

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 OF UNIFIED PATENTS, LLC  
AS *AMICUS CURIAE*  
IN SUPPORT OF NO PARTY AND  
IN SUPPORT OF REVERSAL

---

KEVIN JAKEL  
SHAWN AMBWANI  
JONATHAN STROUD

WILLIAM G. JENKS  
*Counsel of Record*

UNIFIED PATENTS LLC  
1875 Connecticut Ave., NW  
Floor 10  
Washington, DC 20009

JENKS IP LAW PLLC  
1629 K ST., NW  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
wjenks@jenksiplaw.com  
(202) 412-7964

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

---

---

(For Continuation of Caption, See Inside Cover)

---

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

v.

ARTHREX, INC., *ET AL.*,  
*Respondents.*

---

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

v.

ARTHREX, INC., *ET AL.*,  
*Respondents.*

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTERESTS OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
STATEMENT .....	3
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	5
ARGUMENT .....	7
I. APJs ARE NOT PRINCIPAL OFFICERS.....	8
A. Patent Trial And Appeal Board— Members .....	8
B. Patent Trial And Appeal Board— Duties .....	10
C. The Director Exercises Sufficient Control Over Inter Partes Review To Render APJs Inferior Officers.....	13
II. IF APJs ARE PRINCIPAL OFFICERS, THE COURT OF APPEALS CURE WAS EXCESSIVE .....	19
A. This Court Could Sever The Statutory Requirement That The Director “Shall” Issue A Certificate Following Every Final Written Decision .....	21
B. This Court Could Sever The Statutory Requirement That Three Judges Sit On Every Inter Partes Review Panel.....	23
C. This Court Could Sever Just The Statutory Protections Afforded The PTAB’s Executive Members .....	25
CONCLUSION .....	28

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 953 F.3d 760 (Fed. Cir. 2020) .....	8
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010) .....	10
<i>Crowell v. Benson</i> , 285 U.S. 22 (1932) .....	5
<i>Dickinson v. Zurko</i> , 527 U.S. 150 (1999) .....	22
<i>Free Enter. Fund v. Pub. Co. Accounting Oversight Bd.</i> , 561 U.S. 477 (2010) .....	19
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966) .....	8
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	5
<i>Lab. Corp. of Am. Holdings v. Metabolite Labs., Inc.</i> , 548 U.S. 124 (2006) .....	3
<i>Lear, Inc. v. Adkins</i> , 395 U.S. 653 (1969) .....	2
<i>McCormick Harvesting Mach. Co. v. C. Aultman &amp; Co.</i> , 169 U.S. 606 (1898) .....	22
<i>Motion Picture Patents Co. v. Universal Film Mfg. Co.</i> , 243 U.S. 502 (1917) .....	3
<i>Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v. Greene's Energy Grp., LLC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1365 (2018) .....	4, 12
<i>Pope Mfg. Co. v. Gormully</i> , 144 U.S. 224 (1892) .....	3
<i>Quanta Computer, Inc. v. LG Electronics, Inc.</i> , 553 U.S. 617 (2008) .....	3
<i>SAS Inst., Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018) .....	2

### Constitutional Provisions

Art. I, § 8, cl. 8 .....	3
--------------------------	---

### Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 134(a) .....	11
35 U.S.C. § 141(a) .....	11

35 U.S.C. § 151(a)	11
35 U.S.C. § 151(b)	11
35 U.S.C. § 2(b)(2)(A)	16
35 U.S.C. § 3(a)(2)(A)	22
35 U.S.C. § 3(a)(4)	8
35 U.S.C. § 3(b)	8
35 U.S.C. § 3(b)(2)(C)	8
35 U.S.C. § 3(b)(3)	9
35 U.S.C. § 3(b)(3)(A),(B)	16
35 U.S.C. § 3(b)(6)	9
35 U.S.C. § 3(c)	9
35 U.S.C. § 3(c) (2000)	23
35 U.S.C. § 311(a)	2
35 U.S.C. § 314(b)	16
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11)	17
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(4)	16
35 U.S.C. § 316(b)	16
35 U.S.C. § 318(b)	13, 21
35 U.S.C. § 318(c)	22
35 U.S.C. § 6(a)	8, 9
35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2010)	24
35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2012)	24
35 U.S.C. § 6(b)(1)	10
35 U.S.C. § 6(b)(4)	12
35 U.S.C. § 6(c)	14, 24

### Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 1.183	21
37 C.F.R. § 1.313 (a), (b)	11, 21
37 C.F.R. § 41.2	15, 24
37 C.F.R. § 42.107	16
37 C.F.R. § 42.80	21

### Other Authorities

Appeal and Interference statistics, Sep.  
2020 at 5, 7 *available at*

# 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.