

# Contents

*Preface*

*xxvii*

<b>Chapter 1</b>	<b>Foundations of the U.S. Patent System</b>	<b>1</b>
A.	Introduction and Chapter Overview	1
B.	Why Study Patent Law?	2
	1. Rise of the Information-Based Economy	2
	2. Educational Prerequisites	7
C.	What Is a Patent?	8
	1. Patents as a Form of Intellectual Property	8
	2. The Appropriability Problem of Intellectual Property	8
	3. Public Goods	9
	4. Exception to the General Rule of Competition by Imitation	11
	5. The Patent Document and Its Components	11
	6. The Negative Right to Exclude	12
	7. The Patent Term	20
D.	Economic Considerations	25
	1. Is a Patent a Monopoly?	26
	2. Cost/Benefit Analysis for Patents	27
	a. Costs	28
	b. Benefits	31
E.	Philosophical Rationales for Patent Protection	33
	1. Natural Rights	34
	2. Reward for Services Rendered	34
	3. Monopoly Profits Incentive	35
	4. Exchange for Secrets	36
F.	Primary Sources of U.S. Patent Law	37
	1. The Constitution	37
	2. Federal Statutes and Regulations	38
	3. Case Law	41
G.	Adjudicatory Forums for Patent Matters	45
	1. U.S. District Courts	45
	a. Subject Matter Jurisdiction and Venue	45
	(i) Subject Matter Jurisdiction	45
	(ii) Venue	49
		<b>xi</b>

## Contents

b.	Civil Actions Against the USPTO Director in the Eastern District of Virginia	53
2.	U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit	55
3.	USPTO Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB)	59
4.	U.S. International Trade Commission	61
H.	Patent Prosecution Overview	63
1.	Introduction	63
2.	Filing the Application	64
3.	Examination by the USPTO	67
a.	Sample Office Action and Applicant's Response	71
4.	Publication of Pending Patent Applications	74
5.	Continuing Application Practice	77
6.	Double Patenting	82
a.	Introduction	82
b.	Two Forms	83
c.	Policy Concerns	83
d.	Comparing Claims with Claims	86
e.	Case Study	87
f.	Terminal Disclaimers	89
 <b>Chapter 2 Patent Claims</b>		 <b>91</b>
A.	Introduction	91
1.	Historical Development of Patent Claiming	92
2.	Definition of a Patent Claim	92
3.	A Key Reference Work	94
B.	Claim Definiteness Requirement (35 U.S.C. §112(b))	95
1.	Own Lexicographer Rule	95
2.	Definiteness Standards	96
a.	Introduction	96
b.	Supreme Court Adjusts the Standard (Nautilus (U.S. 2014))	101
c.	Federal Circuit Applications of Nautilus	112
(i)	Terms of Degree	112
(ii)	Inconsistencies in Intrinsic Evidence	117
d.	Judicial Correction of Errors in Patent Claims	120
3.	Antecedent Basis	122
C.	Anatomy of a Patent Claim	123
1.	Preamble	124
2.	Transition	126
a.	"Comprising" Transition	126
b.	"Consisting of" Transition	129
c.	"Consisting Essentially of" Transition	129
3.	Body	130

## Contents

D.	Independent and Dependent Claims	132
E.	Specialized Claiming Formats	134
1.	Means-Plus-Function Claim Elements (35 U.S.C. §112(f))	134
a.	Introduction	134
b.	Interpreting the Scope of Means-Plus-Function Elements	137
(i)	Scope-Narrowing Operation	137
(ii)	Timing of Statutory Equivalents	138
(iii)	Presumptions	139
c.	Distinguishing §112(f) Statutory Equivalents and the Doctrine of Equivalents	146
2.	Product-by-Process Claims	147
3.	Jepson Claims	151
4.	Markush Claims	152
5.	Beauregard Claims	154
<b>Chapter 3 Disclosure Requirements (35 U.S.C. §112(a))</b>		<b>161</b>
A.	Introduction	161
1.	The Statutory Framework	161
2.	Disclosure as Quid Pro Quo	163
3.	Timing of Disclosure Compliance	164
B.	The Enablement Requirement	167
1.	Undue Experimentation	168
2.	Wands Factor: Predictable Versus Unpredictable Inventions	171
3.	Wands Factor: Scope of the Claims	174
a.	Generally	174
b.	Requirement for “Full Scope Enablement”	175
(i)	Mechanical Inventions	176
(ii)	Chemical/Biotechnological Inventions	177
(iii)	Electrical Inventions	193
c.	Supreme Court Review of “Full Scope” Enablement	195
4.	Wands Factor: Working Examples	196
5.	Nascent and After-Arising Technology	196
C.	The Best Mode Requirement	199
1.	Best Mode Scale-Back by America Invents Act of 2011	199
2.	Distinguishing Best Mode from Enablement	201
3.	Policy Rationale	201
4.	The Chemcast Analysis	203
a.	Step 1: Subjective Inquiry	203
b.	Step 2: Objective Inquiry	204
5.	Scope of the Best Mode Obligation	206
6.	Is Intentional Concealment Required?	208

## Contents

D.	The Written Description of the Invention Requirement	213
1.	Timing Mechanism	214
2.	How an Application Conveys Possession of an Invention	215
3.	Distinguishing Written Description from Enablement	222
4.	Typical Fact Scenarios Invoking Written Description Scrutiny	223
5.	Federal Circuit's Expansion of the Written Description Requirement	224
a.	Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. Eli Lilly (1997)	226
b.	Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle (2004)	229
c.	Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Hoffman-La Roche (2008)	232
d.	Ariad Pharms. v. Eli Lilly (2010) (en banc)	233
e.	AbbVie Deutschland v. Janssen Biotech (2014)	242
f.	Concluding Thoughts	249

## Chapter 4 Novelty, Loss of Right, and Priority Pre- and Post-America Invents Act of 2011 (35 U.S.C. §102) 251

	<i>Guide to This Chapter</i>	251
	<i>Part I: General Principles of Anticipation</i>	253
A.	The Meaning of Anticipation	253
B.	Burden of Proof	253
C.	The Strict Identity Rule of Anticipation	254
1.	In General	254
2.	The Special Case of Species/Genus Anticipation	255
D.	Anticipation by Inherency	257
E.	Enablement Standard for Anticipatory Prior Art	259
F.	What Is a Printed Publication?	262
	<i>Part II: Novelty, Loss of Right, and Priority Pre-America Invents Act of 2011</i>	271
G.	Introduction	271
1.	Statutory Basis	271
2.	Geographic Distinctions	274
3.	Who Is the Actor?	275
4.	Distinguishing Novelty from Loss of Right	276
H.	"Known or Used" Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) (Pre-AIA)	277
I.	The Statutory Bars of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) (Pre-AIA)	280
1.	Introduction	280
2.	Grace Period	282
3.	Section 102(b) Public Use	284
a.	Inventor's Control	284
b.	Acts by Third Parties	286
c.	"Secret" Public Use?	289
d.	Adding a "Ready for Patenting" Requirement for "Public Use"	290

## Contents

4.	Section 102(b) On Sale Bar	299
a.	Introduction	299
b.	Is Claimed Invention “Ready for Patenting”?	301
c.	Is Claimed Invention the Subject of a Commercial Offer for Sale?	302
5.	Experimental Use Negation of the §102(b) Bars	314
J.	Abandonment Under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) (Pre-AIA)	319
K.	Foreign Patenting Bar of 35 U.S.C. §102(d) (Pre-AIA)	321
L.	Description in Another’s Earlier-Filed Patent or Published Patent Application Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) (Pre-AIA)	322
1.	In General	322
2.	Attempted Reliance on Provisional Application Filing Date as Effective Date for §102(e) Reference (Rule of In re Wertheim)	326
M.	Derivation and Inventorship Under 35 U.S.C. §102(f) (Pre-AIA)	331
1.	Derivation	332
2.	Who Is an Inventor?	333
3.	Correction of Inventorship	335
4.	Joint Inventors	336
N.	Prior Invention Under 35 U.S.C. §102(g) (Pre-AIA)	336
1.	Introduction	336
2.	Interference Proceedings Under §102(g)(1)	337
3.	Anticipation Under §102(g)(2)	340
a.	Introduction	340
b.	Prior Invention Must Not Be “Abandoned, Suppressed, or Concealed”	340
c.	Geographic Requirements	342
d.	Section 102(g)(2) as Invalidity Defense	347
e.	Expansion of the Role of §102(g)	347
4.	Applying the Priority Rule of §102(g)	348
O.	Antedating (or “Swearing Behind”) Prior Art (Pre-AIA)	351
	<i>Part III: Novelty and Priority Post-America Invents Act of 2011</i>	<i>353</i>
P.	Introduction	353
1.	Statutory Basis	357
2.	Sense of Congress and Legislative History	359
3.	Comparing Pre- and Post-AIA Frameworks	361
a.	What Section 3 of the AIA Retained	363
b.	What Section 3 of the AIA Changed	363
Q.	Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events Under Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(a)(1)	370
1.	Invention “Patented, Described in a Printed Publication, or in Public Use, [or] on Sale” Before Effective Filing Date	370

## Contents

2.	Invention “Otherwise Available to the Public” Before Effective Filing Date	372
3.	Does the AIA Permit Secret Prior Art?	373
R.	Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events Under Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(a)(2)	388
S.	Novelty-Preserving Exceptions Under Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(b)	394
1.	Introduction	394
2.	Post-AIA §102(b)(1): Shields Against Post-AIA §102(a)(1) Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events	395
a.	(A)-Type Exceptions	395
b.	(B)-Type Exceptions	398
3.	Post-AIA §102(b)(2): Shields Against Post-AIA §102(a)(2) Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events	399
a.	(A)-Type Exceptions	400
b.	(B)-Type Exceptions	402
T.	Effective Date for AIA §3 First-Inventor-to-File Amendments	403
U.	Common Ownership Under Joint Research Agreements	409
 <b>Chapter 5 The Nonobviousness Requirement (35 U.S.C. §103)</b>		<b>413</b>
A.	Introduction	413
B.	Historical Context: The Hotchkiss “Ordinary Mechanic” and the Requirement for “Invention”	415
C.	Enactment of §103 of the Patent Act of 1952, Incorporating the Requirement of Nonobviousness	418
D.	The Graham v. John Deere Framework for Analyzing Nonobviousness	419
1.	Constitutionality of 35 U.S.C. §103	420
2.	Graham’s Analytical Framework for a §103 Analysis	420
E.	Graham Factor: Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	421
F.	Graham Factor: Scope and Content of the Prior Art	426
1.	Terminology	426
2.	Sources of Prior Art	426
3.	Section 102/103 Overlap	428
a.	Overview	428
b.	In re Bass (C.C.P.A. 1973)	430
c.	1984 Amendments	432
d.	AIPA (1999) Amendments	433
e.	CREATE Act (2004) Amendments	433
f.	AIA (2011) Amendments	434
g.	European Comparison	435
4.	Analogous Art	436
5.	Enablement of Prior Art Used for Obviousness	445

## Contents

G.	Graham Factor: Differences Between Claimed Invention and Prior Art	448
H.	Graham Factor: Secondary Considerations	449
	1. The Weight to Be Accorded Secondary Considerations Evidence	451
	a. Criticality in Federal Circuit Era	451
	b. Diverging Views	452
	2. Requirement for Explicit Analysis	460
	3. The Nexus Requirement for Evidence of Commercial Success	462
I.	Combining the Disclosures of Prior Art References to Establish Obviousness	465
	1. Teaching, Suggestion, or Motivation to Combine	466
	a. Generally	466
	b. Nature of Problem	466
	c. Reasonable Expectation of Success	467
	2. KSR v. Teleflex: Combinations, Predictability, and “Common Sense”	469
	3. Teaching Away	475
	4. “Obvious to Try”	480
	5. Unexpected Results	483
	a. Generally	483
	b. Timing of Evidence	485
	c. Placement in Graham Framework	495
J.	The Prima Facie Case of Obviousness	496
K.	Federal Circuit Standards of Review in §103 Determinations	502
	1. USPTO	503
	2. Federal District Court	505
<b>Chapter 6 The Utility Requirement (35 U.S.C. §101)</b>		<b>507</b>
A.	Introduction	507
B.	Practical/Real-World Utility	508
C.	The Supreme Court View	511
	1. Brenner v. Manson (1966)	511
	2. USPTO Implementing Guidelines	512
D.	The Federal Circuit View	514
	1. Chemical Compounds	514
	2. Methods of Medical Treatment	518
	3. Genetic Inventions	520
E.	Inoperability	523
	1. Examples of Inoperable Inventions	524
	2. Inoperable Species Within a Genus	525
F.	Immoral or Deceptive Inventions	526

## Contents

G.	Relationship Between Utility Requirement of §101 and How-to-Use Requirement of §112(a)	528
H.	Utility Requirement in Foreign Patent Systems	529
1.	Industrial Applicability	529
2.	Morality Criterion	530
 <b>Chapter 7 Potentially Patentable Subject Matter (35 U.S.C. §101)</b>		 <b>531</b>
A.	Introduction	531
1.	The General Nature of §101	531
2.	The Statutory Categories of §101	534
3.	Claiming the Inventive Concept Within Different Statutory Categories	534
4.	Exceptions to §101	537
B.	Section 101 Processes	539
1.	Basic Principles	539
2.	Process Versus Product	541
3.	Computer-Implemented Processes	541
4.	Business Methods	544
a.	State Street Bank (Fed. Cir. 1998)	544
b.	Bilski (U.S. 2010)	548
c.	Mayo (U.S. 2012)	558
d.	Alice Corp. (U.S. 2014)	559
e.	Federal Circuit “Abstract Idea” Cases After Alice Corp.	567
(i)	Decisions Sustaining Patent Eligibility at Step One	573
(ii)	Decisions Sustaining Patent Eligibility at Step Two	586
5.	Methods of Medical Treatment	605
a.	Mayo v. Prometheus (U.S. 2012)	605
b.	Federal Circuit Applications of Mayo	611
6.	Methods of Manufacture	630
C.	Section 101 Machines	638
D.	Section 101 Compositions of Matter	640
1.	Structure Versus Properties	640
2.	Products of Nature	641
a.	Purified Forms of Natural Products	641
b.	Genetic Materials	643
(i)	Myriad Genetics (U.S. 2013)	644
(ii)	Post-Myriad (U.S. 2013) Federal Circuit Decisions	655
c.	Spontaneously-Generated Compositions	661



## Contents

3.	Life Forms	662
a.	Foundation: <i>Diamond v. Chakrabarty</i> (U.S. 1980)	662
b.	Multicellular Organisms	664
c.	Clones	665
E.	Section 101 Manufactures	667
1.	Computer Media Claims	667
2.	Electrical Signals	670
3.	Device Profiles	672
F.	Nonpatentable Subject Matter	674
G.	Medical/Surgical Procedures	675
H.	Patentable Subject Matter Beyond §101: Plant Patents and Design Patents	676
1.	Plant Patents	676
2.	Design Patents	679
a.	Criteria for Obtaining Design Patents	680
(i)	Claimed Design versus Underlying Article	681
(ii)	Nonobviousness of Designs	683
b.	Establishing Infringement of Design Patents	688
c.	Unique Remedy for Design Patent Infringement	691
(i)	Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §289	691
(ii)	No Apportionment	694

## **Chapter 8 Correcting and Challenging Issued Patents in the USPTO 697**

A.	Introduction	697
B.	Certificates of Correction	698
C.	Reissue	700
1.	Overview	700
2.	Historical Development	701
3.	Statutory Basis	703
4.	Broadening Reissues	704
5.	Reissue Error	705
6.	The Recapture Rule	707
7.	Effect of Reissue: Intervening Rights	710
8.	Strategic Considerations for Reissue	714
D.	Reexamination	716
1.	Introduction	716
2.	Ex Parte Reexamination	718
a.	Who Can Request	718
b.	Statutory Grounds for Reexamination	719
c.	Substantial New Question of Patentability	719
d.	Legislative Changes in Response to Portola	721
e.	Reexamination Compared to Reissue	721

## Contents

3.	Inter Partes Reexamination (Pre-AIA)	723
E.	AIA-Implemented Procedures for Challenging Issued Patents	726
	Introduction	726
	Constitutionality	730
	Procedural Aspects	733
1.	Inter Partes Review	736
a.	Introduction	736
b.	Time Limits	736
c.	Scope of Review	737
d.	Standard to Institute Review and Non-Reviewability of Institution Decision	738
	(i) Introduction	738
	(ii) <i>Cuozzo</i> (U.S. 2016): No Judicial Review of “Ordinary” Institution Issues	738
	(iii) <i>Thryv</i> (U.S. 2020): No Judicial Review of Institution Time-Bar Determinations	744
	(iv) <i>SAS Institute</i> (U.S. 2018): Rejection of Partial Institution	748
e.	PTAB as Adjudicator	749
f.	Estoppel	751
2.	Post-Grant Review	757
3.	“Broadest Reasonable Construction” Rule for Claims	761
<b>Chapter 9 Patent Infringement</b>		<b>767</b>
A.	Introduction	767
1.	Statutory Framework	767
a.	Direct Versus Indirect Infringement Under 35 U.S.C. §271	768
b.	“Divided” Infringement by Multiple Parties Under §271(a)	769
2.	Two-Step Analysis for Patent Infringement	781
B.	Step One: Patent Claim Interpretation	782
1.	The Central Role of Claims	783
2.	Judge or Jury as Interpreter? The Markman Revolution	784
3.	Evidentiary Sources for Claim Interpretation	787
4.	The Phillips Debate: “Contextualist” Versus “Literalist” Approaches	789
5.	Markman Hearings	794
6.	Appellate Review of Claim Interpretation: From <i>Cybor</i> (Fed. Cir. 1998) to <i>Teva</i> (U.S. 2015)	795
a.	Federal Circuit’s De Novo Standard of Review	795
b.	Supreme Court Requires Deference for Fact Finding: <i>Teva</i> (2015)	799

## Contents

c.	Federal Circuit Application of the Teva Standard	805
7.	Claim Interpretation Canons	811
C.	Step Two: Comparing the Properly Interpreted Claims to the Accused Device	814
1.	Literal Infringement	814
2.	Infringement Under the Doctrine of Equivalents	816
a.	Historical Origins	816
b.	Policy Rationales	817
c.	Tension with the Notice Function of Claims	818
d.	All-Limitations Rule	819
e.	What Is a Limitation?	819
f.	Determining Technologic Equivalence	822
g.	Reverse Doctrine of Equivalents	824
D.	Legal Limitations on the Doctrine of Equivalents	826
1.	Overview	826
2.	Prosecution History Estoppel	827
a.	Definition	827
b.	Scope of Estoppel	830
c.	Presumption of Estoppel Under Warner-Jenkinson	830
d.	Federal Circuit’s Complete Bar Rule of Festo I	831
e.	Supreme Court’s Presumptive Bar Rule of Festo II	832
f.	Federal Circuit’s Remand Decision in Festo III	835
g.	Federal Circuit Decisions Applying the Festo Rebuttal Criteria	838
3.	Prior Art (Hypothetical Claim Analysis)	844
4.	Dedication to the Public	846
5.	Vitiation of Claim Limitations	851
E.	Aspects of Infringement Beyond 35 U.S.C. §271(a)	853
1.	Inducing Infringement Under §271(b)	853
a.	Overview	853
b.	Direct Infringement Predicate	854
c.	Intent Requirement	855
d.	Global-Tech (U.S. 2011): “Willful Blindness” Standard	858
e.	Commil USA (U.S. 2015): Rejecting Belief of Invalidity as Inducement Defense	859
2.	Contributory Infringement Under §271(c)	864
3.	Drug Marketing Application Filings Under §271(e)	866
4.	Component Exports Under §271(f)	870
a.	Overview	870
b.	Liability	873
c.	Remedy	876
5.	Importation Under §271(g)	880

## Contents

<b>Chapter 10</b>	<b>Defenses to Patent Infringement</b>	<b>883</b>
A.	Introduction	883
B.	Noninfringement	884
C.	Absence of Liability for Infringement	884
1.	License	885
a.	Express License	885
b.	Implied License	885
2.	Prior User Rights	890
3.	Experimental Use	894
4.	Expiration of Damages Limitation Period of 35 U.S.C. §286	897
5.	Laches and Equitable Estoppel in Initiating Patent Infringement Litigation	898
a.	Introduction	898
(i)	Aukerman (Fed. Cir. 1992) (en banc)	899
(ii)	Petrella (U.S. 2014)	900
(iii)	SCA Hygiene II (Fed. Cir. 2015) (en banc)	902
(iv)	SCA Hygiene III (U.S. 2017): Substantial Repeal of Laches Defense	907
b.	Elements of Laches	914
(i)	Unreasonable Delay by Patentee	915
(ii)	Material Prejudice to Accused Infringer	917
(iii)	“Should Have Known”	918
c.	Equitable Estoppel	919
6.	State Sovereign Immunity	923
7.	Temporary Presence Exemption	925
8.	Patent Exhaustion	928
9.	Plaintiff’s Lack of Standing to Sue for Infringement	940
D.	Unenforceability	941
1.	Inequitable Conduct	942
a.	Materiality	943
b.	Intent to Deceive	952
c.	Balancing	955
d.	Burden of Proof and Standard of Review	956
2.	Patent Misuse	956
a.	Introduction	956
b.	Historical Development	960
(i)	Tying	960
(ii)	Post-Patent Expiration Royalties	962
c.	Limitations on Patent Misuse: §271(d)	972
3.	Prosecution History Laches	976
4.	Unclean Hands Based on Misconduct Independent of Inequitable Conduct in Patent Procurement	980
E.	Invalidity	989

## Contents

1.	Burden of Proof	989
2.	Collateral Estoppel Effect of Invalidity Adjudication	992
3.	Statutory Grounds for Invalidity	992
4.	Limits on Accused Infringer’s Standing to Assert Invalidity: Licensee Repudiation and Assignor Estoppel	993
	a. Licensee Repudiation	993
	b. Assignor Estoppel	995
	(i) Generally	995
	(ii) Federal Circuit’s Expansive Approach	996
	(iii) Supreme Court Places Limitations on Assignor Estoppel	1000
F.	Antitrust Counterclaims	1006
	1. Market Power	1007
	2. Anticompetitive Conduct	1012
G.	Patent Declaratory Judgment Actions	1018
	1. Federal Circuit’s Pre-MedImmune “Reasonable Apprehension” Test	1020
	2. Supreme Court’s Decision in MedImmune	1020
	3. Post-MedImmune Federal Circuit Decisions	1022
 <b>Chapter 11 Remedies for Patent Infringement</b>		<b>1027</b>
A.	Introduction	1027
B.	Injunctions	1028
	1. Permanent Injunctions	1029
	a. The eBay v. MercExchange Standard	1031
	b. “Causal Nexus” Requirement for Irreparable Harm	1033
	2. Preliminary Injunctions	1037
	a. Likelihood of Success on the Merits	1038
	b. Irreparable Harm	1040
	c. Balance of the Hardships Tipping in Movant’s Favor	1043
	d. Public Interest	1043
	e. Appellate Standard of Review	1044
C.	Ongoing Royalties for Future Infringements	1045
D.	Damages for Past Infringements	1047
	1. Introduction	1047
	2. Compensatory Damages	1049
	a. Lost Profits	1050
	(i) The Panduit Analysis	1050
	(a) Demand for the patented product	1051
	(b) Absence of acceptable noninfringing substitutes	1051
	(c) Manufacturing and marketing capability	1054
		<b>xxiii</b>

## Contents

(d)	Amount of profit	1054
(ii)	The Rite-Hite Expansion	1054
(iii)	Territoriality Limitations	1056
b.	Entire Market Value Rule/Convoyed Sales	1059
c.	Reasonable Royalty	1063
(i)	Hypothetical Negotiation	1064
(ii)	Analytical Approach	1066
d.	Price Erosion	1069
e.	Apportionment	1069
3.	Enhanced Damages and Willful Infringement	1078
a.	Overview	1078
b.	Early Federal Circuit Decisions on Willfulness	1080
c.	Seagate (Fed. Cir. 2007) (en banc)	1082
d.	America Invents Act (2011) Codification	1085
e.	Supreme Court Rewrites Law of Willful Infringement (2016)	1086
(i)	Halo v. Pulse (Fed. Cir. 2014)	1087
(ii)	Stryker v. Zimmer (Fed. Cir. 2015)	1090
4.	Halo v. Pulse (U.S. 2016)	1092
E.	Attorney Fees	1099
1.	Overview	1099
2.	Statutory Basis	1101
3.	Discretionary	1101
4.	Prevailing Party	1102
5.	“Exceptional” Case	1103
a.	Octane Fitness II (U.S. 2014)	1106
b.	Highmark III (U.S. 2014)	1111
6.	No Attorney Fee Shifting to Patent Office in §145 Actions	1113
F.	Prejudgment Interest	1117
G.	Costs	1118
H.	Patent Marking	1120
I.	Provisional Compensation Remedy	1123

## Chapter 12 International Patenting Issues 1129

A.	Introduction	1129
1.	Territorial Scope of Patents	1129
2.	Obtaining Foreign Patent Protection Prior to the Paris Convention	1131
B.	The Paris Convention	1134
1.	Introduction	1134
2.	National Treatment	1135
3.	Right of Priority	1136

## Contents

4.	U.S. Implementation of the Paris Right of Priority: 35 U.S.C. §119	1139
5.	The Hilmer Rule (Pre-America Invents Act of 2011)	1141
6.	Limitations of the Paris Convention	1144
C.	The Patent Cooperation Treaty	1145
D.	The World Trade Organization's Agreement on Trade- Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS)	1148
E.	Patent Harmonization	1152
1.	First-to-File Versus First-to-Invent	1153
2.	Absolute Versus Qualified Novelty: Grace Period	1157
F.	Gray Market Goods and the International Exhaustion Debate	1158
1.	Domestic Exhaustion	1159
2.	Regional (European Community-Wide) Exhaustion	1160
3.	International Exhaustion	1161
G.	Enforcement of Foreign Patents in U.S. Courts	1174
H.	Patent Protection in Europe	1177
1.	Routes to Obtain Protection	1177
2.	Routes to Enforce Patents	1181
a.	National Courts	1181
b.	Unified Patent Court	1181
	<i>Glossary</i>	<i>1185</i>
	<i>Index</i>	<i>1203</i>
	<i>Table of Cases</i> available online at <a href="http://aspenpublishing.com/products/mueller-patents7">aspenpublishing.com/products/mueller-patents7</a>	

