

No. 19-832

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

APPLE INC.,

*Petitioner,*

*v.*

VIRNETX INC., LEIDOS, INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

**REPLY BRIEF FOR PETITIONER**

---

Mark S. Davies  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON &  
SUTCLIFFE LLP  
1152 15th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005

William F. Lee  
Mark C. Fleming  
Lauren B. Fletcher  
WILMER CUTLER  
PICKERING HALE AND  
DORR LLP  
60 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109

E. Joshua Rosenkranz  
*Counsel of Record*  
Jennifer Keighley  
Alexandra Bursak  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON &  
SUTCLIFFE LLP  
51 West 52nd Street  
New York, NY 10019  
(212) 506-5000  
jrosenkranz@orrick.com

Sachi Schuricht  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON &  
SUTCLIFFE LLP  
405 Howard Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105

*Counsel for Petitioner*

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
I. The Federal Circuit’s Settled Position That Apportionment Of Damages Is Not Required In Prior License Cases Warrants This Court’s Review.....	1
A. The Federal Circuit no longer requires apportionment in prior license cases.....	2
B. This case presents the important question of whether apportionment is required in prior license cases. ....	8
II. Certiorari Should Also Be Granted On The Impact Of Intervening PTO Invalidations On Pending Infringement Actions .....	10
CONCLUSION .....	13

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>B &amp; B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus., Inc.</i> , 575 U.S. 138 (2015).....	11
<i>City of Madison, Joint Sch. Dist. No. 8 v. Wis. Emp't Relations Comm'n</i> , 429 U.S. 167 (1976).....	2
<i>Commonwealth Sci. &amp; Indus. Research Org. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 809 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	2, 3, 4
<i>Dowagiac Mfg. Co. v. Minn. Moline Plow Co.</i> , 235 U.S. 641 (1915).....	1, 7, 8
<i>Elbit Sys. Land &amp; C4I Ltd. v. Hughes Network Sys., LLC</i> , 927 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	5
<i>Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	6
<i>Garretson v. Clark</i> , 111 U.S. 120 (1884).....	1, 8
<i>Nelson v. Adams USA, Inc.</i> , 529 U.S. 460 (2000).....	9

<i>Nestle USA, Inc. v. Steuben Foods, Inc.</i> , 884 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	11
<i>Ohio Willow Wood Co. v. Alps S., LLC</i> , 735 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	11
<i>Prism Techs. LLC v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.</i> , 849 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	7
<i>Sprint Commc'ns Co. v. Time Warner Cable, Inc.</i> , 760 F. App'x 977 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	5, 6
<i>VirnetX Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 931 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	11, 12
<i>VirnetX Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 776 F. App'x 698 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	11
<i>XY, LLC v. Trans Ova Genetics, L.C.</i> , 890 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	11, 12
<i>Yee v. City of Escondido</i> , 503 U.S. 519 (1992).....	10
<b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 316(a) (2006) .....	11

## REPLY

### **I. The Federal Circuit's Settled Position That Apportionment Of Damages Is Not Required In Prior License Cases Warrants This Court's Review.**

This Court long ago held that patent damages must reflect the value of the patented invention in “every case.” *Garretson v. Clark*, 111 U.S. 120, 121 (1884). As the petition (at 18-21, 31-34), amicus briefs supporting Apple, and academic articles (Pet.20, 31-32 & n.2) explain, *Garretson* reflects a foundational precept of an economically sound patent system. But over the past five years, the Federal Circuit has created a gaping loophole that facilitates massive damages in patent cases where the damages claims are based on prior licenses, regardless of whether those licenses reflect the invention's contribution to the end-product. Pet.18-31.

The Court has not needed to examine apportionment of patent damages in over one hundred years, *see Dowagiac Mfg. Co. v. Minn. Moline Plow Co.*, 235 U.S. 641 (1915), since, until relatively recently, the lower courts have been faithful to *Garretson's* command. Yet by soliciting the Solicitor General's views in a closely related apportionment case just a few terms ago (Pet.19), the Court has already recognized the importance of reviewing the Federal Circuit's current caselaw in this area. And with the Federal Circuit now using its Rule 36 procedures to reject challenges to its apportionment methodology, parties will soon stop complaining about the practice. Now is

# 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.