

Post-Grant Patent Proceedings

The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (AIA), enacted in 2011, established post-grant proceedings available on or after September 16, 2012, for challenging the validity of issued U.S. patents. Marshall, Gerstein & Borun LLP can help you use these proceedings to challenge the validity of patents, resolve existing or threatened litigation, or defend your patents whose validity has been challenged.

These post-grant proceedings are administrative trials that take place before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), and include the following:

- Inter partes reviews (IPR)
- Post grant reviews (PGR)

PTAB trials have been popular with petitioners challenging patent validity, because they are simpler, faster, and significantly less expensive in comparison to federal court litigation, and because most cases that proceed to final written decision result in cancellation of many or all challenged claims.

The firm also has a long history in counseling clients and challenging patents through ex parte reexamination proceedings. That history dates to the very first reexamination certificate the U.S. patent and Trademark Office ever issued to our then-client who wished to have certain prior art assessed by the Patent Office before asserting the patent in federal court litigation.

Today, ex parte reexamination is an even more cost-effective way to challenge a competitor's patent and also results in substantively identical cancellation statistics achievable with IPRs and PGRs. The firm's attorneys have experience in preparing and filing reexamination requests and also in prosecuting reexamination applications where our client's competitor has requested reexamination.

Representative Experience

Our Firm has successfully represented clients before the PTAB (and its predecessor, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences), and used PTAB trials and reexamination in connection with related court litigation, including the following:

- Obtained stays of litigation by filing IPR petitions and reexamination requests
- Used IPRs and CBMs to settle litigation
- Successfully defended patents in IPRs
- Successfully represented parties in patent interferences, and in appeals of interference decisions to district courts and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

Client Successes

Eliminating Spillover via an Inter Partes Victory

The Firm secured a complete victory for SSW Holding Company, Inc., in an inter partes review proceeding challenging the validity of an SSW patent, making its client one of just a handful to emerge from the newly established inter partes review process with every challenged patent claim fully intact.



Inter partes review (IPR) is a streamlined process for challenging patents created through the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act of 2011 and, to date, has proven favorable to those challenging patents. Of the 78 decisions issued in IPR proceedings through June of 2014, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board cancelled or invalidated nearly 80 percent of the patent claims before it. In only 14 percent of such cases did the board find in favor of the patent owner with respect to all of the patent claims under consideration, as it did in *Schott Gemtron Corp. v. SSW Holding Company, Inc.* The Patent Trial and Appeal Board's decision rejected arguments that SSW's patent—which covers spill-containing refrigerator shelving technology used by major appliance manufacturers—was "obvious" and therefore invalid. Oral argument in the case took place on June 23, 2014.

Protecting Carbon-Capture Technologies

Marshall, Gerstein & Borun LLP <u>obtained a successful result</u> for CO_2 Solutions, Inc., in an Inter Partes Review (IPR) of one of CO_2 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 CO_2 Solutions on four of the five grounds of review, upholding CO_2 Solutions' commercially significant claims of the challenged patent.

 CO_2 Solutions' proprietary carbon-capture technologies, as covered by the upheld patent claims and by other patents in CO_2 Solutions' portfolio, provide environmentally-friendly, efficient, and cost-effective methods for reducing carbon emissions. As stated by Evan Price, President and CEO of CO_2 Solutions, "We believe this confirms CO_2 Solutions' possession of the least expensive and most environmentally friendly carbon capture technology available on the market."

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.

Post-Grant Proceedings

PTAB Post-Grant Proceedings Under the America Invents Act—What You Should Know

The AIA established post-grant proceedings, available on or after September 16, 2012, to challenge the validity of issued patents at the PTAB. These **PTAB trial** proceedings are attractive to accused infringers, because they are generally simpler, faster, and significantly less expensive in comparison to court litigation, and require a lower burden of proof for invalidation of a patent.

Game changer

Since the legislation went into effect, thousands of challenges have been raised by <u>IPR</u> and <u>PGR</u> reviews resulting in institution of numerous trials and cancellation of many challenged claims.

What's the difference?

Thes PTAB trials are similar in operation and are designed to complement each other. In a nutshell, IPRs are available



to challenge any patent; and **PGRs** are available only during the nine months after an AIA patent has been issued or reissued.

When do I use PTAB proceedings?

Petitions to institute PTAB trial proceedings are most often filed by parties that have been or expect to be charged with patent infringement. Most PTAB trials involve parallel litigation, which is often stayed during the PTAB trial. **The litigation** may resume if some patent claims survive the PTAB trial, or the litigation may be terminated if all asserted claims are canceled.

How are PTAB proceedings different from court litigation?

PTAB proceedings provide a streamlined alternative to federal court review of a patent's validity. These proceedings are attractive to accused infringers because of a lower burden of proof, limited discovery, and expedited schedule. Differences from district court litigation include:

- Petitions are filed with and decided by the PTAB, in particular by Administrative Patent Judges (APJ) with technical backgrounds and expertise in patent law and procedure.
- Petitions are subject to strict formatting guidelines and must be accompanied by all supporting evidence necessary to obtain the petitioned relief.
- Discovery is generally limited to declarations, printed publications relied on by the parties, cross-examination of the declarants, and additional discovery only by agreement of the parties.
- Each party has approximately one hour to present its case at a final hearing.
- The burden of proving patent invalidity is by a "preponderance" of the evidence, a lower standard than the "clear and convincing" evidence standard applicable in court.
- Invalidity grounds that were actually raised (PGR) or could have been raised (IPR) may not be asserted in another, later proceeding.
- The proceedings must be completed within 18 months after a petition is filed, and are appealable to the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals.
- Costs are generally much lower in comparison to district court litigation, although significant filing fees are required for PTAB petitions.

What is the PTAB process?

All PTAB trial proceedings follow the same basic process and adhere to the following 18-month timeline:



Advantage: Petitioner



Since the legislation went into effect, PTAB proceedings have been considered to be very favorable to petitioners. A large majority of filed petitions are instituted as trials, most trials that proceed to final written decision result in cancellation of many or all challenged claims, and most appeals of PTAB decisions are upheld by the Federal Circuit. Challenges to patent validity in federal court are subject to a higher burden of proof and are generally less successful.

The patent owner has only **three months** to prepare an optional preliminary response to a petition. If the PTAB institutes a trial, then the patent owner may file a complete response, supported by declarations and other evidence. The patent owner may also file a motion to amend claims, but such motions are rarely granted, and permitted amendments are limited.

Perhaps the most petitioner-friendly aspect of a PTAB proceeding is the lower burden of proof required to prove patent invalidity. As opposed to the federal court standard of clear and convincing evidence, petitioners need only demonstrate unpatentability of a claim by a preponderance of the evidence.

Petitioners must weigh the benefits of a PTAB proceeding with the potential that they may be estopped from later presenting invalidity arguments that were raised, or could have been raised during the proceeding.

Patent owners should consider the potential need to defend their patents in a PTAB proceeding, and may take steps during patent prosecution to make their patents more resistant to PTAB challenges, such as by including more dependent claims or keeping a continuation application pending.

Inter Partes Review

IPR is and has been the most frequently used PTAB proceeding. Any person other than the patent owner may file an IPR petition to challenge validity based on printed publication prior art that may or may not have been considered by the patent examiner. Although available to non-litigants, IPRs are primarily used as a way for accused infringers to challenge patent validity, and as a basis to request a stay of related litigation.

If litigation has begun, the defendant must file its IPR petition within one year after the complaint has been served. Nonlitigants are not restricted by this time limit. For PGR-eligible patents (based on applications filed on or after March 16, 2013), an IPR cannot be initiated during the time period that a PGR is available or during the pendency of a PGR.

The PTAB will institute an IPR only on grounds of anticipation or obviousness based on *printed* prior art, if the petition demonstrates that there is "a reasonable likelihood" that at least one challenged claim is unpatentable.

Following the PTAB's final written decision on the instituted IPR, estoppel provisions prevent the petitioner from raising in another proceeding, grounds that were actually raised or that reasonably could have been raised in the IPR.

Post-Grant Review

Relative to IPRs, PGR permits raising more types of grounds for challenging validity, but such petitions may only be filed within nine months after an AIA (first-to-file) patent is issued, based on applications filed on or after March 16, 2013. After this time period has passed or completion of a PGR trial, an IPR petition may be filed.

A petitioner may request a PGR to challenge patentability based on virtually any ground that could be raised in federal court: anticipation or obviousness based on printed publications, public use, on-sale activity, other public disclosures; or lack of compliance with the statute's written description, enablement, definiteness, or eligibility requirements. For the PTAB to grant a PGR petition, the petition must show that it is "more likely than not that at least one claim is unpatentable" or the petition must raise "a novel or unsettled legal question that is important to other patents or applications."



Following the PTAB's final written decision on the instituted PGR, estoppel provisions prevent the petitioner from raising in another proceeding, grounds that were actually raised in a PGR.

Comparison of Post-Grant Proceedings

	Ex parte Reexam	IPR	PGR
Eligibility	All patents	All patents	Only AIA patents
Who May File	Anyone who has not lost an IPR/PGR challenging same patent	Anyone who has not already filed an invalidity action	Anyone who has not already filed an invalidity action
Anonymity Permitted?	Yes	No	No
Timing	Anytime	Petition must be filed no more than one year after service of infringement complaint	Petition must be filed within nine months of AIA patent issuance
Standard For Initiating Review	Substantial new question of patentability	A "reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail" with respect to at least one challenged claim	"More likely than not that at least one claim is unpatentable" or the petition raises "a novel or unsettled legal question that is important to other patents or applications"
Grounds	Anticipation or obviousness based on printed prior art	Anticipation or obviousness based on printed prior art	Any grounds that would be available for an invalidity defense
Standard For Canceling Claim	Preponderance of evidence	Preponderance of evidence	Preponderance of evidence
Estoppel	None, but requester is prohibited from later challenging the same patent claims via IPR/PGR	Prohibits petitioner from raising in another proceeding, grounds actually raised or that reasonably could have been raised	Prohibits petitioner from raising in another proceeding, grounds actually raised or that reasonably could have been raised

Ex parte Reexamination

The AIA replaced inter partes reexamination with IPR proceedings, however ex parte reexamination still remains an available and popular option for those interested in challenging patents at the Patent Office.

Any person may file a request for ex parte reexamination, and unlike PTAB petitions (for IPR and PGR), these requests may be filed anonymously, without any obligation to identify a real party in interest. The request should be granted if it raises "a substantial new question of patentability." The proceeding is conducted by highly experienced Patent Office examiners in the Office's Central Reexamination Unit (not by the PTAB), and is usually completed in about eighteen months. In contrast with litigation and PTAB trials, no estoppel applies.

Notable aspects of ex parte reexamination include:

- · Significantly lower cost compared to both litigation and PTAB proceedings
- Request may be filed at any time during the patent term
- · Grounds for unpatentability are limited to anticipation and obviousness based on printed prior art
- Other than filing a request, requestor cannot further participate in the reexamination
- No estoppel applies

Derivation Proceedings



Effective March 16, 2013, the AIA changed the U.S. patent system from a "first-to-invent" system to a "first-to-file" system, eliminating the need for patent interferences to resolve disputes between patent applicants concerning which applicant was the first to invent.

Patent interferences are still being administered by the PTAB, for disputed subject matter in patent applications that have an effective filing date before March 16, 2013. And the firm remains involved in the half dozen such proceedings that currently exists. These proceedings will be phased out over time, but may still be declared and administered by the PTAB as long as competing patent applications were filed before March 16, 2013.

For first-to-file applications, filed on or after March 16, 2013, the AIA provides for derivation proceedings for the PTAB to resolve disputes over whether a patent applicant did not invent the subject matter of an application, and instead "derived" that subject matter from the true inventor. Any patent applicant may petition to institute a derivation proceeding. If the petition is successful, the PTAB may correct the named inventor in a patent application or issued patent. Requirements for the petition, which must be filed within one year of the first publication of an invention that is the same or substantially the same as the earlier application's claim to the invention, include substantial evidence that

- an inventor named in a different, earlier-filed application, derived the claimed invention from the petitioner; and
- the earlier application claiming the derived invention was filed without authorization.

Insights

November 13, 2023 **"Federal Circuit Imperils Term-Adjusted Patents"** ALM's IP Strategist

April 7, 2022 **"Careers in Intellectual Property and Patent Law"** Illinois Intellectual Property Alliance (ILIPA)

June 17, 2021 "How I Made Law Firm Leader: Advice From Marshall Gerstein Executive Committee Member Sandip Patel" Law.com

April 5, 2021 "Protecting Software Related To a Medical Device: A Case Law Review and Strategy Guide" Intellectual Property Owners Association

February 3, 2021 "ITC Blocks Reusable Straw Imports After Patent Probe" (featured quotes) Law360

December 14, 2020 **"Waging the war on Counterfeits Amid a Pandemic"** Managing Intellectual Property

September/October 2020 Issue "Eyes Wide Open" Loss Prevention Magazine



October 27, 2020 USPTO's New Report on Al Marshall Gerstein Insights

October 23, 2020 **Patent Applications Featuring Artificial Intelligence (AI) Doubled Since 2002** Marshall Gerstein Insights

October 2020 Issue "Al and Plastics: The Revolution Begins" (featured quotes) Plastics Engineering Magazine

September/October 2020 Issue "Does Section 285 Permit an Award of Attorney's Fees for Patent Office Proceedings?" IP Litigator

October 8, 2020 USPTO Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property Policy October 2020 Report Marshall Gerstein Insights

August 28, 2020 "Protecting COVID-19-Related Software Innovations" IPWatchdog

August 19, 2020 A USPTO Examination Policy Change You May Have Missed Law360

August 19, 2020 "High Priority" Intellectual Property Magazine

August 14, 2020 Under Current Legal Principals, an Artificial Intelligence Cannot be a Patent Inventor Marshall Gerstein Insights

July 31, 2020 Effective October 2, 2020: Final Rule—Setting and Adjusting Patent Fees Marshall Gerstein Insights

July 31, 2020 **"Fed. Circ.'s UT Immunity Ruling Places Licensing In Spotlight" (featured quotes)** Law360

June 12, 2020 "Data Privacy Law and Intellectual Property Considerations for Biometric-Based Al Innovations" Security Magazine

May 1, 2020 Federal Circuit reaffirms that software inventions are patentable in the U.S. Marshall Gerstein Insights



May 2020 Issue "Private Matter: Data Privacy Law and Intellectual Property Considerations for Biometric Based Artificial Intelligence Innovations" Intellectual Property Magazine

April 2020

The Japanese Patent Office (JPO) provides patent examination case examples pertinent to artificial intelligence (AI) related technologies Marshall Gerstein Insights

April 2020

Federal Circuit finds a cardiac monitor device not abstract (and, therefore, patent eligible) under the Supreme Court's Alice test Marshall Gerstein Insights

February 4, 2020 **"The PTAB Precedential Opinion Panel's Hulu Decision: Any Guidance is Better than No Guidance"** IPWatchdog

January 3, 2020 "What To Expect In Patent Litigation This Year" Law360

January 2020 Issue "IP Due Diligence Checklist: What To Address Before Executing A Transaction" Life Science Leader

December 24, 2019 "What's in the USPTO's 2019 Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance Update?" World Intellectual Property Review

November 27, 2019 **"Patent Practice Tips After the USPTO Guidance Update"** Bloomberg Law

November 27, 2019 "INSIGHT: Three Practice Tips Since USPTO Updated Its Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance" Bloomberg Law

November 13, 2019 "ITC Launches IP Probe Into Reusable Straws From China" (featured quotes) Law360

November 8, 2019 "Lawyers React as Federal Circuit Takes on Constitutional Conundrum" (featured quotes) Managing Intellectual Property

September 16, 2019 **"How Patent Landscape Studies Can Guide Medical Device Innovation"** Medical Design Briefs



June 17, 2019 State University Patents Are Not Immune from Inter Partes Review Marshall Gerstein Alert

June 13, 2019 "USPTO 2019 Patent Eligibility Guidance and PTAB Updates" CLE Presentation

April 15, 2019 **"What Qualifies as Prior Art?"** North Carolina Lawyers Weekly and South Carolina Lawyers Weekly

February 28, 2019 New EU Rules Will Help Generics and Biosimilars Marshall Gerstein Alert

February 24, 2019 "Return Mail Reaction: Patent Bar Sampling Narrowly Favors Finding for Petitioner" (featured quotes) IPWatchdog

February 18, 2019 **"SCOTUS to Consider Whether Government is a 'Person' (featured quotes)** World IP Review

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

December 5, 2018 **"US Supreme Court Likely to Limit On-Sale Bar to Public Prior Art" (featured quotes)** Managing Intellectual Property

December 5, 2018 "SCOTUS Helsinn v Teva Showdown Begins" (featured quotes) Intellectual Property Magazine



December 4, 2018 "SCOTUS Likely to Reverse Helsinn v Teva Ruling, Say Lawyers" (featured quotes) World Intellectual Property Review

September 2018 **"Making 3D Printing Eco-Friendly: A Potential Opportunity for Patent Protection"** INNOVATE Magazine

July 30, 2018 "Federal Circuit Ruling Invites PTAB Fights Over Hidden Parties" (featured quotes) Law360

June 21, 2018 USPTO Memo Addresses Federal Circuit Authority on Patent Eligibility of Some Treatment Methods Marshall Gerstein Alert

June 15, 2018 "What PTAB Attorneys Need to Know About Real Parties-in-Interest" (featured quotes) Law360

April 25, 2018 "Oil Firms' Supreme Court Spat Could Change Patent Law, Attorneys Say" (featured quotes) Westlaw Journal Intellectual Property

April 25, 2018

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

IPWatchdog

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

January 1, 2018 **"Patent Litigation Trends to Watch in 2018" (featured quotes)** Law360

November/December 2017 Issue "Fractured Federal Circuit Reallocates a Burden of Proof in AIA Trials" IP Litigator

November 16, 2017 **"Federal Circuit Confirms TC Heartland Changed the Law" (featured quotes)** World Intellectual Property Review

November 15, 2017 "Federal Circuit Sends Muddy Message on 'TC Heartland' Venue Waivers" (featured quotes) The National Law Journal



November 15, 2017 **"Bearing the Burden" (featured quotes)** IPPro Patents

October 13, 2017 **"Federal Circuit Fracture on Deference Puts USPTO in Tough Spot" (featured quotes)** Law360

October 9, 2017 **"Burden of Amended Claims Falls to Petitioner, Says Federal Circuit" (featured quotes)** IPPro Patents

October 6, 2017 **"Analysis: Was the Federal Circuit's Aqua Products Opinion a Wash Out?" (featured quotes)** Managing Intellectual Property

October 6, 2017 "CAFC's Aqua Products Decision Almost Certainly Guarantees PTAB Will be at Top of New USPTO Director's To-do List" (featured quotes) Intellectual Asset Management

October 5, 2017 "Petitioners Must Prove Unpatentability of Amended Claims in IPR" (featured quotes) World Intellectual Property Review

September 22, 2017 "Amgen Gets \$70M in Biosimilar Patent Suit Against Hospira" (featured quotes) Law360

June 28, 2017 "Lessons From This Year's High Court IP Rulings: Part 2" (featured quotes) Law360

June 27, 2017 "Lessons From This Year's High Court IP Rulings: Part 1" (featured quotes) Law360

June 20, 2017 **"Innovation and the Human Microbiome: Patent Eligibility and IP Protection"** 2017 BIO International Convention

May 31, 2017 **"Lexmark: Good for Consumers, Bad for Manufacturers" (featured quotes)** Intellectual Property Magazine

May 31, 2017 **"U.S. Supreme Court Overturns Federal Circuit Patent Exhaustion Stance in Impression v. Lexmark" (featured quotes)** Managing Intellectual Property



May 30, 2017 **"Supreme Court Limits Use of Patents to Enforce Post-Sale Restrictions"** Marshall Gerstein Alert

May 30, 2017 "Patent Exhaustion at the Supreme Court: Industry Reaction to Impression Products v. Lexmark" (featured quotes) IPWatchdog

May 30, 2017 "SC Ruling Signals New Era for Software Patent Enforcement" (featured quotes) TechNewsWorld

May 25, 2017 "Where to File Patent Complaints After High Court Venue Ruling?" (featured quotes) Bloomberg BNA

May 23, 2017 "Supreme Court Upends Thirty Years of Patent Litigation, Declaring for Venue Purposes That Corporate Defendants 'Reside' Only Where Incorporated" Marshall Gerstein Alert

May 22, 2017 **"High Court Rocks 25 Years of Patent-Venue Precedent" (featured quotes)** Courthouse News Service

May 22, 2017 **"Industry Reaction to SCOTUS Patent Venue Decision in TC Heartland v. Kraft Food Group" (featured quotes)** IPWatchdog

May 17, 2017 **"Fee Shifting in Patent Litigation"** IP Defense Summit–Chicago

May 10, 2017 **"Fee Shifting in Patent Litigation"** IP Defense Summit–Boston

March 28, 2017 "Impression v. Lexmark Arguments Analysis: When Are Patent Rights Exhausted?" (featured quotes) Managing Intellectual Property

March 24, 2017 **"SCOTUS Reviews 'Long and Tortured' Patent Exhaustion Doctrine" (featured quotes)** Intellectual Property Magazine

March 24, 2017 **"Forum Shopping Case to be Heard Next Week" (featured quotes)** IPPro Patents



March 22, 2017 **"Impression v. Lexmark: SCOTUS Questions Patent Exhaustion Rules" (featured quotes)** World Intellectual Property Review

March 22, 2017 "SCOTUS Laches Ruling Won't Have 'Monumental' Impact, Says Lawyers" (featured quotes) World Intellectual Property Review

March 22, 2017 "Patent Owners Can Wait to Sue, Get Six Years Damages" (featured quotes) Bloomberg BNA

March 22, 2017 **"SCOTUS Weakens Laches as a Defence" (featured quotes)** IPPro Patents

March 21, 2017 "Justices' Laches Decision Could Be Boon For Patent Owners" (featured quotes) Law360

March 20, 2017 "SCOTUS to Decide Patent Exhaustion Question" (featured quotes) IPPro Patents

March 14, 2017 **"Intellectual Property Dispute Settlement in Life Sciences"** AUTM Annual Meeting

March 14, 2017 **"The Diminishing Returns of Venture Philanthropy"** AUTM Annual Meeting

March 13, 2017 **"Are You Wasting Too Much Time on Non-license Agreements?"** AUTM Annual Meeting

March 2, 2017 **"Patent Owners and Petitioners Weigh In"** PTAB Bar Association Inaugural Conference

February 21, 2017 **"Groupon Succeeds in Fed Circuit Patent Fight" (featured quotes)** World Intellectual Property Review

February 20, 2017 **"Evolutionary Intelligence Patents Dismissed" (featured quotes)** IPPro Patents

February 17, 2017 **"Apple, Tech Giants Win Data Patent Dispute At Fed. Circ." (featured quotes)** Law360



January 26, 2017 **"AIA Estoppel Provision Not As Restricted As Many Expected" (featured quotes)** Law360

January 5, 2017 "En Banc Federal Circuit Time-Bar Case May Increase AIA Appeals" (featured quotes) Law360

December 21, 2016

"Supreme Court Might End Texas' Preferred Patent Venue Status, Attorneys Say" (featured quotes) Thomson Reuters Legal Solutions Blog

December 16, 2016 **"Forum shopping decision could reduce patent lawsuits" (featured quotes)** IPPro The Internet

December 15, 2016 **"Justices Could Deal Blow To East Texas Patent Docket" (featured quotes)** Law360

December 15, 2016 **"TC Heartland Has Potential to 'Shake-Up' Patent Litigation" (featured quotes)** Intellectual Property Magazine

December 15, 2016 **"SCOTUS to Hear TC Heartland Case on Patent Venue" (featured quotes)** World Intellectual Property Review

December 9, 2016 **"Attorneys Weigh in on High Court 'Substantial Portion' Patent Debate (U.S.)" (featured quotes)** Westlaw Journal, Intellectual Property

December 8, 2016 **"U.S. High Court Hears Patent Case With Global Trade Implications" (featured quotes)** Intellectual Property Watch

December 7, 2016 **"Analysing Life Tech v. Promega Arguments At The US Supreme Court" (featured quotes)** Managing Intellectual Property

December 6, 2016 "Life Tech Litigation Clashes with 'America First' Trade Policy" (featured quotes) Intellectual Property Magazine

December 5, 2016 "Promega IP Case May Portend More Liability for Exporting Cos." (featured quotes) Law360

November 18, 2016 "Neutralizing 'Patent Trolls' for His Clients" Emerging Lawyers Magazine



August 17, 2016 **"When a Tech Patent is Neither" (featured quotes)** Bloomberg Businessweek

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

April 25, 2016 "Cuozzo at SCOTUS: Day One Arguments and 'Tectonic Shift' Calls" (featured quotes) World Intellectual Property Review

August 13, 2015 "En Banc Federal Circuit Extends Law on Divided Infringement" Marshall Gerstein Alert

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

March 2015 "Encouraging Growth and Advancement of Women in Intellectual Property Professions" ManagingIP.com

June 19, 2014 "Lawyers Weigh In On High Court's Software Patent Ruling" (featured quotes) Law360

June 2, 2014 **"Supreme Court Clarifies Requirements for Proving Inducement of Infringement"** Marshall Gerstein Alert

August 1, 2013 Marshall, Gerstein & Borun Attorneys Authoring a Four-Part Series in BioProcessing Journal BioProcessing Journal

March 18, 2013 **"Subduing the Troll"** Intellectual Property Magazine

December 19, 2012 **"2012: A Year of Patents, Mobile Fights, and One Big IPO" (featured quotes)** CNET News

August 30, 2011 Tom Ross Interviewed By Crain's Chicago Business on IP Enforcement in China Crain's Chicago Business



February 2011 "Chicago Patent Litigator Offers Advice on How E-Tailers Can Stave Off Costly Infringement Suits" Intellectual Property Lawcast

January 2011 "Defusing the Patent Bomb" (featured quotes) Internet Retailer

July 28, 2010 "HSN Receives Two E-Commerce Patents" (featured quotes) Internet Retailer

News

January 25, 2024 Marshall Gerstein Lawyers Named 2024 "Illinois Super Lawyers" and "Illinois Rising Stars"

October 6, 2023 Pamela Cox and Ryan Phelan Honored in IAM Strategy 300 for 2023

January 24, 2023

Marshall Gerstein Lawyers Named 2023 "Illinois Super Lawyers" and "Illinois Rising Stars" Illinois Super Lawyers & Illinois Rising Stars

June 14, 2022

Lynn Janulis, Ph.D. Named Among Profiles in Diversity Journal's 2022 Women Worth Watching *Profiles in Diversity Journal*

May 18, 2022 Tiffany Gehrke and Kwanwoo Lee elected to Intellectual Property Law Association of Chicago Board

January 31, 2022 Marshall Gerstein Lawyers Named 2022 "Illinois Super Lawyers" and "Illinois Rising Stars"

January 26, 2022 Marshall Gerstein Lawyers Named 2022 "Leading Lawyers" and "Emerging Lawyers"

September 7, 2021 Crain's Chicago Business Selects Two Marshall Gerstein Partners to 'Rising Stars' List

June 22, 2021 Managing Intellectual Property Recognizes Marshall Gerstein and Fifteen Partners in 2021 IP Stars Survey

May 20, 2021 Partner Tiffany Gehrke Elected IPLAC President-Elect

April 1, 2021 Partners Benjamin Horton and Paul Stephens Named to The American Lawyer's List of 2021 Midwest Trailblazers The American Lawyer

March 16, 2021 Ryan Phelan Launches PatentNext Blog, Providing Thought Leadership on Patent and IP Law



March 1, 2021 Cox, Phelan, and Terrell to Teach Intellectual Property Courses at Northwestern University Pritzker School of Law During Spring 2021 Semester

January 29, 2021 Marshall Gerstein Lawyers Named 2021 "Illinois Super Lawyers" and "Illinois Rising Stars"

January 26, 2021 Marshall Gerstein Lawyers Named 2021 "Leading Lawyers" and "Emerging Lawyers"

August 20, 2020 Marshall Gerstein Attorneys Listed Among "Best Lawyers in America" 2021 Edition The Best Lawyers in America©

June 4, 2020 Heather Kissling Recognized in Managing Intellectual Property's Top 250 Women in IP 2020 Edition Managing Intellectual Property

April 30, 2020 **Ryan Phelan Authors Article About Data Privacy Law and IP Considerations for Biometric-Based AI Innovations in Intellectual Property Magazine** *Intellectual Property Magazine*

March 24, 2020 Marshall Gerstein Achieves 100 Percent Lawyer Participation in Chicago Bar Foundation's 2020 Investing in Justice Campaign

January 29, 2020 Marshall Gerstein Lawyers Named 2020 "Illinois Super Lawyers" and "Illinois Rising Stars"

January 28, 2020 Marshall Gerstein Lawyers Named 2020 "Leading Lawyers" and "Emerging Lawyers"

January 3, 2020 Eric Brusca, Ph.D. Authors Article "IP Due Diligence Checklist: What To Address Before Executing A Transaction" in Life Science Leader Life Science Leader

November 13, 2019 Benjamin Horton Quoted in Law360 Article About the ITC's Investigation of Importing Reusable Straws Law360

November 8, 2019 Benjamin Horton Quoted in Managing Intellectual Property Article About Arthrex v. Smith & Nephew Managing Intellectual Property

September 26, 2019 Ryan Phelan Quoted in Disruptor Daily Article About the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Agriculture Disruptor Daily

September 16, 2019 Daniel Chavka Authors Article "How Patent Landscape Studies Can Guide Medical Device Innovation" in



Medical Design Briefs Medical Design Briefs

August 15, 2019 Marshall Gerstein Attorneys Listed Among "Best Lawyers in America" 2020 Edition

June 11, 2019 Paul B. Stephens Named to Inaugural "Nation's Best" List by Lawyers of Color

May 29, 2019 Cox and Kissling Recognized in Managing Intellectual Property's Top 250 Women in IP 2019 Edition Managing Intellectual Property Magazine

May 21, 2019 Marshall Gerstein Announces Changes to Executive Committee and Practice Group Leadership

May 21, 2019

Managing Intellectual Property Recognizes Marshall Gerstein and Fourteen Partners in 2019 IP Stars Survey Managing Intellectual Property Magazine

May 15, 2019

Marshall Gerstein Partners Tiffany D. Gehrke and Pamela L. Cox Elected to Leadership Roles with Prominent Area Organizations

May 14, 2019

Managing Intellectual Property's May/June 2019 Issue Features Marshall Gerstein New Hires Managing Intellectual Property Magazine

April 15, 2019

Eric M. Brusca, Ph.D. Uncovers "What Qualifies as Prior Art" in Articles Published for North Carolina Lawyers Weekly and South Carolina Lawyers Weekly

April 3, 2019 Marshall Gerstein Expands with Five Team Members, Including Three Attorneys

March 21, 2019

Marshall Gerstein Achieves 100 Percent Lawyer Participation in Chicago Bar Foundation's 2019 Investing in Justice Campaign

March 1, 2019 John R. Labbé Named 2019 'Intellectual Property Trailblazer' by The National Law Journal

January 28, 2019 Marshall Gerstein Lawyers Named 2019 "Leading Lawyers" and "Emerging Lawyers"

January 24, 2019 Marshall Gerstein Lawyers Named 2019 "Illinois Super Lawyers" and "Illinois Rising Stars"

January 17, 2019 Marshall Gerstein Elects Two New Partners

December 12, 2018 Tiffany D. Gehrke Named to the First Edition of Managing Intellectual Property's Rising Stars List



September 28, 2018 Marshall Gerstein and Paul B. Stephens Receive 2018 'Spirit of Generosity Award' During Cabrini Green Legal Aid "I Am Somebody" Benefit

May 18, 2018 Fourteen Marshall Gerstein Partners Named IP Stars in Managing IP's 2018 IP Stars Survey

January 25, 2018 Marshall Gerstein Lawyers Named 2018 "Illinois Super Lawyers" and "Illinois Rising Stars"

January 24, 2018 Marshall Gerstein Lawyers Named 2018 "Leading Lawyers" and "Emerging Lawyers"

September 28, 2017 "Weekly Verdict: Legal Lions & Lambs" (Firm Mention) Law360

September 22, 2017 Marshall Gerstein Trial Team Wins \$70 Million Jury Verdict for Amgen Inc. Law360

May 18, 2017 Fourteen Marshall Gerstein Partners Named IP Stars in Managing IP's 2017 IP Stars Survey

January 25, 2017 Marshall Gerstein Lawyers Named 2017 "Leading Lawyers" and "Emerging Lawyers"

January 13, 2017 Marshall Gerstein Lawyers Named 2017 "Illinois Super Lawyers" and "Illinois Rising Stars"

November 18, 2016 Benjamin Horton Featured in Emerging Lawyers Magazine – November Edition 2016 Emerging Lawyers Magazine

September 19, 2016 Marshall Gerstein Named "IP Boutique Firm of the Year" at LMG Life Sciences Awards 2016

May 24, 2016 Fifteen Partners Named IP Stars in Managing IP's 2016 IP Stars Survey

May 10, 2016 Two Marshall Gerstein Biotechnology Partners Selected Among Top 250 Women in IP

February 17, 2016 Biotech Partner & Chair Heather Kissling Wins 2016 ILO Client Choice Award

January 12, 2016 Marshall Gerstein Lawyers Named 2016 "Leading Lawyers" and "Emerging Lawyers"

January 8, 2016 Marshall Gerstein Lawyers Named 2016 "Illinois Super Lawyers" and "Illinois Rising Stars"



September 28, 2015 Marshall Gerstein's PTABWatch Blog Launches April 20, 2015 Twelve Partners Named IP Stars in Managing IP's 2015 World IP Handbook and Survey January 22, 2015 Marshall, Gerstein & Borun Lawyers Named 2015 "Leading Lawyers" and "Emerging Lawyers" January 16, 2015 Marshall, Gerstein & Borun Lawyers Named 2015 "Illinois Super Lawyers" and "Illinois Rising Stars" January 7, 2015 Marshall, Gerstein & Borun Elects Two New Partners December 12, 2014 Marshall, Gerstein & Borun LLP Attorneys Author InsideCounsel Magazine Articles November 3, 2014 David A. Gass Featured in Lawyer Monthly Sector Focus - Bioscience June 11, 2014 Marshall, Gerstein & Borun Ranked as "Highly Recommended" in the 2014 IAM Patent 1000 April 15, 2014 Eleven Partners Named IP Stars in Managing IP's 2014 World IP Handbook and Survey January 13, 2014 Marshall, Gerstein & Borun 2014 "Illinois Super Lawyers" and "Illinois Rising Stars" Named August 1, 2013 Marshall, Gerstein & Borun Attorneys Authoring a Four-Part Series in BioProcessing Journal June 3, 2013 Marshall, Gerstein & Borun and Five Partners Recognized in the 2013 IAM Patent 1000 March 14, 2013 Marshall, Gerstein & Borun Ranked Among World's Leading Patent Firms February 19, 2013 Patent Reform January 4, 2013 Marshall, Gerstein & Borun 2013 "Illinois Super" and "Illinois Rising Stars" Named March 20, 2012 Unanimous Supreme Court Decision In Mayo Collab. Serv. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc. February 7, 2012 Firm Partner Publishes "A Lopsided Estoppel In Post-Grant Review" January 31, 2012 Marshall, Gerstein & Borun Congratulates its 2012 Illinois Super Lawyers and Rising Stars



December 21, 2011 Partner Sandip Patel Authors Law360 Article "A Lopsided Estoppel In Post-Grant Review"

November 18, 2011 Jeremy D. Protas Announces 2011 Jeremy D. Protas LGBT Patent Law Scholarship

November 2, 2011

Pamela L. Cox named "World's Leading Patent and Technology Licensing Lawyers" in the 2012 IAM Licensing 250 list

August 30, 2011 Thomas I. Ross Named Fellow of Litigation Counsel of America

August 23, 2011 Update on "Gene patents" in the US

August 23, 2011 US Patent Reform

August 16, 2011 Marshall, Gerstein & Borun LLP Announces New Associates, Special Counsel and Technical Specialist

June 10, 2011

Supreme Court Unanimously Holds that Invalidity of U.S. Patents Must be Proven by Clear and Convincing Evidence

June 6, 2011 Supreme Court Holds that the Bayh-Dole Act Does Not Vest Title to Federally-funded Inventions in Universities

May 31, 2011 Supreme Court Holds that Induced Patent Infringement Requires Knowledge that the Induced Acts Constitute Patent Infringement

March 9, 2011 Patent Reform Bill S.23 Passed

February 28, 2011 USPTO to Open Midwest Office

January 25, 2011 Marshall, Gerstein & Borun 2011 "Illinois Super Lawyers" and "Illinois Rising Stars" Named

January 5, 2011 Thomas L. Duston Comments on e-Commerce Patent Lawsuits

December 21, 2010 USPTO Expands Communications and Public Engagement

September 15, 2010 Marshall, Gerstein & Borun Named Top Tier Illinois Intellectual Property Law Firm by U.S. News & World Report and Best Lawyers



April 7, 2010 Marshall, Gerstein & Borun 2010 "Illinois Rising Stars" Named

Events

November 11, 2022 | 66th Annual Intellectual Property, Information & Privacy Law Conference November 11, 2022 Virtual

October 20, 2022 | Meet Partner Jeremy Protas and Patent Agent Lilian Ficht at the Northwestern University Society of Women Engineers Industry Day Career Fair October 20, 2022 Virtual

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors Women In Bio–Chicago Eighth Annual Start-Up Challenge September 28, 2022 Portal Innovations (or Zoom)

September 22, 2022 | Partner Ryan Phelan to Lead WIPO Discussion on Intellectual Property Law's Impact on the Artificial Intelligence Industry September 22, 2022 Zurich, Switzerland and Zoom

September 19-20, 2022 | Partners Julianne Hartzell and Ryan Phelan to Speak at IPO Annual Meeting September 19, 2022 Los Angeles, CA

Partner Jeremy D. Protas to Speak at Diversity in the Law Panel for IPLAC June 30, 2021 Virtual

June 8, 2021 | Marshall Gerstein to Co-Sponsor Child's Voice Golf Outing June 8, 2021

May 4, 2021 | Partners Robert Gerstein and Cameron Pick Discuss IP Issues in Al, Software Licensing, and IT Services Agreements at the 2021 World Intellectual Property Forum May 4, 2021

April 16, 2021 | Managing Partner Jeffrey Sharp and Partner Michael Muczynski to Speak at Keiretsu Forum Midwest Event, "The Value of Intellectual Property to Investors" April 16, 2021

April 14, 2021 | Partner Ryan Phelan to Speak at Intellectual Property Owners Association Panel, "Protecting Software Related to a Medical Device: A Case Law Review & Strategy" | Webinar April 14, 2021

February 17, 2021 | Ryan Phelan to Present at Joint Event Between IPLAC and JPAA: Patenting Al Inventions in Japan and the U.S. | Virtual Event February 17, 2021

Ryan Phelan to Speak During Artificial Intelligence Think Tank for Center for International Legal Studies January 26, 2021



Jeremy Protas to Serve as Panelist for the Chicago Bar Association's Coming Out in the Workplace Seminar December 2, 2020

Ryan Phelan to Speak at UIC John Marshall 64th Annual IP Conference November 13, 2020

Ryan Phelan to Present on Intellectual Property Policy Considerations and Strategies on Patenting AI in the U.S. During IPO's 2020 Virtual Annual Meeting September 21, 2020

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors Women In Bio–Chicago Sixth Annual Start-Up Challenge September 10, 2020 via Zoom

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors WBAI's 106th Annual Reception September 10, 2020

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors BWLA's Women of Color in Politics: Leading the Charge to Transform Democracy Fundraiser September 3, 2020

Rueth, Elliott, and Watson to Speak on Patent and Licensing Strategy During RTAC-ACC Lunch & Learn Program October 16, 2019

Ryan Phelan to Speak on Artificial Intelligence Patent Prosecution Strategy at IIPLA 4th Annual Meeting September 24, 2019 Sheraton Hotel

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors Women In Bio–Chicago Fifth Annual Start-Up Challenge September 18, 2019

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors WBAI's 105th Annual Dinner

May 30, 2019 Chicago, IL

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors the 2019 Children's Home & Aid Champions for Children Luncheon

May 23, 2019 Chicago, IL

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors 2019 BIO IPCC Spring Conference & Meeting

April 8, 2019 Denver, CO

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors 2019 PTAB Bar Association Conference

March 14, 2019 Washington, D.C.

Cox, Phelan, and Terrell to Teach Intellectual Property Courses at Northwestern University Pritzker School of Law During Spring 2019 Semester March 2, 2019 Chicago, IL



Elliott, Rueth, and Gerstein to Co-Present at ACC Research Triangle Area 2019 IPPulooza

February 22, 2019 Research Triangle Park, NC

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors 2019 Equality Illinois Gala

February 2, 2019 Chicago, IL

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors Chicago Women in IP Fourth Annual Post-Holiday Progressive Networking Dinner

January 24, 2019 Chicago, IL

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors 2018 BIO IPCC Fall Conference & Meeting November 14, 2018 Indianapolis, IN

Heather R. Kissling, William K. Merkel, Ph.D., and Michael J. Allikian, Ph.D. to Present on the Patent Process During Innovation and New Ventures (INVO) at Northwestern University Luncheon Program October 9, 2018 Chicago, IL

Tiffany D. Gehrke to Moderate a Panel at Federal Circuit Bar Association's 2018 Bench & Bar® in Dialogue Program

October 3, 2018 Chicago, IL

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors IPO Annual Meeting 2018

September 23, 2018 Chicago, IL

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors Women In Bio–Chicago Fourth Annual Start-Up Challenge

September 17, 2018 Chicago, IL

Chavka, Duffy, and Hartzell to Conduct Roundtable on 3D Printing May 2, 2018 Marshall Gerstein

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors ACC Research Triangle Area Chapter's 2018 Spring Reception

April 25, 2018 Raleigh, NC

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors 2018 BIO IPCC Spring Conference & Meeting April 11, 2018 New Orleans, LA

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors 2018 PTAB Bar Association Conference

March 22, 2018 Washington, D.C.



Phelan and Terrell to Present on Patenting Software & Al Inventions: Why, What, and How

February 26, 2018 Evanston, IL

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors ACI's 2018 Life Sciences Patents Summit & ACI's 2018 Medical Device and

MedTech Patents Summit February 21, 2018 New York, New York

Ryan N. Phelan to Present on Patent Quality and 101 Rejections During the USPTO's First Chicago Regional Seminar

February 9, 2018 Chicago, IL

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors 2017 BIO IPCC Fall Conference & Meeting

November 13, 2017 Annapolis, MD

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors IPO Annual Meeting 2017

September 17, 2017 San Francisco, CA

Elliott, Rueth, and Watson to Speak at RTAC-ACC IP Update 2017

August 16, 2017 Raleigh, NC

David Gass to Speak on IP Rights and the Human Microbiome at 2017 BIO International Convention June 20, 2017

San Diego, CA

Tom Duston to Speak at IP Defense Summit 2017 – Chicago

May 17, 2017 Chicago, IL

Ben Horton to Speak at IP Defense Summit 2017 - Boston May 10, 2017 Boston, MA

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors ACC Research Triangle Area Chapter's 2017 Spring Reception

April 26, 2017 Raleigh, NC

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors 2017 BIO IPCC Spring Conference & Meeting

March 27, 2017 Newport Beach, CA

Tiffany Gehrke to Speak at Intellectual Property Law Symposium

March 15, 2017 Chicago, IL



Cox, Gerstein, and Watson to Speak at AUTM 2017 Annual Meeting

March 12, 2017 Hollywood, FL

Marshall Gerstein Co-Sponsors PTAB Bar Association Inaugural Conference

March 1, 2017 Washington, D.C.

Phelan and Terrell to Present on IP Law and the IoT

February 16, 2017 Chicago, IL

Marshall Gerstein Sponsors IPO Annual Meeting 2016

September 11, 2016 New York, NY

Ben Horton to Present at IP Strategy Summit 2016 – Houston May 12, 2016 Houston, TX

Horton and Patel to Speak at 2014 IP Defense Summit: Chicago October 8, 2014 Chicago, IL

Gass to Speak at 2013 BIO International Convention April 22, 2013

Use of Alternative Dispute Resolution to Resolve Intellectual Property and Licensing Disputes October 18, 2011

2011 National LGBT Bar Association Lavender Law Conference and Career Fair September 8, 2011

Marshall, Gerstein & Borun CLE - Stanford v. Roche and Resulting Practice Considerations August 4, 2011

2011 BIO International Convention in Washington, D.C., June 27-30 April 18, 2011

Marshall, Gerstein & Borun Co-Sponsors "Sweet Home Chicago" Event December 17, 2010

Minority Associate and In-House Counsel Bash October 14, 2010