

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit**

---

**FALL LINE PATENTS, LLC,**  
*Appellant*

v.

**UNIFIED PATENTS, LLC, FKA UNIFIED PATENTS,  
INC.,**  
*Appellee*

**KATHERINE K. VIDAL, UNDER SECRETARY OF  
COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
AND DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES  
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE,**  
*Intervenor*

---

2019-1956

---

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark  
Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board in No. IPR2018-  
00043.

---

Decided: December 19, 2022

---

MATTHEW JAMES ANTONELLI, Antonelli, Harrington &  
Thompson, LLP, Houston, TX, for appellant. Also repre-  
sented by ZACHARIAH HARRINGTON, LARRY D. THOMPSON,

JR.; SARAH RING, Porter Hedges LLP, Houston, TX.

JAMES R. BARNEY, Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP, Washington, DC, for appellee. Also represented by DANIEL COOLEY, Reston, VA; JONATHAN R. BOWSER, Haynes & Boone, LLP, Washington, DC; JONATHAN RUDOLPH KOMINEK STROUD, Unified Patents LLC, Washington, DC.

SARAH E. CRAVEN, Office of the Solicitor, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria, VA, argued for intervenor. Also represented by DANIEL KAZHDAN, THOMAS W. KRAUSE, FARHEENA YASMEEN RASHEED.

---

Before HUGHES, BRYSON, and STARK,<sup>1</sup> *Circuit Judges*.

Hughes, *Circuit Judge*.

In the wake of *United States v. Arthrex, Inc.*, 141 S. Ct. 1970 (2021), we remanded to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to allow appellant Fall Line Patents, LLC to seek Director rehearing of a final written decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board. Then-Commissioner for Patents Andrew Hirshfeld, who had been delegated the functions and duties of the Director during a vacancy of the office, denied the request for rehearing. Fall Line challenges whether Commissioner Hirshfeld had the constitutional and statutory authority to act on requests for Director review. Our recent decision in *Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.*, 35 F.4th 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2022), says that he did. Consequently, we affirm.

---

<sup>1</sup> Circuit Judge O'Malley retired on March 11, 2022. Circuit Judge Stark was added to the panel after Circuit Judge O'Malley retired from the Court.

## I

Fall Line Patents, LLC was the respondent in an inter partes review proceeding that resulted in a final written decision by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board finding claims 16–19, 21 and 22 of U.S. Patent No. 9,454,748 B2 unpatentable. Fall Line appealed that decision to this Court, and, on July 28, 2020, we issued a nonprecedential decision that rejected Fall Line’s real-party-in-interest challenge as unreviewable under 35 U.S.C. § 314(d) but vacated and remanded in view of our then-binding precedent in *Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.*, 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019). *Fall Line Pats., LLC v. Unified Pats., LLC*, 818 F. App’x 1014 (Fed. Cir. 2020). Following the Supreme Court’s decision in *United States v. Arthrex, Inc.*, 141 S. Ct. 1970 (2021), the Supreme Court granted certiorari and vacated our decision in this case. *Iancu v. Fall Line Pats., LLC*, 141 S. Ct. 2843 (2021).

We then entered an order remanding the case to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office for the limited purpose of allowing Fall Line the opportunity to request Director rehearing, which Fall Line did. The offices of Director and Deputy Director were vacant at the time, however, and so the responsibility of addressing Fall Line’s request fell to the Commissioner of Patents, Andrew Hirshfeld. Commissioner Hirshfeld ultimately denied the rehearing request.

We then reinstated the appeal and granted Fall Line’s request for supplemental briefing to address whether Commissioner Hirshfeld had the requisite authority to act on the request for further review. Fall Line argued that he did not, and that his exercise of the Director’s authority violated the Appointments Clause and the Federal Vacancies Reform Act (FVRA). *See* Appellant’s Second Supplemental Brief at 2–4.

After Fall Line submitted its supplemental brief, we held in *Arthrex Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc. (Arthrex II)* that (1) “the Commissioner’s exercise of the Director’s

authority while that office was vacant did not violate the Appointments Clause,” and (2) “the Commissioner’s order denying Arthrex’s rehearing request on the Director’s behalf did not violate the FVRA.” 35 F.4th 1328, 1335, 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2022). Furthermore, we explained how “the Patent Act broadly empowers the President, acting through the Director, to delegate the Director’s duties as he sees fit.” *Id.* at 1335. In light of that decision, we issued an order directing Fall Line to “show cause . . . as to why we should not summarily affirm in light of *Arthrex [II]*.” ECF No. 124 at 2.

Fall Line submits that it has an additional argument—not considered by us in *Arthrex II*—as to why delegation to Commissioner Hirshfeld was improper. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(4)(A).

## II

Fall Line argues “that the Patent Act does not authorize delegations *to the commissioners*,” even if the Act authorizes delegations to other inferior officers. Appellant’s Response to Show Cause Order at 1 (emphasis in original) (citing Appellant’s Second Supplemental Reply Brief at 3–5). This argument is premised on the language of 35 U.S.C. § 3(b)(3), which allows the Director to appoint officers and employees to the agency (under § 3(b)(3)(A)) and delegate duties to them (under § 3(b)(3)(B)). *See* 35 U.S.C. § 3(b)(3) (“The Director shall . . . appoint such officers . . . as the Director considers necessary to carry out the functions of the Office, . . . and delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Office as the Director may determine.”).

The office of the Commissioner, however, is established by 35 U.S.C. § 3(b)(2). *See* 35 U.S.C. § 3(b)(2)(A) (“The Secretary of Commerce shall appoint a Commissioner for Patents . . .”). Fall Line argues that because the office of Commissioner is created by § 3(b)(2)—as opposed to § 3(b)(3)—the delegation authority found in “[§] 3(b)(3) does not apply to Commissioner Hirshfeld at all[.]”

Appellant’s Second Supplemental Reply Brief at 4. *See also id.* (“[C]ommissioners are uniquely **not** authorized to perform the duties of the Director.” (emphasis in original)).

We disagree with Fall Line’s argument for two reasons. *First*, we held in *Arthrex II* that the Patent Act—specifically 35 U.S.C. § 3(b)(3)(B)—authorized the delegation of the Director’s duties to the Commissioner:

Congress *did* authorize the President to select the Commissioner to temporarily perform the Director’s duties. That is because the Patent Act broadly empowers the President, acting through the Director, to delegate the Director’s duties as he sees fit. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 3(b)(3)(B) (“The Director shall . . . delegate to [officers and employees] such of the powers vested in the Office as the Director may determine.”); Patent and Trademark Office Efficiency Act, Pub. L. No. 106-113, § 4745, 113 Stat. 1501, 1501A-587 (1999) (codified at 35 U.S.C. § 1 note) (The Director “may delegate any of [his] functions . . . to such officers and employees . . . as [he] may designate.”).

...

The Patent Act bestows upon the Director a general power to delegate “such of the powers vested in the [PTO] as the Director may determine.” 35 U.S.C. § 3(b)(3)(B). There is nothing in the Patent Act indicating that the Director may not delegate this rehearing request review function.

*Arthrex II*, 35 F.4th at 1334–35, 1338 (all emphases and alterations in original). Our determination that § 3(b)(3) authorized the delegation to the Commissioner forecloses Fall Line’s argument to the contrary. *Deckers Corp. v. United States*, 752 F.3d 949, 959 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (“In this Circuit, a later panel is bound by the determinations of a

# 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.