In the Supreme Court of the United States

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Petitioner,

v.

ARTHREX, INC. ET AL., Respondents.

SMITH & NEPHEW, INC., ET AL., Petitioners,

V.

ARTHREX, INC., ET AL., Respondents.

ARTHREX, INC., Petitioner,

v.

SMITH & NEPHEW, INC., ET AL., Respondents.

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

BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE, AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW ASSOCIATION, IN SUPPORT OF REVERSAL

PATRICK J. COYNE

PRESIDENT-ELECT

AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL

PROPERTY LAW ASSOCIATION

1400 CRYSTAL DRIVE, SUITE 600

ARLINGTON, VA 22202

(703) 415-0780

SOPHIE F. WANG

COUNSEL OF RECORD

BRYANA T. McGILLYCUDDY
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110
(617) 248-5000
SWANG@CHOATE.COM

DECEMBER 2, 2020

COUNSEL FOR AMICUS CURIAE



i

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIESii
INTEREST OF THE AMICUS CURIAE1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT2
ARGUMENT4
I. CONGRESS INTENDED THAT APJS BE INFERIOR OFFICERS UNDER THE APPOINTMENTS CLAUSE TO MAINTAIN THE BALANCE BETWEEN EFFICIENCY AND POLITICAL ACCOUNTABILITY 4
II. THE TOTALITY OF CIRCUMSTANCES SUPPORTS FINDING THAT APJS ARE INFERIOR OFFICERS BECAUSE THEY ARE DIRECTED AND SUPERVISED AT SOME LEVEL BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE USPTO
A. Edmond Supports a Flexible Approach to Appointments Clause Cases10
B. The Federal Circuit's Three-Factor Test Does Not Take into Consideration All Relevant Facts
C. The Director's Lack of "Unfettered" Review and Removal Power Does Not Outweigh His Substantial Direction and Supervision over APJs
III. A FINDING OF CONSTITUTIONALITY WILL MOOT THE QUESTION OF REMEDY AND MINIMIZE DISRUPTION TO THE PATENT SYSTEM25
CONCLUSION 32



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page
CASES
Apotex Inc. v. Amgen Inc., IPR2016-01542, Paper 60 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 15, 2018)26
Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc., 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019)passim
Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S. 1 (1976)
Edmond v. United States, 520 U.S. 651 (1997)passim
Ex parte Hennen, 38 U.S. 230 (1839) 5, 7, 9
Ex parte McAward, 2015-006416 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 25, 2017)
Ex parte Mewherter, 2012-007692 (P.T.A.B. May 8, 2013)23
Ex parte Siebold, 100 U.S. 371 (1879)6
Free Enter. Fund. v. Pub. Co. Accounting Oversight Bd., 561 U.S. 477 (2010)6, 9
Freytag v. Commissioner, 501 U.S. 868 (1991)
Go-Bart Importing Co. v. United States, 282 U.S. 344 (1931)
Hulu, LLC v. Sound View Innovations, LLC, IPR2018-01039, Paper 29
(P.T.A.B. Dec. 20, 2019)23



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued Page In re Alappat, 33 F. 3d 1526 (Fed. Cir. 1994)8 In re Boloro Global. No. 19-2349 (Fed. Cir. July 7, 2020)28 In re JHO Intell. Prop. Holdings, LLC, No. 19-2330 (Fed. Cir. June 18, 2020)28 In re Sealed Case, 838 F.2d 476 (D.C. Cir. 1988)6 Intercollegiate Broad. Sys. v. Copyright Royalty Bd., 684 F.3d 1332 (D.C. Cir. 2012) 18, 22 Lectrosonics, Inc. v. Zaxcom, Inc., IPR2018-01129, Paper 33 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 24, 2020).....23 Lucia v. SEC, Luoma v. GT Water Prods., Inc., No. 19-2315 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 17, 2020)......28 Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. v. Pfizer Inc., IPR2017-02131, Paper 59 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 13, 2019)26 Moderna Therapeutics, Inc. v. Protiva Biotherapeutics, Inc., IPR2018-00680, Paper 46 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 10, 2019)......26 Morrison v. Olson, 487 U.S. 654 (1988)passim Myers v. United States,



iv

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued	Dama
	Page
NLRB v. SW Gen. Inc., 137 S.Ct. 929 (2017)	15
Piano Factory Grp., Inc. v. Schiedmayer Celesta GmbH, No. 20-1196 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 26, 2020)	29
SAS Institute Inc. v. Iancu, 138 S.Ct. 1348 (2018)	23, 24
Soler-Somohano v. Coca-Cola Co., No. 19-2414 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 19, 2019)	29
United States v. Eaton, 169 U.S. 331 (1898)	5, 7, 9
United States v. Germaine, 99 U.S. 508 (1878)	5
United States v. Wilson, 6 M.J. 214 (C.M.A. 1979)	15
VirnetX Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc., 958 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	28
VirnetX Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc., No. 19-1671 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 24, 2020)	28
Weiss v. United States, 510 U.S. 163 (1994)	9
Westlake Servs., LLC v. Credit Acceptance Corp., CBM2014-00176, Paper 28 (P.T.A.B. May 14, 2015)	23
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS	
U.S. Const. Art. II, § 2, cl. 2	4



DOCKET

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.

