

<b>Preface to the Seventh Edition</b>	<b>xxi</b>
<b>Preface to the First Edition</b>	<b>xxiii</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>xxv</b>
 <b>Chapter 1 History and Architecture of the Patent System</b>	 <b>1</b>
Introduction	1
A. A History of Patent Law	9
1. The Classical Period	9
2. European Origins	12
a. The Italian Renaissance	12
b. English Patent Policy and the Statute of Monopolies	17
3. The American Experience	23
4. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit	37
B. Economics of Patent Law	41
Comparative Perspective: The European Patent Convention	44
C. The Patent Document and Process of Obtaining Patent Rights	54
 <b>Chapter 2 Claiming and Disclosing the Invention</b>	 <b>73</b>
Introduction	73
A. The Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art	76
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co., Ltd. v. Apotex, Inc.</i>	77
<i>Stryker Corp. v. Hill-Rom Services, Inc.</i>	79
Comments	84
B. Claim Interpretation	86
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i>	87
Comments	99
<i>Unique Concepts, Inc. v. Brown</i>	106
Comments	113
C. Enablement	119
1. Enablement and Claim Scope	120
<i>O'Reilly v. Morse</i>	120

<i>Consolidated Electric Light Co. v. McKeesport Light Co.</i> <i>(The Incandescent Lamp Case)</i>	125
Comments	132
Matt Richtel, Edison . . . Wasn't He the Guy Who Invented Everything?	141
Policy Perspective: Optimal Claim Scope and Patent Law's Delicate Balance	143
2. Enablement and Undue Experimentation	144
<i>Cedarapids, Inc. v. Nordberg, Inc.</i>	145
<i>Automotive Technologies International, Inc. v. BMW</i> <i>of North America, Inc.</i>	147
<i>Amgen, Inc. v. Sanofi</i>	153
Comments	162
D. Written Description	168
<i>Ariad Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i>	169
Comments	176
<i>Gentry Gallery, Inc. v. Berkline Corp.</i>	184
Comments	187
E. Definiteness	189
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i>	189
<i>Niazi Licensing Corp. v. St. Jude Medical S.C., Inc.</i>	196
Comments	201
F. Best Mode	205
<i>Young Dental Manufacturing Company, Inc. v. Q3 Special</i> <i>Products, Inc.</i>	206
Comments	209
<b>Chapter 3    Novelty and Prior Art</b>	<b>213</b>
Introduction	213
A. Novelty's Doctrinal Framework	216
<i>Atlas Powder Company v. IRECO Incorporated</i>	216
Comments	222
B. Defining Prior Art	227
1. "Known or Used" Under Section 102(a) (Pre-AIA)	227
<i>Gayler v. Wilder</i>	227
<i>Rosaire v. Baroid Sales Division</i>	230
Comments	232
2. "Printed Publication"	235
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i>	236
Comments	241

3. “On Sale”	246
a. Developmental Stage of the Claimed Invention	247
<i>Pfaff v. Wells Electronics</i>	247
Comments	253
b. What Constitutes an Offer for Sale?	255
<i>The Medicines Company v. Hospira, Inc.</i>	255
Comments	264
c. Confidential Sales Pre- and Post-AIA	271
<i>Helsinn Healthcare S.A. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.</i>	271
<i>Celanese Int’l Corp. v. International Trade Comm’n.</i>	276
Comments	284
4. “Public Use”	287
<i>Egbert v. Lippmann</i>	287
<i>Motionless Keyboard Co. v. Microsoft Corp.</i>	290
Comments	294
Comparative Perspective: Prejudicial Disclosures Under the European Patent Convention	299
5. The Grace Period and Exceptions to Disclosures Made Under Post-AIA Section 102(a) (1)	301
6. “Publicly Disclosed”	306
<i>Sanho Corp. v. Kaijet Technology Int’l, Inc.</i>	306
Comments	313
7. Third-Party On-Sale and Public Use Activity	314
<i>Lorenz v. Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co.</i>	314
<i>Evans Cooling Systems, Inc. v. General Motors Corp.</i>	317
Comments	321
8. Experimental Use	326
<i>City of Elizabeth v. American Nicholson Pavement Co.</i>	326
Comments	330
9. Novelty-Defeating Patent Disclosures	333
<i>Alexander Milburn Co. v. Davis-Bourmonville Co.</i>	334
Comments	336
Patent Reform Perspective: The AIA, Pre-AIA Section 102(g), and Prior User Rights	341
Comparative Perspective: Novelty and State of the Art Under the European Patent Convention	344
C. Priority	348
1. Proving Date of Invention	349
<i>Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.</i>	349
Comments	353

2. Diligence and Abandonment	356
<i>Griffith v. Kanamaru</i>	357
<i>Fujikawa v. Wattanasin</i>	361
Comments	368
Comparative Perspective: First-to-File vs. First-to-Invent	371
<b>Chapter 4 Nonobviousness</b>	<b>373</b>
Introduction	373
A. The Historical Foundation of Section 103 and the Nonobviousness Requirement	376
<i>Hotchkiss v. Greenwood</i>	376
Comments	379
B. The <i>Graham</i> Test	380
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i>	381
<i>United States v. Adams</i>	387
Comments	393
C. Application of the <i>Graham</i> Test	401
1. Determining Obviousness (or Not)	401
<i>KSR International v. Teleflex, Inc.</i>	401
a. PHOSITA's "Common Sense"	414
<i>Perfect Web Technologies, Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.</i>	414
b. Motivation to Combine References	418
<i>In re NuVasive, Inc.</i>	418
Comments	421
c. Structural Similarity and Chemical Compounds	433
<i>Procter &amp; Gamble Company v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.</i>	433
Comments	438
Policy Perspective: Using Section 103 as a Policy Tool	443
Comparative Perspective: Section 103's European Counterpart — "Inventive Step"	444
2. Available Prior Art and the Analogous Art Doctrine	446
<i>In re Icon Health &amp; Fitness, Inc.</i>	446
<i>In re Klein</i>	449
Comments	457
D. Secondary Considerations	460
<i>Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Drilling USA, Inc.</i>	460
Comments	468

<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>Eligible Subject Matter and Utility</b>	<b>475</b>
Introduction		475
A. Eligible Subject Matter		476
<i>Diamond v. Chakrabarty</i>		477
Comments		486
<i>Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Laboratories, Inc.</i>		489
Comments		499
<i>Alice Corporation Pty. v. CLS Bank International</i>		508
Comments		516
<i>Contour IP Holding LLC v. GoPro, Inc.</i>		522
Comments		527
<i>Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.</i>		530
Comments		537
<i>Harvard College v. Canada (Commissioner of Patents)</i>		544
Comments		554
A Note on Patents, Biotechnology, and the Bayh-Dole Act		555
Comparative Perspective: Biotechnology Patents in Europe		556
B. Utility		557
1. Operability and the Basic Utility Test		557
<i>In re Swartz</i>		557
Comments		558
2. Substantial Utility		560
<i>Brenner v. Manson</i>		560
Comments		564
Note on Design Patents		565
<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>Enforcing Patent Rights</b>	<b>569</b>
Introduction		569
Comparative Perspective: Enforcing Patents in Europe		577
A. Claim Interpretation		578
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc. (Markman II)</i>		579
<i>Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i>		582
Comments		589
B. Infringement		596
1. Literal Infringement		596
<i>Larami Corporation v. Amron</i>		596
Comments		600

2. The Doctrine of Equivalents	604
Comparative Perspective: Non-Literal Infringement in Europe	606
<i>Graver Tank &amp; Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Prods. Co.</i>	607
Comments	612
<i>Warner-Jenkinson Co., Inc. v. Hilton Davis Chemical Co.</i>	613
Comments	623
3. Limitations on the Doctrine of Equivalents	630
a. Prosecution History Estoppel	630
<i>Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd. (Festo VIII)</i>	631
Comments	639
Policy Perspective: <i>Festo</i> and the Devolution of Responsibility	646
b. Disclosure-Dedication Rule	647
<i>Johnson &amp; Johnston Assocs., Inc. v. R.E. Service Co., Inc.</i>	647
Comments	654
c. All-Limitations Rule and Specific Exclusion	657
<i>SciMed Life Systems, Inc. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Systems, Inc.</i>	657
Comments	665
d. Ensnarement	670
<i>Wilson Sporting Goods Co. v. David Geoffrey &amp; Associates</i>	670
Comments	676
4. Indirect Infringement	676
<i>Lucent Technologies, Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.</i>	677
<i>Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.</i>	680
Comments	685
<i>Akamai Technologies, Inc. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.</i>	691
Comments	694
5. Infringement of Means-Plus-Function Claims	697
<i>Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC</i>	697
<i>Odetics, Inc. v. Storage Technology Corp.</i>	706
Comments	712
C. Defining the Geographic Scope of the Patent Right	713
1. The Parameters of Section 271(a): Defining “Within the United States”	714
<i>NTP, Inc. v. Research In Motion, Ltd.</i>	714
Comments	723
2. The Parameters of Section 271(f): Export Activity	725
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. AT&amp;T Corp.</i>	726

<i>Life Technologies Corp. v. Promega Corp.</i>	736
Comments	741
3. The Parameters of Section 271(g): Import Activity	746
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. American Cyanamid Co.</i>	746
Comment	752
<b>Chapter 7 Defenses to Patent Infringement</b>	<b>755</b>
Introduction	755
A. Patent Exhaustion and Rights and Limitations on the Use of Contract in Exploiting Patent Rights	755
1. The Scope of Patent Exhaustion and the Repair-Reconstruction Doctrine	757
<i>Jazz Photo Corp. v. International Trade Commission</i>	757
Comments	765
2. Contractual Limitations on Use and Restraints on Alienation	768
a. Field-of-Use and Other Licensing Restrictions	768
<i>Mallinckrodt v. Medipart</i>	769
<i>Impression Products, Inc. v. Lexmark International, Inc.</i>	774
Comments	782
<i>Bowman v. Monsanto Company</i>	788
Comments	793
b. Package Licenses and Tying Arrangements	794
<i>Morton Salt Co. v. G.S. Suppiger Co.</i>	795
<i>U.S. Philips Corp. v. International Trade Commission</i>	797
Comments	806
c. Contractual Provisions Relating to Royalty Payments	811
<i>Brulotte v. Thys Co.</i>	811
<i>Scheiber v. Dolby Laboratories, Inc.</i>	815
Comments	819
3. Contractual and Jurisdictional Restrictions Relating to Challenging Patent Validity	821
a. Licensee's Ability to Challenge Patent Validity	821
<i>Lear, Inc. v. Adkins</i>	821
<i>MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i>	827
Comments	832
b. Declaratory Judgment Jurisdiction	838
<i>SanDisk Corp. v. ST Microelectronics, Inc.</i>	838
Comments	849

B. Antitrust	853
1. Patents and Market Power	854
<i>Illinois Tool Works, Inc. v. Independent Ink, Inc.</i>	854
Comments	860
2. <i>Walker Process</i> and “Sham” Litigation	862
<i>Nobelpharma AB v. Implant Innovations, Inc.</i>	862
Comments	871
3. Settlements	874
<i>Federal Trade Commission v. Actavis, Inc.</i>	874
Comments	886
4. Refusal to Deal	889
<i>In re Independent Service Organizations Antitrust Litigation</i>	890
Comments	894
C. Inequitable Conduct and the Duty of Candor	896
<i>Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co.</i>	896
Comments	904
D. Experimental Use	908
1. Statutory Experimental Use Under Section 271(e)(1)	908
<i>Merck v. Integra Lifesciences I</i>	908
Comments	914
2. Common Law Experimental Use	916
<i>Madey v. Duke University</i>	916
Comments	921
E. Inventorship	922
<i>HIP, Inc. v. Hormel Foods Corp.</i>	922
Comments	928
F. Preemption	931
1. The Framework of Preemption Analysis	932
<i>Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America v. District of Columbia</i>	932
2. Preemption of State Law	938
<i>Kewanee Oil Co. v. Bicron</i>	938
<i>Bonito Boats, Inc. v. Thunder Craft Boats, Inc.</i>	948
Comments	957
<b>Chapter 8     Remedies</b>	<b>959</b>
Introduction	959
A. Money Damages	959



<b>Contents</b>	<b>xix</b>
1. Lost Profits	960
<i>Rite-Hite Corp. v. Kelley Co., Inc.</i>	960
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. American Maize-Products Co.</i>	969
Comments	980
2. Reasonable Royalty	984
<i>Trio Process Corp. v. Goldstein's Sons, Inc.</i>	985
<i>Lucent Technologies, Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.</i>	990
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i>	1003
Comments	1013
B. Equitable Relief	1018
1. Preliminary Injunctions	1018
<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. Barnesandnoble.com, Inc.</i>	1018
<i>Celsis In Vitro, Inc. v. CellzDirect, Inc.</i>	1024
Comments	1034
2. Permanent Injunctions	1036
<i>eBay Inc. v. Mercexchange, LLC</i>	1036
<i>Edwards Lifesciences v. CoreValve, Inc.</i>	1040
<i>Robert Bosch LLC v. Pylon Manufacturing Corp.</i>	1042
Comments	1052
Policy Perspective: Property Rules, Liability Rules, and Patent Litigation	1057
C. Willful Infringement and Enhanced Damages	1058
<i>Halo Electronics, Inc. v. Pulse Electronics, Inc.</i>	1058
Comments	1065
D. Marking and Constructive Notice	1066
<i>Maxwell v. J. Baker, Inc.</i>	1066
Comments	1069
 <b>Selected Patent Statutes</b>	 <b>1073</b>
<b>Table of Cases</b>	<b>1077</b>
<b>Index</b>	<b>1097</b>

