

Nos. 19-1434, 19-1452, and 19-1458

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

UNITED STATES,
Petitioner,
v.

ARTHREX, INC., ET AL.,
Respondents.

On Writs of Certiorari to the United States Court of
Appeals for the Federal Circuit

BRIEF OF CROSS-INDUSTRY GROUPS AS
AMICI CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF
PETITIONERS IN NOS. 19-1434 AND 19-1452,
AND RESPONDENTS IN NO. 19-1458

IAN HEATH GERSHENGORN
LINDSAY C. HARRISON
ELIZABETH B. DEUTSCH
JENNER & BLOCK LLP
1099 New York Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 639-6000
igershengorn@jenner.com

STEPHEN I. VLADECK
Counsel of Record
727 East Dean Keeton Street
Austin, TX 78705
(512) 475-9198
svladeck@law.utexas.edu

(For continuation of the caption, see inside cover;
for additional counsel, see signature page.)

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

19-1434

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Petitioner,

v.

ARTHREX, INC. AND POLARIS INNOVATIONS LIMITED,
Respondents.

19-1452

SMITH & NEPHEW, INC. AND ARTHROCARE CORP.,
Petitioners,

v.

ARTHREX, INC. AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Respondents.

19-1458

ARTHREX, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SMITH & NEPHEW, INC.; ARTHROCARE CORP.; AND
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Respondents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT..... 3

ARGUMENT..... 5

I. As Intended, *Inter Partes* Review Has Significantly Increased the Accuracy and Efficiency of the Patent System..... 5

 A. The America Invents Act Was Largely a Response to the Rise in Suits By Non-Practicing Entities Against End Users 6

 B. Having Administrative Patent Judges Resolve *Inter Partes* Disputes Was a Central Aspect of the 2011 Reforms..... 12

 C. The America Invents Act Has Largely Succeeded at Achieving Its Goals 15

II. The Text, Purpose, and Structure of the *Inter Partes* Regime Underscore Why Administrative Patent Judges Are “Inferior” Officers 18

 A. Congress Clearly Intended APJs to Be Inferior Executive Branch Officers 19

 B. Applying All of This Court’s Criteria, APJs Are Inferior Officers..... 21

III. Even if Administrative Patent Judges are “Principal” Officers, the Federal Circuit’s Severability Analysis is Most Faithful To Congress’s Intent..... 27

CONCLUSION 30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Barr v. American Association of Political Consultants, Inc.</i> , 140 S. Ct. 2335 (2020).....	28
<i>Bonito Boats, Inc. v. Thunder Crafts Boats, Inc.</i> , 489 U.S. 141 (1989).....	6
<i>Buckley v. Valeo</i> , 424 U.S. 1 (1976).....	25
<i>Cuozzo Speed Technologies, LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	11, 12, 13, 23
<i>Edmond v. United States</i> , 520 U.S. 651 (1997)	21, 22, 23, 27
<i>Free Enterprise Fund v. Public Co. Accounting Oversight Board</i> , 561 U.S. 477 (2010)	28
<i>Freytag v. Commissioner</i> , 501 U.S. 868 (1991)	23
<i>Intercollegiate Broadcasting System, Inc. v. Copyright Royalty Board</i> , 684 F.3d 1332 (D.C. Cir. 2012).....	26
<i>Lucia v. SEC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2044 (2018).....	18
<i>Morrison v. Olson</i> , 487 U.S. 654 (1988)	22, 23
<i>Myers v. United States</i> , 272 U.S. 52 (1926)	20
<i>Oil States Energy Services, LLC v. Greene’s Energy Group, LLC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1365 (2018)	11, 13, 23, 24, 27
<i>Polaris Innovations Ltd. v. Kingston Technology Co.</i> , 792 F. App’x 820 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	19, 20

<i>Pope Manufacturing Co. v. Gormully</i> , 144 U.S. 224 (1892).....	6
<i>Return Mail, Inc. v. United States Postal Service</i> , 139 S. Ct. 1853 (2019).....	10, 11
<i>SAS Institute, Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018)	10
<i>Seila Law LLC v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau</i> , 140 S. Ct. 2183 (2020)	28
<i>TC Heartland LLC v. Kraft Foods Group Brands LLC</i> , 137 S. Ct. 1514 (2017).....	14
<i>Thryv, Inc. v. Click-to-Call Technologies, LP</i> , 140 S. Ct. 1367 (2020)	10, 13, 24

STATUTES

28 U.S.C. § 44(a).....	14
35 U.S.C. § 6(a).....	11, 12, 19
Act of Aug. 12, 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-313, § 1(a), 122 Stat. 3014, 3014.....	19
Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, Pub. L. No. 112-29, 125 Stat. 284 (2011)	3

LEGISLATIVE MATERIALS

<i>Abusive Patent Litigation: The Impact on American Innovation and Jobs, and Potential Solutions: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet of the H. Comm. on the Judiciary</i> , 113th Cong. (2013)	9
---	---

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.