

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

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Petitioner,

v.

ARTHREX, INC., ET AL.,

Respondents.

**On Writs Of Certiorari To The
United States Court Of Appeals
For The Federal Circuit**

**BRIEF FOR AMICUS CURIAE NISKANEN CENTER
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

DAVID BOOKBINDER
NISKANEN CENTER
820 First Street, NE
Suite 675
Washington, DC 20002
301-751-0611
dbookbinder@niskanencenter.org

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae
Niskanen Center*

December 2, 2020

COCKLE LEGAL BRIEFS (800) 225-6964
WWW.COCKLELEGALBRIEFS.COM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	4
ARGUMENT	7
I. A PATENT IS A PUBLIC RIGHT, NOT PRIVATE PROPERTY	7
II. THE PTAB IS AN ESSENTIAL PART OF THE U.S. PATENT SYSTEM.....	11
A. Patent Examiners Make Mistakes	12
B. The PTAB is an Economically Efficient Means of Eliminating Bad Patents	14
1. The PTAB Saves Millions of Dollars in Litigation Costs	14
2. The PTAB is a Useful Tool Against Anticompetitive Patent Trolling.....	17
CONCLUSION.....	19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>Brown v. Duchense</i> , 60 U.S. 183 (1856)	10
<i>Ebay Inc. et al. v. Mercexchange, L.L.C.</i> , 547 U.S. 388 (2006)	18
<i>Gayler v. Wilder</i> , 51 U.S. 477 (1850)	10
<i>Oil States Energy Services, LLC v. Greene’s En- ergy Group, LLC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1365 (2018)	2, 3, 10
<i>Overstock.Com, Inc. v. Furnace Brook, LLC</i> , 420 F.Supp.2d 1217 (D. Ut. 2005)	6
<i>SAS Institute v. Iancu</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2020)	5, 12
<i>Thompson v. Haight</i> , 23 F. Cas. 1040 (Cir. Ct. SDNY, 1826)	12
<i>Thryv, Inc. v. Click-to-Call Technologies</i> , 140 S. Ct. 1367 (2020)	4, 12, 19
<i>United States v. Bell Telephone</i> , 128 U.S. 315 (1888)	9
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS	
U.S. Const., Art. I, § 8	7
STATUTES AND RULES	
35 U.S.C. 261	3, 7
35 U.S.C. 311(b)	11
35 U.S.C. 316(a)(11)	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page
Sup. Ct. R. 37.2(a)	1
Sup. Ct. R. 37.6	1
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
Anne S. Layne-Farrar, “The Cost of Doubling Up: An Economic Assessment of Duplication in PTAB Proceedings and Patent Infringement Litigation”, <i>Landslide</i> , Vol. 10, No. 5, p. 1 (2018).....	14, 15
Caleb Nelson, “Adjudication in the Political Branches,” 107 <i>Columbia Law Review</i> , p. 559 (2007).....	8
Daniel Takash & Brink Lindsey, “Why Intellectual Property is a Misnomer”, Niskanen Center, September 2019	5
Executive Office of the President, “Patent Assertion and U.S. Innovation,” June 2013	18
Federal Trade Commission, “Patent Assertion Entity Activity,” October 2016	18
Harold Demsetz, “Toward a Theory of Property Rights,” <i>The American Economic Review</i> , Vol. 57, No. 2, p. 359 (1967).....	8
James Bessen and Michael J. Meurer, “The Direct Costs From NPE Disputes,” <i>Cornell Law Review</i> , Vol. 99, p. 387 (2014).....	17
James Madison, “Detached Memoranda,” c.a. 31 January 1820, National Archives	8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page
Josh Landau, “Inter Partes Review: Five Years, Over \$2 Billion Saved,” <i>Patent Progress</i> , September 14, 2017	15
Mark A. Lemley and A. Douglas Melamed, “Missing the Forest for the Trolls,” 113 <i>Columbia Law Review</i> , p. 2117 (2013)	17, 18
Matthew G. Sipe, “Experts, Generalists, Laypeople—and The Federal Circuit,” <i>Harvard Journal of Law & Technology</i> , Vol. 32, No. 2, p. 575 (2019)	16, 17
Michael D. Frakes & Melissa F. Wasserman, “Irrational Ignorance at the Patent Office,” <i>Vanderbilt Law Rev.</i> , Vol. 72, No. 3, p. 1002 (2019)	13
Michael D. Frakes and Melissa F. Wasserman, “Is the Time Allocated to Review Patent Applications Inducing Examiners to Grant Invalid Patents? Evidence from Micro-Level Application Data,” NBER Working Paper 20337, July 2014	13
Paul Clement, “Patent Rights v. Property” (2019)	9
Thomas Jefferson to Isaac McPherson, August 13, 1813	8, 11
World Intellectual Property Organization, “World Intellectual Property Indicators 2019—Patents”	12
United States Patent and Trademark Office, “Fiscal Year 2019 Performance and Accountability Report”	12

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.