

SECOND EDITION

PATENT-RELATED  
MISCONDUCT  
ISSUES IN U.S.  
LITIGATION

JOEL DAVIDOW  
JAMES TOUPIN

# Patent-Related Misconduct Issues in U.S. Litigation

---

Second Edition

Joel Davidow and James Toupin

2013

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:

Matt Gallaway at ..... (908) 464-6800  
Email: ..... matt.gallaway@lexisnexis.com

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at ..... (800) 833-9844  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3000  
Fax Number ..... (518) 487-3584  
Customer Service Web site ..... <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>  
For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or ..... (800) 223-1940  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3000

Library of Congress Card Number: 99-67220

ISBN: 9780769869230 (print)  
ISBN: 9780769877105 (eBook)  
ISSN: 2328-1952 (Print)  
ISSN: 2328-1960 (Online)

Cite this publication as:

Joel Davidow and James Toupin, Patent-Related Misconduct Issues in U.S. Litigation (Second Edition) § [sec. no.] (Matthew Bender)

Example:

Joel Davidow and James Toupin, Patent-Related Misconduct Issues in U.S. Litigation (Second Edition) § 6[A][1] (Matthew Bender)

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. Matthew Bender and the Matthew Bender Flame Design are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2013 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. Originally published in: 2013

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Offices  
121 Chanlon Rd., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800  
201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200  
[www.lexisnexis.com](http://www.lexisnexis.com)

MATTHEW  BENDER

# Table of Contents

## Introduction

---

<b>Part I</b>	<b>Conduct Issues Arising Out of Incorrect Preparation or Prosecution of Patent Applications</b>
---------------	--

---

<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	<b>INVENTORSHIP AND PRE-FILING USE OF THE INVENTION</b>
------------------	---

---

§ 1.01	Scope
§ 1.02	Improper Conduct as to Inventorship
§ 1.03	Pre-Filing Use of an Invention
[1]	Introduction
[2]	Prior Use and on Sale Bars Under Pre-AIA Law
[3]	Post-AIA Law on Pre-filing Disclosures of the Invention
[4]	Prior User Defense and Good Faith

---

<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	<b>INADEQUATE DISCLOSURE OF THE INVENTION</b>
------------------	---

---

§ 2.01	Scope
§ 2.02	Lack of Description
§ 2.03	Lack of Enablement
§ 2.04	Failure to Disclose (or Concealment of) the Best Mode for Achieving the Invention

---

<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	<b>MISCONDUCT IN PATENT APPLICATION PROSECUTION</b>
------------------	---

---

§ 3.01	Scope
§ 3.02	Inequitable Conduct
[1]	Introduction
[2]	Pleading
[3]	The Duty of Candor and who Owes it
[4]	Knowledge and Specific Intent
[5]	Materiality
[a]	Affirmative Misrepresentations Found
	Material—Scientific Showings to Support Patentability
[b]	Affirmative Statements Found to Be
	Material—Procedural Matters

---

## *Table of Contents*

[c]	Cumulative References
[6]	Adequacy of Disclosure
[a]	Translation
[b]	Burying References
[7]	Balancing the Equities
[8]	Extent of the Equitable Remedy
[9]	The Opportunity for Cure and the America Invents Act
[10]	The Scope of the Unenforceability Remedy and the America Invents Act
§ 3.03	The Relationship between Inequitable Conduct and Unclean Hands
§ 3.04	Prosecution Laches
<b>CHAPTER 4</b>	<b>RELEVANT PROCEDURAL ISSUES</b>
§ 4.01	Attorney-Client Privilege
§ 4.02	Inventorship Is a Triable Issue of Fact but Correction Is Possible
§ 4.03	Summary Judgment Is Sometimes Feasible
§ 4.04	Inequitable Conduct Is an Issue for the Judge, Sitting as an Equity Court, but the Jury May Be Assigned an Advisory Role
§ 4.05	Jury Trial Is Required for Overlapping Equitable and Non-Equitable Issues
<b>CHAPTER 5</b>	<b>STRATEGIES IN LITIGATING PTO CONDUCT DEFENSES</b>
§ 5.01	Strategies Regarding Inventor Evidence
§ 5.02	Inequitable Conduct Discovery
[1]	Prior Art Search
[2]	Discovery of the Patent Prosecution Attorney, Including One Who is Plaintiff's Trial Counsel
§ 5.03	Pleading Inequitable Conduct: Rule 9(b)
§ 5.04	Summary Judgment

---

## *Table of Contents*

---

<b>Part II</b>	<b>Patent Litigation Misconduct</b>
<b>CHAPTER 6</b>	<b>TYPES OF LITIGATION ABUSE</b>
§ 6.01	Scope
§ 6.02	Delay or Unconscionability in Suing: Laches and Estoppel
[1]	Introduction
[2]	Statutory Laches
[3]	Equitable Laches
[4]	Equitable Estoppel/Implied License
[5]	Ambush and Unclean Hands
§ 6.03	Reckless Cases or Reckless Pleadings: Rule 11 and its Requirements
§ 6.04	Discovery Misconduct or Recalcitrance: Rule 37 Sanctions
§ 6.05	Egregious Litigation Conduct: 35 U.S.C. § 285
§ 6.06	Assessment of Fees against Attorneys Who Cause Excess Costs and Fees to the Opposing Side: 28 U.S.C. § 1927
§ 6.07	Threats by Patent Holders: Appropriate Scope of Rights
<b>CHAPTER 7</b>	<b>PROCEDURAL ISSUES IN RAISING LITIGATION MISCONDUCT ISSUES</b>
§ 7.01	Scope
§ 7.02	Laches or Estoppel Can Be Litigated at the Outset
§ 7.03	Section 285 Award's Burden of Proof
§ 7.04	The Relationship between Rule 37 and Section 285
[1]	Introduction
[2]	Sanctions for Frivolous Patent Appeals
§ 7.05	Compensable Items
<b>CHAPTER 8</b>	<b>LITIGATION STRATEGIES</b>
§ 8.01	Filing Rule 11 Motion Promptly
§ 8.02	Discovery of Plaintiff to Probe Basis for the Case

---

## *Table of Contents*

---

### **Part III                      Patent Misuse and Antitrust Misconduct**

---

#### **CHAPTER 9                      MISUSE DEFENSES—SUBSTANTIVE STANDARDS**

---

§ 9.01	Scope
§ 9.02	History of the Misuse Defense
§ 9.03	Clauses Leading to Misuse Contentions
[1]	Introduction
[2]	Tie-In Clauses
[3]	Tie-Out Clauses
[4]	Price Clauses
[5]	Post-Expiration Royalties
[6]	Grantback Clauses
[7]	No-challenge Clauses
[8]	Settlements
[9]	Acquisition of Competing Technologies
[10]	Mismarking
§ 9.04	Clauses That Will Seldom Engender Misuse or Antitrust Conclusions
[1]	High Royalties
[2]	Discriminatory Royalties
[3]	Field of Use Restrictions
[4]	Geographic Restrictions
[5]	Export Restrictions
[6]	Quantity Restrictions
[7]	Nonexclusive Grantback Clauses
[8]	Packages of Patents
[9]	Royalties on Unpatented or Unused Products
§ 9.05	Horizontal Antitrust Offenses and Misuse Defenses
§ 9.06	Relevance of the Antitrust Guidelines

---

#### **CHAPTER 10                      ANTITRUST COUNTERCLAIMS**

---

§ 10.01	Scope
§ 10.02	Patentee's Cartel Conduct
[1]	Introduction
[2]	Sham Cross-Licenses or Settlements
[a]	Pharmaceutical Settlements
[3]	Anticompetitive Patent Pooling

---

## Table of Contents

[a]	DOJ Clearances for MPEG-2 and DVD Pools
[4]	Boycotts
§ 10.03	Patentee's Single Firm Abuses (Attempt to Monopolize or Monopoly Maintenance)
[1]	Introduction
[2]	Elements of Monopoly Offenses
[3]	<i>Walker Process</i> Claims
[4]	<i>Handgards</i> Claims
§ 10.04	Abuse of the Standard-Making Process
§ 10.05	Antitrust Claims against Accused or Potential Infringers
§ 10.06	Rico Claims or Counterclaims

---

<b>CHAPTER 11</b>	<b>PROCEDURAL ISSUES IN LITIGATION OF PATENT ANTITRUST ISSUES</b>
-------------------	---

---

§ 11.01	Scope
§ 11.02	Standing
§ 11.03	Compulsory Counterclaim
§ 11.04	Relevancy of Rule 9(b)
§ 11.05	Bifurcation/Role of Judge and Jury
[1]	Bifurcation of Trials
[2]	Advisory Jury
[3]	Dismissal of Counterclaims and Defenses
[4]	Jurisdiction
§ 11.06	Choice of Law
§ 11.07	Remedies

---

<b>CHAPTER 12</b>	<b>LITIGATION STRATEGY</b>
-------------------	----------------------------

---

§ 12.01	In Misuse Cases
§ 12.02	As to Walker Process
§ 12.03	As to <i>Handgards</i> Cases
§ 12.04	As to Antitrust Rule of Reason Counterclaims
§ 12.05	Conclusion: General Advice
[1]	Avoid Contradictions
[2]	Avoid Being Injured By "Friendly Fire"
[3]	Use Deposition Redirect With Summary Judgment in Mind



---

# Table of Contents

## Appendices

---

Appendix A	Selected U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Rules and Policies
Appendix B	Selections from U.S. Patent Act, Title 35
Appendix C	Antitrust Guidelines for the Licensing of Intellectual Property
Bibliography	
Table of Cases	
Index	

## Introduction

- § 0.01      **Basic Issues: Infringement, Novelty**
- § 0.02      **Bad Conduct Issues**
- § 0.03      **Offensive Use of Bad Conduct Contentions**
- § 0.04      **Degrees of Fault and Their Consequences**

THIS BOOK ADDRESSES the wild cards of patent enforcement, that is, conduct issues—actions by a patent holder—that can defeat patent infringement liability or give rise to liability by the patent holder. The book encompasses not only issues of patent law but also other areas, such as antitrust claims against the patent holder and sanctions against either side in litigation.<sup>1</sup> Although the book deals primarily with defenses and counterclaims, it also covers declaratory judgment actions, standalone antitrust cases, and sanctions (fee) motions by either side.

This brief volume is intended as a survey, or guide, to the party considering patent litigation, whether as plaintiff or defendant, to the variety of conduct issues that can arise. The conduct issues described here encompass issues that can arise in patent procurement, patent-related litigation, or patent licensing. Accordingly, we intend it to be of use to, the patent prosecutor, or the business person concerned with patent licensing or deciding whether to seek patent protection. The patent professional may be familiar with issues that can give rise to invalidity or inequitable conduct claims but not be equally familiar with the misconduct issues that would concern the antitrust professional, and vice versa. The businessperson considering litigation may want an orientation to the risks that will arise in the litigation context. The book's focus is, however, on issues as they arise during court proceedings, and it assumes that the reader has the knowledge of a general litigator. As a survey, it is intended to give accurate and current legal citations but not to provide a treatise's compendium of relevant cases. The thrust of this book is practical. In addition to describing the framework of settled law, we discuss uncertainties and conflicts that we anticipate future case law will clarify. We do not, however, generally offer our own policy preferences. Since the first edition of this book, changes have been most dramatic in the statute and precedents that concern conduct issues under the Patent Act. While these changes attempt to cabin the effects of misconduct, they create new procedures and give rise to new uncertainties. We hope these pages provide a useful roadmap through the thicket.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Patent holder may refer not only to the patentee, but also to an assignee, or to an exclusive licensee authorized to enforce the patent.*

The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act of 2011 (“America Invents Act” or “AIA”) is the most comprehensive rewriting of the United States’ patent laws since 1952. Among many other changes, relevant to the topic of this book, it converts the United States’ patent law from a “first to invent” system to what has been called, with pardonable inaccuracy, a “first inventor to file” system.<sup>2</sup> The authors of the America Invents Act were clearly concerned with the costs to patentees of the conduct defenses that this book addressed in its first edition. Thus, while the Act maintains as a ground of patentability the requirement that the patent applicant disclose the best mode of practicing the invention, it eliminates the failure to disclose the best mode as an invalidity defense. The Act also institutes a new procedure for cleansing a patent of inequitable conduct that patentees will need to consider before initiating litigation. Some elements of the America Invents Act (such as the change in the law of best mode) apply to all issued patents, others only to patents issued after the effective date. The Act thus requires this book to have a dual focus both on the old law and the new.

Concurrently with this change in the statute, the exclusive court of appeals for patent cases, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, sitting en banc, reconsidered the judge-made doctrine of inequitable conduct.<sup>3</sup> Among other holdings, the court changed the law of the materiality of undisclosed information so that (at least absent egregious misconduct) information not disclosed to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office during the patent application process would not be regarded as material unless but-for its nondisclosure, the Office would not have issued the patent. Like the changes made in the Patent Act, this change in a judge made defense primarily affects Part I of this volume, the section concerned with conduct during patent procurement. However, before this change in the inequitable conduct doctrine of materiality, litigation of inequitable conduct defenses had limited relevance to antitrust claims, since under the *Walker Process* doctrine misconduct before the Patent Office gave rise to an antitrust claim only if the patent was fraudulently procured. The new but-for materiality standard for inequitable conduct brings these doctrines closer and thus requires new consideration as this volume treats antitrust issues in patent cases as well.

---

<sup>2</sup> See H. Rep. 112-98, at 40, 64 (2011); AIA, §§ 3(0), (p), 125 Stat. 293 (sense of Congress to adopt first inventor to file system; *See also, e.g., Brookings Policy Brief #184* September 2011). <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2011/09/patents-villasenor> (as of May 25, 2011) (discussing exceptions to first inventor to file principle).

<sup>3</sup> *Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson and Co.*, 649 F.3d 1276 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (en banc).

### § 0.01 Basic Issues: Infringement, Novelty

The basic defense in patent infringement litigation is noninfringement, that is, the asserted patent claims, properly construed, do not read on the accused product or process. As to this issue, the plaintiff has the burden of proof, by a preponderance of the evidence. The most common affirmative defense in such cases is that the patent is not valid, either because the invention was not novel,<sup>4</sup> was obvious,<sup>5</sup> or was otherwise unpatentable.<sup>6</sup> Invalidity defenses can involve issues of patent applicant conduct, as when the patent does not adequately disclose the invention or name the correct inventors or when the patentee's own invention becomes prior art because the applicant has exploited the invention too long before seeking patent protection. As to these issues, defendant has the burden of proof. That burden is set high ("clear and convincing evidence") because granted patents benefit from a presumption that the United States Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) acted correctly.<sup>7</sup>

### § 0.02 Bad Conduct Issues

The wild cards in patent litigation are bad conduct allegations. For a firm anticipating or facing infringement charges, establishing bad conduct by the patentee or patent holder or enforcer can accomplish two things. First, proof of laches or estoppel, inequitable conduct, or misuse will allow the defendant to prevail even though the patent may be both valid and infringed. Second, as will be discussed, allegations that the plaintiff sued on an invalid or unenforceable patent, or possessed little or no proof of infringement, will not only allow the defendant to prevail but may well shift the risks or costs of the litigation. Normally, in U. S. litigation, each side bears its own fees and costs. On the other hand, if the defendant can show that the plaintiff should have known that the patent was invalid, unenforceable, or not infringed, such defendant can go beyond the American rule and win an award of fees and costs that perhaps will even be multiplied if antitrust law is implicated. Conversely, if a clearly meritorious infringement suit is delayed and made extra costly by recalcitrance and the assertion of frivolous defenses, fees and costs may be awarded to the prevailing patent holder.

---

<sup>4</sup> 35 U.S.C. § 102.

<sup>5</sup> 35 U.S.C. § 103.

<sup>6</sup> See 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 (nonstatutory subject matter, lacks utility), and 112 (claims not enabled, claims lack written description, claims indefinite).

<sup>7</sup> 35 U.S.C. § 282(a); See *Microsoft Corp. v. I4I Limited Partnership*, 131 S.Ct. 2238 (2011).

### § 0.03 Offensive Use of Bad Conduct Contentions

A conduct *defense* can sometimes be asserted offensively, among other ways, by filing a declaratory judgment action against the patent holder alleging invalidity based on certain types of bad conduct. Doing this has been made easier by the U.S. Supreme Court's *MedImmune*<sup>8</sup> decision, which holds that a firm may take a license on a patent and still have standing to attack the patent's validity by means of a declaratory judgment action.

Also, patentee misconduct can be asserted as a basis for counterclaims or separate damage actions. Such counterclaims or such separate suits usually involve allegations of antitrust law violation but can include tort claims such as tortious interference or defamation, and on rare facts, Racketeer Influenced and Corruption Organizations Act (RICO) claims.

In sum, successful assertion of a conduct defense, claim, or counterclaim can bring three levels of reward to an accused infringer: (1) Any such defense, if successful, brings the defendant legal peace and perhaps legal security. The alleged infringement is excused and/or need not be defended; (2) In cases in which the conduct is egregiously bad, the reward for prevailing may be not only defeat of the claim but also an award of the costs of defense, including attorney's fees. Such award is usually granted under the Patent Act, 35 U.S.C. § 285. Requests for fee awards are only proper after the movant has prevailed on the merits, and thus are neither defenses nor counterclaims; (3) In cases in which the bad conduct is proved to have been aimed at the likely monopolization of the product or service market covered by the patent and its substitutes, the successful defendant is deemed to be a benefactor to the consuming public under the antitrust laws, and is awarded three times its damages, including its cost of defense, plus the fees and costs involved in asserting the antitrust claim.<sup>9</sup> Successful RICO claims would also entitle defendant to treble damages, but court rulings have made this defense difficult to invoke in patent litigation.<sup>10</sup>

### § 0.04 Degrees of Fault and Their Consequences

As will be demonstrated in subsequent chapters, the various levels of sanctions force trial judges and appellate courts to seek to define subtle gradations of fault. For instance, an unexplained failure to cite a relevant reference may be deemed so lacking in fault that no sanction is appropriate.

---

<sup>8</sup> *MedImmune v. Genentech*, 549 U.S. 118, 137 (2007).

<sup>9</sup> Clayton Act § 4.

<sup>10</sup> See Chapter 10, "E. RICO Claims or Counterclaims," *infra*.

If the omission is intentional and material to obtaining a patent, inequitable conduct may be found, leading to unenforceability and the loss of an infringement suit. Such inequitable conduct can justify a finding that the lawsuit based on that patent was recklessly brought, leading to a shifting of legal fees to the losing plaintiffs.

The courts must weigh whether the inequitable conduct caused the bringing of the infringement suit to be egregiously unwarranted. Deciding factors might be whether the crucial facts about the conduct were frankly admitted during the litigation or were elicited only due to pressure from the defendant. Lastly, it must be determined whether (1) the omission or commission amounts to the fraudulent obtaining of a market-dominating patent and thus an undeserved monopoly; or (2) the patent was used as an instrument of illegal monopolization or cartelization. Either justifies an award to an injured rival of treble damages, including defense costs, under antitrust law standards, specifically, the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

Conduct defenses comprise virtually all affirmative defenses that can be asserted by an accused infringer, except, as noted above, the defenses that the patent is invalid as anticipated or obvious. It is the thesis of this book that conduct defenses or counterclaims raise issues that, for ease of review, can be grouped into three broad categories of conduct: (1) in the patenting process, (2) during patent litigation, (3) in the licensing or exploiting of the invention. In regard to each category, this book will first set out the conduct standards and then examine procedural and evidentiary issues relating to when and how the issue can be raised and resolved. Final sections of each chapter will deal with tactics and strategy.

At the trial level, patent cases are triable in any federal district court. The aberration is that plaintiffs favor “rocket dockets” and/or districts with trial judges known for patent law expertise.<sup>11</sup> These have included the Eastern District of Virginia, the Eastern District of Texas, the District of Delaware, and the Western District of Wisconsin. However, attitudes, personnel, and practicalities change over time. Forum shopping remains important.

Patent plaintiffs can utilize the prompt procedure and broad, *in rem* relief granted to the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) by Section 337 of the Tariff Act. However, to invoke ITC remedies, patent holders must show that a domestic industry in the patented product or process exists or is in the process of coming into existence, through such actions as the patentee’s

---

<sup>11</sup> Cono A. Carrano, Cecil E. Key & Brian Su, *Rocket Dockets: Coming Soon to a Venue Near You?*, INTELL. PROP. TODAY, 10 (December 2006).

investment in plant and equipment, employment, research and development, or licensing.<sup>12</sup> Parallel ITC and district court proceedings are allowed, since the ITC cannot grant damages and the district court cannot issue injunctions against importation of classes of merchandise.<sup>13</sup> Thus, this book will discuss ITC cases and strategies.

All appeals of district court, ITC, and PTO patent rulings since 1981 are channeled by law to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (Federal Circuit).<sup>14</sup> The Federal Circuit will defer to the antitrust jurisprudence of the circuit in which a mixed patent-antitrust case originated, unless proper resolution of the issue is viewed as crucial to sound patent law and policy.<sup>15</sup>

We now examine the three types of conduct issues, in turn, in the following sections.

---

<sup>12</sup> See 19 U.S.C. § 1337(a)(2), (3), discussed in *John Mezzalingua Assocs., Inc. v. U.S. International Trade Comm'n*, 660 F.2d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2011).

<sup>13</sup> See 19 U.S.C. §§ 1337 (c), (f), (l).

<sup>14</sup> The Supreme Court in *Holmes Group, Inc. v. Vornado Air Circulation Systems, Inc.*, 535 U.S. 826 (2002) had held that the Federal Circuit's jurisdiction did not extend to appeals from cases in which a claim sounding in patent law is pleaded as a counterclaim, but none appears in the plaintiff's well-pleaded complaint. The America Invents Act remedies that exception by amending 28 U.S.C. § 1295 (a)(1) to extend the court's appellate jurisdiction to "any civil action in which a party has asserted a compulsory counterclaim arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents or plant variety protection." AIA.

<sup>15</sup> See Chapter 11, "D. Choice of Law," *infra*.

# I

## Conduct Issues Arising Out of Incorrect Preparation or Prosecution of Patent Applications

THE PATENT ACT makes a wide range of failures in the prosecution of patent applications grounds for defense to allegations of patent infringement. Having established, *inter alia*, in its first paragraph that a patent is entitled to a presumption of validity, the second paragraph of 3 U.S.C. § 281 (recodified in the AIA as 281(a) and (b) respectively) sets forth the grounds of defense. Among these grounds of defense are several that will be the subject of this chapter: unenforceability, specified in § 281(a)(1); any of the conditions of patentability 35 U.S.C. Part II, in § 281(2); and failure to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 except for its best mode requirement, in § 281(3). The courts have long held that the conditions of patentability to which § 281(2) refers are “utility and eligibility [under § 101], novelty [under § 102], and nonobviousness [under § 103] are the only so-called conditions for patentability.”<sup>1</sup>

The Federal Circuit has held both that there are some defenses arising from actions before the PTO that are not enumerated in section 282,<sup>2</sup> and that other missteps not enumerated do not constitute a defense.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, much of patent litigation centers around allegations of missteps by the patent applicant that section 282 makes defenses to infringement liability. Recent changes in the statute and case law have sought to ameliorate some of those issues. Many, however, remain and even the changes in law will be the source of dispute in court for many years.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Aristocrat Technologies Australia Pty Ltd. v. International Game Technology*, 543 F.3d 657, 662 (2008), *cert. denied*, 129 S.Ct. 2791 (2009), relying on *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1, 12 (1962).

<sup>2</sup> *Quantum Corp. v. Rodime, PLC*, 65 F.3d 1577 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (improper broadening of claims in reexamination contrary to 35 U.S.C. § 305).

<sup>3</sup> *Aristocrat Technologies*, 543 F.3d at 662–64 (2008) (improper revival of abandoned application, absent inequitable conduct, does not constitute ground for invalidity defense).



