

# THE SCOTUS YEAR IN REVIEW FOR IP

Penny Slicer  
May 19, 2014



STINSON  
LEONARD  
STREET

# Patent Exhaustion

***Vernon Hugh Bowman v. Monsanto,***  
133 S.Ct. 1761 (May 13, 2013)

- Exhaustion doctrine does not permit purchaser to make new copies of patented item.
- Harvesting new soybeans constitutes infringement.
- “Blame the bean” defense rejected.



# Patent Eligibility for Isolated DNA and cDNA (35 U.S.C. §101)

***Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics***, 133 S.Ct. 2107 (June 13, 2013)

- A naturally occurring segment of DNA is not patent eligible by virtue of its isolation from the rest of the human genome.
- cDNA is not naturally occurring even though the order of the exons may be dictated by nature.



# Reverse Payment Settlements in Patent Cases

***Federal Trade Commission v. Actavis***,  
133 S.Ct. 2223 (June 17, 2013)

- Reverse payment settlements can violate the antitrust laws even if anticompetitive effects fall within the scope of the exclusionary potential of the patent.
- A "large and unjustified" reverse payment can bring with it the risk of significant anticompetitive effects that are not immune to antitrust liability.



# Burden of Proof for Patent Infringement

***Medtronic v. Mirowski Family Ventures,***  
134 S.Ct. 843 (Jan. 22, 2014)

- DJ action for non-infringement by licensee is "action arising under an act of Congress relating to patents" such that subject matter jurisdiction is present.
- The burden of proving infringement rests with the patentee even in the limited circumstance when an infringer is foreclosed by a patentee is foreclosed by the continued existence of a license.



# Exceptional Case Attorneys' Fees Award (35 U.S.C. §285)

***Octane Fitness v. Icon Health & Fitness***,  
2014 U.S. LEXIS 2107 (April 29, 2014)

- An "exceptional" case is "simply one that stands out from others with respect to the substantive strength of a party's litigating position ... or the unreasonable manner in which the case was litigated."
- District courts are to consider the totality of the circumstances based on a preponderance of the evidence standard.



# Standard of Review for Exceptional Case Finding (35 U.S.C. §285)

*Highmark Inc. v. Allcare Health Management System*, 2014 U.S. LEXIS 3106 (April 29, 2014)

- §285 commits the determination of whether a case is exceptional to the discretion of the district court.
- The Federal Circuit should have reviewed the district court's §285 determination under a deferential abuse-of-discretion standard.



# Patent Eligibility for Computer Implemented Inventions (35 U.S.C. §101)

*Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Intern.*, (Oral Argmt. March 31, 2014)

- **Question Presented:** Whether claims to computer-implemented inventions — including claims to systems and machines, processes and items of manufacture — are directed to patent-eligible subject matter within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101 as interpreted by this Court?





# Induced Patent Infringement (35 U.S.C. §271(b))

*Limelight Networks v. Akamai Technologies*, (Oral Argmt. April 30, 2014)

- **Question Presented:** Whether the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit erred in holding that a defendant may be held liable for inducing patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. §271(b) even though no one has committed direct infringement under Section 271(a)?



# Indefiniteness (35 U.S.C. §112)

***Nautilus v. Biosig Instruments***, (Oral Argmt.  
April 28, 2014)

- **Questions Presented:**
- Does the Federal Circuit's acceptance of ambiguous patent claims with multiple reasonable interpretations - so long as the ambiguity is not "insoluble" by a court - defeat the statutory requirement of particular and distinct patent claiming?
- Does the presumption of validity dilute the requirement of particular and distinct patent claiming?



# Standard of Review for Claim Construction

*Teva Pharm. USA v. Sandoz*, (Cert. granted April 18, 2014)

- **Question Presented:** Whether a district court's factual finding in support of its construction of a patent claim term may be reviewed *de novo*, as the Federal Circuit requires (and as the panel explicitly did in this case), or only for clear error, as Rule 52(a) requires.



# Standing for Trademark Invalidity Claim

***Already dba Yums, v. Nike***, 133 S.Ct. 721 (Jan. 9, 2013)

- Broad covenant not to sue can moot DJ claim if party originally asserting infringement meets burden of showing that it could not reasonably be expected to resume its enforcement efforts.



# “Standing” for False Advertising Claim (15 U.S.C. §1125(a))

*Lexmark International v. Static Control  
Components*, 134 S.Ct. 1377 (March 25,  
2014)

- The zone of interests test and proximate-cause requirement should be applied to determine if plaintiff has a cause of action.
- Cause of action for false advertising requires injury to a commercial interest in sales or business reputation proximately caused by the defendant.



# FDCA Preemption Of Trademark Infringement Claim

*Pom Wonderful v. The Coca-Cola Company*, (Oral Argmt. April 21, 2014)

- **Question Presented:** Whether the court of appeals erred in holding that a private party cannot bring a Lanham Act claim challenging a product label regulated under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.



# Laches Defense in Continuing Copyright Infringement Action

***Petrella v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer*** (Oral  
Argmt. Jan. 21, 2014)

- **Question Presented:** Is the non-statutory defense of laches available without restriction to bar all remedies for civil copyright claims filed within the three-year statute of limitations prescribed by Congress, 17 U.S.C. § 507(b)?



# Copyright Infringement by Public Performance

***American Broadcasting Companies v. Aereo***, (Oral Argmt. April 22, 2014)

- **Question Presented:** Whether a company "publicly performs" a copyrighted television program when it retransmits a broadcast of that program to thousands of paid subscribers over the Internet.

