



Intellectual Property ADVISORY ■

NOVEMBER 7, 2013

2013: Patent Cases and the Supreme Court

The Supreme Court has recently granted certiorari in three patent-related cases this term. These cases have important consequences that companies should consider as they move forward in considering their intellectual property strategy.

Medtronic Inc. v. Boston Scientific Corp.

No 12-1128

Oral Argument: November 5, 2013

Issue: Licensees to patents may determine that an existing product no longer implicates a licensed patent. This can be based on a licensee's determination that the patent is invalid, unenforceable or not infringed. In such instances, the licensee may pursue a declaratory judgment action to challenge the patent, while at the same time, continuing to pay the royalty—and thus preclude any claim of infringement by the patent owner. Under these circumstances, does the licensee bear the burden of establishing noninfringement, or does the patent owner bear the burden of establishing infringement?

Facts: The *Medtronic* case came about as a result of the Supreme Court's relatively recent decision in *MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.*, 549 U.S. 118, 137 (2007), that a patent licensee need not repudiate a patent license before seeking a declaratory judgment that the underlying licensed patent is not infringed. Medtronic was a licensee of two patents owned by Mirowski Family Ventures (MFV), both of which related to a biventricular pacemaker. Based on a prior contract, MFV had identified several Medtronic medical devices, which it believed implicated the two patents, and Medtronic had been making royalty payments into an escrow account for related licenses since 2003. Medtronic then filed a declaratory judgment action seeking a finding of noninfringement and invalidity for those two patents. Both parties alleged that the other had the burden relating to infringement. The district court held that the burden rested with the patentee to affirmatively prove infringement. The district court found that both patents were valid and enforceable, but that MFV had not proven that Medtronic's devices infringed. MFV appealed the finding of noninfringement to the Federal Circuit. The Federal Circuit reviewed the district court's ruling regarding burden of proof de novo.

This advisory is published by Alston & Bird LLP to provide a summary of significant developments to our clients and friends. It is intended to be informational and does not constitute legal advice regarding any specific situation. This material may also be considered attorney advertising under court rules of certain jurisdictions.

The Federal Circuit ruled that the burden rested on the licensee seeking the declaratory judgment. Traditionally, the burden rests on the party that owns the patent to prove that it is infringed. However, the Federal Circuit concluded that in the context of the license, it is the licensee who is attempting to change the status quo by escaping the license, and therefore should assume the burden. The circuit court then remanded to the district court with instructions that Medtronic affirmatively prove its noninfringement. Medtronic appealed the Federal Circuit ruling.

Implications: If the Federal Circuit's ruling is upheld, it will make declaratory actions of this type more costly and difficult for licensees since they will have the burden of proving that they do not infringe the patent, as opposed to the traditional structure of the patentee having the burden of showing infringement. As a result, licensees may seek more favorable terms in license agreements since there would be a higher cost and additional risk associated with maintaining the license while challenging the patent. For licensors, a reversal of the Federal Circuit's decision might increase the number of declaratory judgment actions repudiating licenses, which could make it harder to guarantee license-based revenue streams.

Octane Fitness v. Icon Health and Fitness

No. 12-1184

Petition Granted: October 1, 2013

Issue: Under 35 U.S.C. § 285, attorney's fees may be awarded in exceptional cases to the prevailing party. The Federal Circuit has construed this statute such that if the patentee/plaintiff does not commit litigation misconduct, prevailing defendants must show both that the case was objectively baseless and that it was brought in subjective bad faith in order to get attorneys' fees. The two-part test imposed on successful defendants sets a high bar, making the award of attorneys' fees rare. The Supreme Court has been asked to decide whether this two-part test improperly appropriates the district court's discretionary authority to find cases exceptional and award such fees, and asks the Supreme Court to eliminate the Federal Circuit's current two-part test.

Facts: Icon Health and Fitness filed a complaint alleging that two of Octane Fitness' elliptical machines infringed on Icon's patent. The patent claims at issue focus on the linkage system that connects the portion of an elliptical that the user stands on to the portion that guides the elliptical rotation. The district court found that the linkage systems were sufficiently different and granted Octane summary judgment of noninfringement. Octane further alleged that certain email evidence showed that Icon only brought suit so as to distract Octane before Icon released a new competitive elliptical onto the market. In light of this, Octane asked the court for a finding that the case was exceptional and an award of attorneys' fees. Citing the Federal Circuit's two-prong standard, the district court found that the case was neither objectively baseless, nor was there clear and convincing evidence of subjective bad faith, and denied the award of attorney fees. The Federal Circuit affirmed. Octane then appealed the Federal Circuit's decision.

Implications: If the Federal Circuit is upheld, clients acting as plaintiffs will retain the protections they currently have against exceptional case findings and awards of attorney fees. If the Federal Circuit is reversed and the Supreme Court invalidates the two-part test promulgated by the Federal Circuit, then trial courts

could have more discretion to award attorney fees to successful defendants. The threat of a successful Section 285 action could function as a litigation deterrent for certain plaintiffs, thus decreasing the likelihood of going to trial and reducing the pressure held by patent plaintiffs in settlement negotiations.

Highmark, Inc. v. Allcare Health Management Systems, Inc.

No. 12-1184

Petition Granted: October 1, 2013

Issue: This case also addresses 35 U.S.C. § 285. Here, the district court ruled that a case was objectively baseless and brought in subjective bad faith, and therefore found the case exceptional. The Federal Circuit reviewed that judgment de novo and overturned the findings, thus vacating the award of attorneys' fees. The issue presented to the Supreme Court is the level of deference that a district court's grant of attorneys' fees be given: de novo review or, as petitioner urges, a review for clear error.

Facts: Allcare owns a patent directed to health care management. Highmark sued Allcare in a declaratory judgment action seeking a finding of noninfringement, invalidity and unenforceability of that patent. The district court granted summary judgment on the issue of noninfringement for Highmark, which Allcare appealed. While the appeal was pending, Highmark moved for an exceptional case finding under Section 285 and for sanctions against Allcare's attorneys under Fed. R. Civ. P. 11. The district court found that the case was exceptional based on the litigation of two claims within the patent, as well as other litigation issues, and that the attorneys had violated Rule 11. The Rule 11 finding was later vacated, but the district court maintained the exceptional case finding and awarded attorneys' fees against Allcare. Allcare then appealed the Section 285 award.

The Federal Circuit reviewed the district court's exceptional case finding de novo. While it agreed with the district court as to the exceptional case finding for one of the patent claims, it reversed the district court's exceptional case finding for the other patent claim and the other litigation issues and correspondingly reduced the award of attorney fees awarded to Highmark. This opinion was met with a dissent, which argued for a deferential review of attorney fees and a corresponding affirmance of the district court's award in its entirety.

Implications: If the Federal Circuit is upheld and allowed de novo review of all Section 285 awards, any such awards issued by a district court will be uncertain until the threat of appeal has passed. If, however, the Supreme Court reverses and restricts the Federal Circuit's review to the more deferential standard of clear error, defendants and plaintiffs alike could have a greater level of certainty after a trial-level award of attorneys' fees. Thus, a reversal might improve the viability of Section 285 motions by reducing the likelihood and corresponding cost of appeal.

If you would like to receive future *Intellectual Property Advisories* electronically, please forward your contact information to ip.advisory@alston.com. Be sure to put “**subscribe**” in the subject line.

If you have any questions or wish to discuss further, please contact any of the following members of Alston & Bird's Intellectual Property Group:

Wesley Cameron Achey
wes.achey@alston.com
404.881.4930

Blas P. Arroyo
blas.arroyo@alston.com
704.444.1012

William M. Atkinson
william.atkinson@alston.com
704.444.1026

Timothy J. Balts
tim.balts@alston.com
704.444.1185

Ross R. Barton
ross.barton@alston.com
704.444.1287

Philippe Bennett
philippe.bennett@alston.com
212.210.9559

Kirk T. Bradley
kirk.bradley@alston.com
704.444.1030

Keith E. Broyles
keith.broyles@alston.com
404.881.7558

Rachel M. Capoccia
rachel.capoccia@alston.com
213.576.1037

Romy L. Celli
romy.celli@alston.com
650.838.2011

Natalie C. Clayton
natalie.clayton@alston.com
212.210.9573

Michael S. Connor
mike.connor@alston.com
704.444.1022

Jason W. Cook
jason.cook@alston.com
214.922.3407

Jason P. Cooper
jason.cooper@alston.com
404.881.4831

Jeffrey A. Cooper
jeff.cooper@alston.com
404.881.7892

John W. Cox, Ph.D.
john.cox@alston.com
404.881.7333

Sean P. DeBruine
sean.debruine@alston.com
650.838.2121

Brian C. Ellsworth
brian.ellsworth@alston.com
704.444.1265

Patrick J. Flinn
patrick.flinn@alston.com
404.881.7920

Christopher J. Gegg
chris.egg@alston.com
704.444.1024

Joseph J. Gleason
joe.gleason@alston.com
404.881.4966

Jon M. Gordon
jonathan.gordon@alston.com
213.576.1165

Guy R. Gosnell
guy.gosnell@alston.com
704.444.1029

Gregory T. Gronholm
greg.gronholm@alston.com
404.881.7968

Jim A. Harvey
jim.harvey@alston.com
404.881.7328

John D. Haynes
john.haynes@alston.com
404.881.7737

Steven D. Hemminger
steve.hemminger@alston.com
650.838.2029

Donald M. Hill, Jr.
donald.hill@alston.com
704.444.1006

Yitai Hu
yitai.hu@alston.com
650.838.2020

Louis A. Karasik
lou.karasik@alston.com
213.576.1148

David C. Keating
david.keating@alston.com
404.881.7355

S.H. Michael Kim
michael.kim@alston.com
650.838.2100

Ryan W. Koppelman
ryan.koppelman@alston.com
404.881.7742

Robert L. Lee
bob.lee@alston.com
404.881.7635

Joe Liebeschuetz, Ph.D.
joe.liebeschuetz@alston.com
650.838.2038

Jitty Malik, Ph.D.
jitty.malik@alston.com
704.444.1115

Michael D. McCoy
mike.mccoy@alston.com
704.444.1011

Todd S. McClelland
todd.mcclelland@alston.com
404.881.4789

Richard M. McDermott
rick.mcdermott@alston.com
704.444.1045

George Douglas Medlock, Jr.
george.medlock@alston.com
404.881.7765

Deepro R. Mukerjee
deepro.mukerjee@alston.com
212.210.9501

Michael J. Newton
mike.newton@alston.com
214.922.3423

Shane Nichols
shane.nichols@alston.com
404.881.4540

Thomas J. Parker
thomas.parker@alston.com
212.210.9529

Scott J. Pivnick
scott.pivnick@alston.com
202.239.3634

S. Benjamin Pleune
ben.pleune@alston.com
704.444.1098

Elizabeth H. Rader
elizabeth.rader@alston.com
650.838.2008

Bruce J. Rose
bruce.rose@alston.com
704.444.1036

Holly Hawkins Saporito
holly.saporito@alston.com
404.881.4402

David M. Saravitz, Ph.D.
david.saravitz@alston.com
919.862.2217

Frank G. Smith
frank.smith@alston.com
404.881.7240

W. Murray Spruill, Ph.D.
murray.spruill@alston.com
919.862.2202

M. Scott Stevens
scott.stevens@alston.com
704.444.1025

Dave J. Stewart
david.stewart@alston.com
404.881.7952

R. Flynt Strean
flynt.strean@alston.com
704.444.1430

George M. Taulbee
george.taulbee@alston.com
704.444.1023

David S. Teske
david.teske@alston.com
404.881.7935

Jamie D. Underwood
jamie.underwood@alston.com
202.239.3706

Katherine M. Wallace
katherine.wallace@alston.com
404.881.4706

ALSTON & BIRD LLP

WWW.ALSTON.COM

© ALSTON & BIRD LLP 2013

ATLANTA: One Atlantic Center ■ 1201 West Peachtree Street ■ Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 30309-3424 ■ 404.881.7000 ■ Fax: 404.881.7777
BRUSSELS: Level 20 Bastion Tower ■ Place du Champ de Mars ■ B-1050 Brussels, BE ■ +32 2 550 3700 ■ Fax: +32 2 550 3719
CHARLOTTE: Bank of America Plaza ■ 101 South Tryon Street ■ Suite 4000 ■ Charlotte, North Carolina, USA, 28280-4000 ■ 704.444.1000 ■ Fax: 704.444.1111
DALLAS: 2828 North Harwood Street ■ 18th Floor ■ Dallas, Texas, USA, 75201 ■ 214.922.3400 ■ Fax: 214.922.3899
LOS ANGELES: 333 South Hope Street ■ 16th Floor ■ Los Angeles, California, USA, 90071-3004 ■ 213.576.1000 ■ Fax: 213-576-1100
NEW YORK: 90 Park Avenue ■ 15th Floor ■ New York, New York, USA, 10016-1387 ■ 212.210.9400 ■ Fax: 212.210.9444
RESEARCH TRIANGLE: 4721 Emperor Blvd. ■ Suite 400 ■ Durham, North Carolina, USA, 27703-85802 ■ 919.862.2200 ■ Fax: 919.862.2260
SILICON VALLEY: 275 Middlefield Road ■ Suite 150 ■ Menlo Park, California, USA, 94025-4004 ■ 650-838-2000 ■ Fax: 650.838.2001
WASHINGTON, DC: The Atlantic Building ■ 950 F Street, NW ■ Washington, DC, USA, 20004-1404 ■ 202.756.3300 ■ Fax: 202.756.3333
VENTURA COUNTY: 2801 Townsgate Road ■ Suite 215 ■ Westlake Village, California, USA, 91361 ■ 805.497.9474 ■ Fax: 805.497.8804