachusetts. Twenty-two passengers were taken to hospitals by ambulance or air. (FRA Report C-4-96.)

- On October 3, 1995, a Metro-North Commuter Railroad Company (Metro-North) train with a cab car in the lead struck a loaded tractor-trailer which had become lodged in a grade crossing near Milford, Connecticut. Two crewmembers and 24 passengers were injured. (FRA Report C-60-95.)

- On September 21, 1995, an Amtrak train traveling at 81 mph struck a loaded tractor-trailer at a highway-rail grade crossing near Indiantown, Florida. The assistant engineer was killed, and five other persons onboard the train were injured. (FRA Report C-56-95.)

- On November 30, 1993, an Amtrak train derailed after striking an 82-ton turbine being transported by a 184-foot long vehicle which was fouling a grade crossing near Intercession City, Florida. Fifty-eight of the train's passengers and crewmembers were injured. (NTSB Highway Accident Report 95/01.)

In addition to collisions involving passenger trains striking highway vehicles, highway vehicles may also strike passenger trains. According to FRA's Rail-Highway Grade Crossing Accident/Incident database, 13.8% of all highway-rail grade crossing collisions involving passenger trains from 1986 through 1995 occurred when the highway vehicle struck the passenger train. This accounts for 388 such occurrences out of 2,820 highway-rail grade crossing collisions involving passenger trains in this period. In commenting on the ANPRM, the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) had asked that FRA clarify the statement that 25 percent of all highway-rail grade crossing accidents involve a highway vehicle striking the side of a train. **See** 61 FR 30692. Though this higher figure does include accidents involving both freight and passenger trains, the potential for a highway vehicle to strike a passenger train is real.

The WSDOT also requested that FRA document how many "heavy" highway vehicles were involved in highway-rail grade crossing accidents in which highway vehicles struck passenger trains. Over the same ten-year period from 1986 through 1995, 52 of the 388



struck a passenger train involved a heavy highway vehicle. For purposes of this analysis, FRA considered the number of heavy highway vehicles which struck passenger trains to consist of all those vehicles identified as a "Truck-Trailer" (12) and one-half the number of those vehicles identified as a "Truck" (79), as specified according to Form FRA F 6180.57—Rail-Highway Grade Crossing Accident/Incident Report.

Passenger trains are also vulnerable to accidents caused by defective railroad track structure and vehicle interaction with the rail structure.

- On August 3, 1994, an Amtrak train derailed while travelling at approximately 79 mph on Conrail trackage near Batavia, New York, because of the dynamic interaction between a material handling car and a flattened rail head. Five of the derailed passenger cars descended a railroad embankment and came to rest on their sides. One-hundred-and-eight passengers and ten crewmembers were injured. (NTSB/RAR-96/02.)

- On July 31, 1991, an Amtrak train derailed while travelling at 80 mph over CSXT trackage in Lugoff, South Carolina, when a switch point leading to a parallel auxiliary track unexpectedly opened under the Amtrak train. The derailed passenger cars collided with the first of nine hopper cars stored on the auxiliary track. The collision caused the wheel set from the first hopper car to penetrate the last passenger car. Eight passengers were fatally injured, and 12 passengers sustained serious injuries. (NTSB/RAR-93/02.)

Moreover, passenger trains are vulnerable to accidents caused by vandalism and sabotage.

- On October 9, 1995, an Amtrak train derailed near Hyder, Arizona, while operating at 50 mph on Southern Pacific Transportation Company trackage because the railroad track structure had been sabotaged. The derailment killed an Amtrak employee who occupied a passenger car which had rolled over onto its side. Seventy-eight passengers were also injured. (FRA Report C-62-95.)

- On May 21, 1993, an Amtrak train traveling at approximately 45 mph derailed after striking two pieces of steel pipe which had been lodged between the rails of a turnout near Opa-Locka, Florida. Six of the train's passengers and crewmembers were injured. (FRA Report C-34-93.)

- On August 12, 1992, an Amtrak train traveling at 79 mph derailed at Newport News, VA, after being unexpectedly diverted into a railroad

switch. Seventy of the train's passengers and crewmembers were injured. (FRA Report C-52-92.)

Regardless of the cause of an accident, the occupants of a passenger train may risk harm caused by the crushing of the occupant compartment, in which the occupants themselves are crushed, and local penetration into the occupant compartment, where an object intrudes into the occupant compartment and directly strikes an occupant, as demonstrated in the Amtrak accident in Lugoff, South Carolina. Passenger train occupants are also vulnerable to harm from collisions within the train's interior, including loose objects inside the train, such as baggage. For example, the NTSB determined that at least two passengers in a lounge car were injured when they were struck by displaced pedestal seats as a result of the Intercension City, Florida, grade crossing collision on November 30, 1993. The seat columns on four pedestal seats had separated from their floor attachments, allowing them to be projected forward.

A variety of threats to passengers are also posed by fire, broken glazing, electrical shock, and submergence. These dangers may arise following a train derailment or collision, with potentially catastrophic results.

- On September 22, 1993, an accident occurred when an Amtrak train travelling at approximately 72 mph derailed after striking a girder that had been displaced when a towboat, pushing six barges, struck a railroad bridge near Mobile, Alabama. The train's three locomotives, the baggage and dormitory cars, and two of its six passenger cars fell into the water. Forty-two passengers and five crewmembers were killed. All passengers died from asphyxia due to drowning, and the train's three locomotive engineers died from asphyxia and blunt force trauma while inside the lead locomotive that became filled with mud. Two other employees died from smoke inhalation inside the dormitory coach car which had caught on fire. (NTSB Railroad-Marine Accident Report 94/01.)

Further, in the 1996 Silver Spring, Maryland, train collision between the MARC and Amtrak trains, fire erupted after the fuel tank of one of the Amtrak locomotives was breached. Fuel oil spilled into the MARC train's cab car through the openings in the torn car body. The forward section of the cab car was incinerated.

Some dangers to passenger train occupants, such as fire and smoke, may also arise independently without being associated with a train collision or

- On June 23, 1982, a fire started onboard an Amtrak passenger train in a sleeping car travelling en route to Los Angeles, California. As a result of the fire and smoke, two passengers died, two passengers were seriously injured, and 59 other occupants of the train were treated for smoke inhalation. (NTSB/RAR-83/03.)

#### Development of Passenger Train Safety Program

This rulemaking is part of several related and complementary efforts by FRA that will contribute to rail passenger safety. FRA has proposed regulations governing emergency preparedness and emergency response procedures for rail passenger service in a separate rulemaking proceeding, designated as FRA No. PTEP-1. See 62 FR 8330, Feb. 24, 1997. In addition, FRA has formed a separate working group (the Passenger Train Emergency Preparedness Working Group) to assist FRA in the development of such regulations. This related proceeding is also addressing some of the issues FRA identified in the ANPRM on passenger equipment safety. Persons wishing to receive more information regarding this other rulemaking should contact Mr. Edward R. English, Director, Office of Safety Assurance and Compliance, FRA, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590 (telephone number: 202-632-3349), or David H. Kasminoff, Esq., Trial Attorney, Office of Chief Counsel, FRA, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590 (telephone: 202-632-3191).

Further, in response to the New Jersey Transit and MARC train accidents in early 1996, FRA issued Emergency Order No. 20 (Notice No. 1) on February 20, 1996, requiring prompt action to immediately enhance passenger train operating rules and emergency egress and to develop an interim system safety plan addressing the safety of operations that permit passengers to occupy the leading car in a train. 61 FR 6876, Feb. 22, 1996. Both the New Jersey Transit and MARC train accidents involved operations where a cab car occupied the lead position in a passenger train. The Emergency Order explained that in collisions involving the front of a passenger train, operating with a cab car in the forward position or a multiple unit (MU) locomotive, *i.e.*, a self-propelled locomotive with passenger seating, presents an increased risk of severe personal injury or death as compared with locomotive-hauled service when the locomotive occupies the lead position in the train and thereby acts as a buffer for the trailing

# 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.