



Sandip H. Patel

Partner

Tel 312.474.9562
spatel@marshallip.com

Sandip Patel advises companies in the chemical and life sciences industries on high-stakes patent matters, from securing and managing valuable patent portfolios to resolving complex disputes globally. His practice encompasses all aspects of patent law, including patent prosecution, portfolio strategy, opinion counseling, Patent Trial and Appeal Board proceedings, federal court litigation, and foreign opposition and litigation matters.

With experience spanning the full spectrum of patent practice, Sandip brings a uniquely comprehensive perspective to the challenges facing innovative companies. He regularly helps clients navigate matters in the United States and key international jurisdictions, including Australia, China, Europe, and Japan. Clients rely on his deep experience to develop practical solutions to their most significant intellectual property challenges.

After graduating from Indiana University's Maurer School of Law, Sandip joined Marshall Gerstein, where he was trained by a group of the firm's leading patent lawyers, working at the cutting edge of the law, biotech, and chemical sciences. As their apprentice, he learned to write and prosecute patent applications in ways that strategically strengthened patent portfolios for multinational corporations, including BASF, British Petroleum, International Paper, Pfizer, Raytheon, and SK Hynix. Sandip developed a reputation for helping inventors articulate and protect their most important innovations. He worked closely with them to ensure their patents not only secure meaningful protection but also withstand challenges in adversarial proceedings and rigorous foreign opposition systems. Today, he applies those same principles in mentoring the next generation of Marshall Gerstein attorneys, helping them develop the skills necessary to counsel innovators and build strong, defensible patent portfolios.

Early in his career, Sandip built a foundation in both patent litigation and Patent Office contested proceedings. He worked on federal court matters for companies such as Amgen and Procter & Gamble, gaining experience in discovery, trial preparation, and dispute resolution strategy. At the same time, he developed extensive experience in Patent Office interferences, helping clients protect innovations ranging from early cancer treatments and genetically modified plants to technologies found in everyday consumer products.

Over the past two decades, Sandip has continued to lead complex contested proceedings on behalf of ACCO Brands, Gillette, Monsanto, Newell Rubbermaid, and Pharmacia & Upjohn, as well as numerous emerging companies and universities.

Today, Sandip provides strategic counseling in all areas of patent law, with a particular focus on proceedings before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB), including America Invents Act (AIA) trials whose procedural framework evolved from earlier interference practice. He has spent much of the past decade helping clients, including a Nobel Laureate, develop and protect worldwide patent portfolios covering foundational CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing technologies. This includes counseling in multiple foreign oppositions and U.S. patent interferences.

In these matters and many others, Sandip has worked closely with leading IP practitioners in the United States and abroad to develop coordinated strategies for protecting and enforcing valuable innovations across the globe.

Sandip has a formal education in chemical engineering from Michigan State University (Go Green!), but his work has spanned the entire spectrum of engineering, chemical, and life sciences. Through that experience, he has proven adept at quickly grasping diverse technologies and devising efficient intellectual property strategies that clients have used to achieve their business objectives.

He is thankful for the many clients who have sought his advice for nearly 30 years, and the clients and peers who have recognized his work through honors such as:

- "Notable Practitioner" in the 2025 *Chambers USA Guide*
- IAM Patent 1000: The World's Leading Patent Professionals 2025
- Lawdragon 500 Leading Global IP Lawyers (since 2024)
- Lawdragon 500 Leading Litigators in America (since 2022)
- "Leading Lawyer" per Law Bulletin Media's Leading Lawyers division (since 2019)
- *Best Lawyers in America*® (since 2016)
- "IP Star" in the *Managing Intellectual Property* IP Stars Survey (since 2016)
- "Life Sciences Star" per *LMG Life Sciences* (since 2016)
- *Illinois Super Lawyers*® (since 2013)

In addition to his client work, Sandip has been deeply involved in the leadership of Marshall Gerstein, having chaired the firm's attorney recruiting committee for 10 years, helping attract and develop generations of attorneys, and later served for six years on the executive committee, where he contributed to the firm's strategic planning and governance.

Practices

- IP Litigation
- Patent Prosecution
- Post-Grant Patent Proceedings

Industries

- Biotechnology & Life Sciences
- Chemical Sciences
- Cleantech & Renewables
- Consumer Products
- Pharmaceuticals

Education

- Indiana University Maurer School of Law (Bloomington) (J.D.)
 - Served as Notes and Comments Editor of the Indiana Law Journal
- Michigan State University (B.S., *with honors*)
 - Chemical Engineering

Bar Admissions

- Illinois
- U.S. Court of Appeals, Federal Circuit
- U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois
- U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Community and Professional Involvement

- American Bar Association
- American Intellectual Property Law Association

Representative Matters

Below are some of the cases Sandip has handled with colleagues at the firm and, occasionally, with co-counsel at other firms. The represented party is denoted with an asterisk.

Represented CureVac in obtaining a \$740 million settlement from defendants BioNTech and Pfizer on the eve of trial in a Virginia federal court, concerning the defendants' manufacture and sales of its Covid-19 vaccine (Comirnaty®). CureVac alleged infringement of several patents covering mRNA manufacturing and vaccine technologies. The case was *CureVac SE* v. BioNTech, Inc. & Pfizer Inc.*

Represented Nobel Laureate Emmanuelle Charpentier and her licensees in multiple patent interference proceedings involving dozens of patents and patent applications concerning foundational CRISPR-Cas9 technologies. Through some of these interferences, Professor Charpentier and the co-owners of her applications obtained more than 60 U.S. patents regarding these technologies. Some of the interferences remain pending with the potential to obtain more patents. The various cases include *The Regents of the University of California, University of Vienna, and Emmanuelle Charpentier* v. The Broad Institute, Inc., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and President and Fellows of Harvard College.*

With Japanese patent counsel, successfully defended the validity of Prof. Charpentier's (and her co-owners') Japanese patent on foundational CRISPR-Cas9 technologies from attack in an Invalidation Trial at the Japanese Patent Office and the challenger's subsequent appeal to the Japanese IP High Court. The cases were styled as *ToolGen, Inc. v. The Regents of the University of California, University of Vienna, and Emmanuelle Charpentier.**

With European patent counsel, successfully attacked the validity of claims the European Patent Office improvidently issued to several entities in several European patents regarding foundational CRISPR-Cas9 technologies. Each case was first heard by the Opposition Division and later by the Technical Board of Appeals at the European Patent Office (EPO). Among the patents the EPO revoked are those owned by The Broad Institute, Sigma-Aldrich Co., and ToolGen, Inc.

Represented Amgen in the first biosimilar patent litigation under the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act. The case was in a Delaware federal court and involved dozens of patents related to AbbVie's Humira® drug product, and it concluded in a favorable settlement that included allowing Amgen's biosimilar product (Amjevita®) to enter the market long before most of AbbVie's asserted patents expired. The case was *AbbVie Inc. v. Amgen Inc.**

Successfully persuaded the Patent Office to not institute multiple inter partes reviews of P&G patents concerning commercial-scale manufacturing of co-form fibrous materials used in household (Swiffer®)

brand) and baby care (Pampers® brand) products. The cases were *Fitessa Simpsonville, Inc. v. The Procter & Gamble Company*.*

In several inter partes review and reexamination proceedings, we successfully represented ACCO Brands in seeking cancellation of patents owned and asserted by a non-practicing entity regarding mechanisms that lock computers to a table/desk. We later successfully defended those Patent Office decisions on appeal. We also succeeded in defeating the patent owner's infringement claims in the parallel litigations it initiated in federal courts in Chicago and Brooklyn. The various cases were styled as *Think Products Inc. v. ACCO Brands Corporation*.*

Represented Canfield Scientific, a company specializing in medical devices, in inter partes reviews seeking to invalidate its competitor's patents. The Patent and Trademark Office decided not to cancel the patent, but we succeeded in persuading the Federal Circuit to reverse that decision. The cases were styled as *Canfield Scientific, Inc.* v. Melanoscan, LLC*.

In one of the first biotech inter partes reviews, AbbVie petitioned the Patent Office to review antibody formulations of its Humira® drug product that included a combination of formulation ingredients that Genentech had taught years earlier. The Patent Office, however, refused to perform the petitioned review. The challenge over these and other patents was resolved through settlement of parallel litigation that our team handled for Amgen. The cases were styled as *Amgen Inc.* v. AbbVie Inc.*

Represented Amgen in its enforcement and validity defense of several patents on its foundational erythropoietin drug patent estate covering Epogen®, the recombinant form of human erythropoietin that stimulates the production of red blood cells. Our team successfully persuaded a Boston federal court that the defendants' erythropoietin drug infringed claims in Amgen's patents and successfully defended these claims against validity challenges. The decision was affirmed on appeal and prevented the defendants from entering the market. The cases were styled as *Amgen Inc.* v. Hoechst Marion Roussel et al.*

Represented Amgen in its enforcement and validity defense of several patents on its foundational erythropoietin drug patent estate covering Epogen®. Our team successfully persuaded the Boston federal court that Roche's pegylated version of the drug infringed claims in several Amgen patents. The decision was affirmed-in-part on appeal, and the case concluded in a favorable settlement shortly thereafter. The cases were styled as *Amgen Inc.* v. F. Hoffmann-LaRoche LTD et al.*

Successfully persuaded the Patent Office to not institute inter partes review of a P&G patent concerning medical imaging technology used to detect cancerous melanomas and other skin-related maladies. The case was *Quantificare, Inc. v. The Procter & Gamble Company*.*

Successfully represented P&G in a patent interference involving patents claiming an enzymatic method for reducing the amount of acrylamide in thermally processed foods (e.g., potato chips and coffee), and foods produced by that method. We demonstrated that P&G's scientists conceived and thereafter diligently reduced to practice the method before scientists at Frito-Lay. The case was *Zyzak (The Procter & Gamble Company*) v. Elder (Frito Lay North America Inc.)*.

Successfully represented P&G in the Federal Circuit, where it defended the propriety of Patent Office decisions that canceled its competitor's sanitary napkin patents in interference proceedings. The case was *Correa et al. (Johnson & Johnson) v. Roberts et al. (The Procter & Gamble Company)**.

Prepared and prosecuted a patent for P&G that concerned a bio-based plastic water bottle, including those with a blue-colored tint. Coca-Cola later began using that technology to package its Dasani® bottled water product. We successfully defended this patent from Coca-Cola's validity challenge in a since-antiquated inter partes reexamination proceeding and obtained additional commercially significant claims through that proceeding. The case was *Coca-Cola Co. v. The Procter & Gamble Company.**

Successfully represented The Gillette Company in a patent interference concerning multiblade handheld razor products relating to the company's MACH3® brand products. The proceeding concluded with the Patent Office canceling the opponent's patent and awarding our client a patent on this technology. The case was *Macove v. Luxton (The Gillette Company)**.

Represented a Monsanto subsidiary in a patent interference concerning genetically engineered monocot plants (e.g., corn). We demonstrated that Monsanto scientists were the first to invent a method of transforming an ordinary corn plant into one that would resist herbicides and insects by permanently modifying the plant's genome so that its progeny would similarly carry the genetic modification. The case was *Adams (Monsanto)* v. Leemans (Bayer Crop Sciences)*.

Represented Monsanto in a lengthy and complicated multiparty patent interference concerning genetically engineered dicot plants (e.g., tomato). We demonstrated that Monsanto scientists were the first to conceive a method for introducing into plants genes encoding certain bacterial proteins that are selectively toxic to insects, so that plant cells produce the bacterial insect toxin and are protected from insects that feed on them. The case was *Barton v. Fischhoff* (Monsanto) v. Adang (Mycogen Plant Science)*.

Represented the University of Michigan in defense of inventions claimed in its patent application, which a startup company alleged the university's scientists derived from the startup's founders. We succeeded in persuading the Patent Office that the allegations lacked merit and the startup failed to satisfy the statutory requirements to support its allegations. The case was *Biocrede, Inc. v. Regents of the University of Michigan.**

In a lengthy and complicated multiparty interference, successfully represented Pharmacia & Upjohn Company scientists in their attempt to obtain a patent on a taxol variant useful as a cancer therapeutic and succeeded in canceling an overlapping patent the Patent Office improvidently granted to Bristol-Myers Squibb. The cases were styled as *Chen (Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.) v. Hester (Pharmacia & Upjohn Co.)** v. *Bouchard (Aventis Pharma S.A.)*.

Represented Newell Rubbermaid in its appeal of a Patent Office interference decision that awarded priority of invention to its competitor on a patent relating to electric typewriter correction-tape dispensers. On appeal, we persuaded the Federal Circuit to reverse the Patent Office's decision and award judgment to Newell Rubbermaid. The case was *Stevens (Newell Rubbermaid Inc.)** v. *Tamai (Seed Rubber Company)*.

Successfully represented ACCO Brands in multiple patent interferences concerning paper shredders electromechanically designed to avoid paper jamming. We demonstrated to the Patent Office that engineers at ACCO Brands were the first to invent and first to make these shredders. The proceedings concluded with the Patent Office canceling the competitor's patents. The cases were *Aries (ACCO Brands Corporation)** v. *Matlin (Fellows Brands Corporation)*.

Our client, a Canadian company, patented an enzymatic process for removing carbon dioxide from industrial gas streams with a biochemical fluidized bed reactor. We persuaded the Patent Office to maintain the patent's commercially significant claims during an inter partes review. The case was *Akermin, Inc. v. CO₂Solutions Inc.**

In a multiparty interference, we represented a Japanese company in an interference concerning compositions and methods for increasing platelet production involving functional fragments of thrombopoietin. We successfully persuaded the Patent Office to cancel the competitor's licensor's patent as one having been obtained through fraudulent behavior. The case was *McDonald (University of Tennessee) v. Miyazaki (Kirin Brewery Company Ltd.)*.*

With European patent counsel, prepared, prosecuted, and later successfully defended validity of claims in European Patent Office proceedings concerning a patent directed to processes for purifying biological materials. The case was heard first by the Opposition Division and later by the Technical Board of Appeals at the European Patent Office. The patents were owned by Baxter International Inc.* and Baxter Healthcare S.A.*

With European patent counsel, successfully attacked the validity of claims the European Patent Office issued to our client's competitor on vapor degreasing solvents used to clean sensitive electronic parts on, for example, jet engines powering Boeing and Airbus commercial aircraft. The case was heard first by the Opposition Division and later by the Technical Board of Appeals at the European Patent Office. The patent was owned by a Japanese company, Dipsol Chemical Co., Ltd.

As part of a coordinated litigation strategy involving parallel litigation, our team prepared, prosecuted, and later defended several patents in post grant review challenges. The patents claim processes for producing polyunsaturated fats (PUFAs) in transgenic plants, where, before this invention, such PUFAs were available predominantly only from fish. The matters were resolved via a favorable global settlement of these and other litigation. The cases were styled as *Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation v. BASF Plant Science Company GmbH*.*

Successfully represented BASF in a multi-patent interference regarding plant herbicide compositions. The case was *Refsell (Valent USA Corp. and Sumitomo Chemical Co) v. Sievernich (BASF SE)*.*

Successfully represented Groupon in several post-grant review proceedings that led the Patent Office to cancel patent claims owned by a non-practicing entity that asserted in a Delaware federal court that Groupon infringed. Our team also successfully defended those decisions on appeals at the Federal Circuit. The case was *Groupon, Inc. v. Kroy IP Holdings, LLC*.

Represented a generic pharmaceutical company in ANDA litigation in a New Jersey federal court regarding cancer therapeutics (cisplatin). The matter was resolved via a favorable settlement. The case was *Research Corp. Techs. and Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Labs* et al.*

Represented Keystone Industries in a patent interference concerning patents claiming train railcar shock absorbers. The matter was resolved via a favorable settlement. The case was *Monaco (Keystone Industries)* v. Kalina (FM Industries)*.

Client Successes

Securing FDA Authorization for Innovative ENDS Products

Marshall Gerstein congratulates its client, Glas LLC, in securing multiple authorizations from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to market age-gated electronic nicotine delivery system (ENDS) products through the premarket tobacco product application (PMTA) pathway. The authorizations mark the first time the FDA permitted non-tobacco, non-menthol flavored ENDS products for sale in the United States.

Marshall Gerstein's team, led by Sandip Patel, Matt Jorge, and Nick Terrell, counseled Glas and prepared and prosecuted several patents directed to the underlying technology that notably differentiated the Glas products from other ENDS products, including those that the FDA has denied marketing orders. The technology requires age verification using government-issued identification, Bluetooth pairing with a verified smartphone, and ongoing authentication measures to ensure use only by authorized adults.

Smoking is the leading preventable source of chronic disease and premature death in the United States. The FDA's authorization of the Glas products therefore represents a significant milestone in the evolving regulatory framework for ENDS products. "By helping to prevent youth use, device access restrictions are a potential game changer," said Dr. Bret Koplow, acting director of the FDA's Center for Tobacco Products. The Glas "technology is also an indication of the role innovation may serve in the effort to protect young people from threats posed by nicotine use and addiction while helping to enable availability of an expanded array of flavored options for adults who smoke who may use these products to completely switch away from regular cigarettes."

The FDA's authorization is a significant result for our client. "We are very grateful for Marshall Gerstein's assistance on this journey and the expertise you have shared to help us in achieving this milestone," said Kevin Higgins, the Chief Operating Officer at Glas. "It is a fantastic outcome and we were very fortunate to have you all on our team."

Marshall Gerstein Counsels CureVac through Global Resolution of Patent Litigation with Pfizer/BioNTech

Marshall, Gerstein & Borun LLP represented CureVac, a global biopharmaceutical company developing a new class of transformative medicines based on mRNA, in a high-profile intellectual property infringement lawsuit originally filed in June 2022. The case involved allegations that Pfizer and BioNTech's COVID-19 variant-adapted vaccines, including those targeting the Omicron and XBB1.5 variants, infringed CureVac's patents, including European Patent EP4023755 relating to split poly-A tail mRNA vaccines.

In May 2023, CureVac filed counterclaims in the U.S. asserting infringement of nine U.S. patents, later expanded to include a tenth patent (U.S. Patent No. 11,667,910), covering mRNA purification methods — a critical component of the mRNA manufacturing process.

In August 2025, it was announced that BioNTech and CureVac reached a global resolution. Under the terms of the agreements, CureVac and GSK will receive in aggregate a payment of \$740 million as well

as single-digit royalties on sales of COVID-19 vaccines in the United States going forward. Additionally, CureVac will receive \$50 million from GSK for monetizing a portion of U.S. product royalties due under its existing license agreement announced on July 3, 2024.

The resolution resolved all pending U.S. and European litigation, including what would have been the first U.S. trial over COVID-19 vaccine patents. It was one of the most-watched biotechnology patent disputes in recent years.

Partner Mark H. Izraelewicz led CureVac's U.S. litigation strategy, alongside a team at Marshall Gerstein, which included Kevin M. Flowers, John R. Labbé, Michael R. Weiner, Sandip H. Patel, Michael J. Allikian, Thomas R. Burns, Izabella N.C. Higson, Daniel Gonzalez, and Christopher J. Hall.

For more coverage, see the following articles:

[CureVac's Patent Settlement: A Strategic Win for mRNA Innovation and Future Revenue Streams](#)

[GSK collects \\$320M as BioNTech, Pfizer settle mRNA patent spat with CureVac | Fierce Pharma](#)

IPR Win for ACCO's ClickSafe® Locks

Marshall Gerstein successfully represented ACCO Brands Corporation and ACCO Brands USA LLC in Inter Partes Reviews (IPR) before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB), appeal of that decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, and in related infringement litigation in the Eastern District of New York, in which Think Products accused ACCO's ClickSafe® line of computer locks of infringing two Think Products patents.

Marshall Gerstein petitioned for IPR of each asserted patent, arguing that the Think Products patents were obvious over combinations of prior-art references, and anticipated by a published video disclosing the accused ClickSafe® product.

In both IPRs, the PTAB ruled in favor of ACCO on all grounds of review, cancelling all challenged claims of the patents, and these decisions were upheld on appeal to the Federal Circuit.

Protecting Carbon-Capture Technologies

Marshall, Gerstein & Borun LLP obtained a successful result for CO₂ Solutions, Inc., in an Inter Partes Review (IPR) of one of CO₂ Solutions' patents covering its enzyme-based technology for capturing carbon dioxide from exhaust gas. The Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office ruled in favor of CO₂ Solutions on four of the five grounds of review, upholding CO₂ Solutions' commercially significant claims of the challenged patent.

CO₂ Solutions' proprietary carbon-capture technologies, as covered by the upheld patent claims and by other patents in CO₂ Solutions' portfolio, provide environmentally-friendly, efficient, and cost-effective methods for reducing carbon emissions. As stated by Evan Price, President and CEO of CO₂ Solutions, "We believe this confirms CO₂ Solutions' possession of the least expensive and most environmentally friendly carbon capture technology available on the market."

Publications and Presentations

April 14, 2026

"Appeals Against CNIPA Invalidation Decisions: Representative Cases"

Managing IP

March 23, 2026

"Overturning Chinese Invalidation Decisions: Timelines and Procedures"

Managing IP

September 18, 2025

"The Pros and Cons of Levying Value-Based Fees on Patents"

Law360

July 1, 2024

"Federal Circuit Holds Recoverability of Attorney's Fees Does Not Extend to AIA Trials"

IP Litigator

May 3, 2024

"Potentially Poisonous Patents"

AUTM Insight

November 13, 2023

"Federal Circuit Imperils Term-Adjusted Patents"

ALM's IP Strategist

September/October 2023

"Patent Interferences May Not Involve Pure AIA Patent"

IP Litigator

May 12, 2023

"Intel Cancels One VLSI Patent Underlying \$2 Billion Verdict" (featured quotes)

Bloomberg Law

June 17, 2021

"How I Made Law Firm Leader: Advice From Marshall Gerstein Executive Committee Member Sandip Patel"

Law.com

September/October 2020 Issue

"Does Section 285 Permit an Award of Attorney's Fees for Patent Office Proceedings?"

IP Litigator

April 13, 2020

"The Impact of Distinct Printed Publication Rules In Exams, IPR" (featured quotes)

Law360

February 4, 2020

"The PTAB Precedential Opinion Panel's Hulu Decision: Any Guidance is Better than No Guidance"

IPWatchdog

January/February 2019 Issue

"Supreme Court Decision Invites Confusion and Delay"

IP Litigator

January 24, 2019

Supreme Court Confirms Secret Sales Can Invalidate Patents

Marshall Gerstein Alert

December 17, 2018

"The Biggest Patent Cases of 2018" (featured quotes)

Law360

December 13, 2018

"Industry Reaction to Helsinn Healthcare v. Teva Pharmaceuticals Oral Arguments" (featured quotes)

IPWatchdog

December 5, 2018

"SCOTUS Helsinn v Teva Showdown Begins" (featured quotes)

Intellectual Property Magazine

December 5, 2018

"US Supreme Court Likely to Limit On-Sale Bar to Public Prior Art" (featured quotes)

Managing Intellectual Property

December 5, 2018

"Supreme Court Steps in as Grammar Police for AIA's On-Sale Bar" (featured quotes)

BioWorld

December 4, 2018

"SCOTUS Likely to Reverse Helsinn v Teva Ruling, Say Lawyers" (featured quotes)

World Intellectual Property Review

June 25, 2018

Supreme Court Decides Infringement Remedies May Include Foreign Lost Profits

Marshall Gerstein Alert

April 25, 2018

"SAS: When the Patent Office Institutes IPR it Must Decide Patentability of All Challenged Claims" (featured quotes)

IPWatchdog

April 25, 2018

"Oil Firms' Supreme Court Spat Could Change Patent Law, Attorneys Say" (featured quotes)

Westlaw Journal Intellectual Property

April 24, 2018

Supreme Court Decides that IPR Final Decisions Must Address All Challenged Claims

Marshall Gerstein Alert

April 17, 2018

"SCOTUS: Patent Case Sparks Concerns Over International Relations" (featured quotes)

World Intellectual Property Review

April 16, 2018

"Justices Press Both Sides Over Foreign Patent Damages" (featured quotes)

Law360

November/December 2017 Issue

"Fractured Federal Circuit Reallocates a Burden of Proof in AIA Trials"

IP Litigator

March 2, 2017

"Patent Owners and Petitioners Weigh In"

PTAB Bar Association Inaugural Conference

January 26, 2017

"AIA Estoppel Provision Not As Restricted As Many Expected" (featured quotes)

Law360

August 16, 2016

"Amendments Case Could Help Patents Survive AIA Review" (featured quotes)

Law360

April 28, 2016

“High Court May Be Next Stop For PTAB Deference Issue” (featured quotes)

Law360

May 27, 2015

“Supreme Court Holds that an Accused Infringer’s Belief Regarding Patent Validity is Not a Defense to Induced Infringement”

Marshall Gerstein Alert

October 13, 2014

“Preparing Patents to Withstand AIA Trials and Defending a Patent in AIA Trials”

2014 IP Defense Summit, Chicago, IL

October 2014

“The amendment conundrum of inter partes review”

InsideCounsel

March 18, 2014

“The Never-ending Debate Over Appellate Review of Claim Construction”

InsideCounsel

February 18, 2014

“Supreme Court to Redefine Patent Law’s Indefiniteness Standard”

InsideCounsel

January 21, 2014

“The Murky Morass Plaguing the Patent System”

InsideCounsel

October 30, 2013

“U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Issues Final Rules to Implement Provisions of the Patent Law Treaty that Change Aspects of U.S. Patent Laws”

Marshall Gerstein Alert

April 2013

“Idenix Pharmaceuticals” (featured quotes)

BioPharm Insight

November 27, 2012

“Kappos a Tough Act to Follow as USPTO Director” (featured quotes)

Law360

September 18, 2012

“Patent office gets face-lift over the weekend with new rules, prices” (featured quotes)

Chicago Daily Law Bulletin

September 2012

“The America Invents Act—What Patent Administrators Need to Know”

Keynote speaker, Association of Legal Administrators IP Retreat

December 11, 2009

“The Limited Benefits of Product-By-Process Claims”

Intellectual Property Today

November 2009

“Resetting Judicial Doctrine of Inequitable Conduct”

Author and Moderator, ABA Roundtable Discussion

June 2005

“Patents and Tying: Why the Supreme Court Is Getting Involved”

Law360

April 2005

“Industries Await Exemption Verdict”

Managing IP, No. 14

1996

“Graduate Students’ Ownership and Attribution Rights in Intellectual Property” 71 Ind. L.J. 481