

Patent Litigation

Protecting valuable inventions in a highly competitive global environment has become increasingly challenging for multinational businesses. With the significant rise in patent litigation and with damages exceeding the billion-dollar mark in the US, the risks and opportunities facing companies are higher than ever. Whether enforcing your patents against others or defending you against claims of patent infringement, DLA Piper has the experience to help you succeed.

With over 130 patent litigators on the ground in key jurisdictions worldwide, DLA Piper is uniquely positioned to help companies successfully navigate their patent matters around the globe. Our team of over 70 patent litigators located in the major US cities alone, plus an additional 60 patent litigators in other key jurisdictions worldwide, know the laws, the courts and the judges in the jurisdictions where most patent disputes occur.

We often manage related patent matters in multiple US jurisdictions simultaneously, including the ITC. With our global reach, we are also accustomed to acting for clients in resolving multijurisdictional patent disputes in the US, Canada, Europe and Asia Pac. In particular, we have significant experience with cross-border patent litigation involving the US, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Turkey, UK, China and Australia, as well as other countries worldwide. We are highly adept at developing and implementing global patent enforcement strategies for our clients and strategically selecting venues to increase their probability of success.

Our deep technical bench includes lawyers with advanced degrees and/or experience in most technical areas, especially electronics, computer science, telecommunications and wireless, pharma and biotech, medical devices, chemical engineering, materials and automotive – so we can quickly understand your technology and industry.

We try cases – and we win them. Since we are trial lawyers, we develop potential trial themes early and use them to evaluate the evidence by both parties. We are known for our ability to explain complex technologies to judges and juries. Since our opponents know we are not afraid to go to trial, we are very often able to reach a favorable settlement. We also have a leading appellate practice, and have helped clients hold on to their victory or reverse any adverse result. Additionally, we have extensive experience handling inter partes reviews (IPRs) and post-grant reviews (PGRs) in the US, as well as supporting clients in opposition proceedings before the European Patent Office.

We do not represent patent assertion entities ('patent trolls'). We have deep experience opposing such entities and have developed successful, cost-effective litigation strategies against them.

EXPERIENCE

Deborah Bould MA

Partner

London

T: +44 207 796 60 21 deborah.bould@dlapiper.com

Sean C. Cunningham

Partner

San Diego (Downtown) T: +1 619 699 2900

sean.cunningham@dlapiper.coi

William (Skip) Fisher

Partner

Shanghai

T: +86 21 3852 2198 william.fisher@dlapiper.com

Dr Markus Gampp LL.M.

Partner

Munich

T: +49 89 23 23 72 261 markus.gampp@dlapiper.com

Robynne Sanders

Partner

Melbourne

T: +61 3 9274 5539

robynne.sanders@dlapiper.com

Bruce W. Stratton

Partner

Toronto

- Advising a global tech giant in relation to a high profile, multijurisdictional patent litigation case, our global team successfully represented our client in a 27-patent case in the Northern District of Texas and three High Court trials in the UK, resulting in a confidential worldwide settlement. This was the biggest patent case before the UK Courts in 2009 and 2010. This matter involved strategic, cross-border coordination of complex patent litigation among the US, the UK, and other jurisdictions. It also involved complex issues relating to antitrust and anti-competition claims, standard-setting claims and defences and issues concerning what constitutes a fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory (FRAND) licensing commitment in the standard-setting context.
- Representing a data protection software client in a patent trial in the popular US District of Delaware, we won a full defense jury verdict. Our client's rival asserted that our client and the other defendants infringed two patents relating to fundamental technology for anti-virus software. Their rival had previously won a jury verdict and a permanent injunction against another anti-virus software company. However, at trial our client demonstrated that it invented the same technology years before their rival filed for its patents, and following a three-week trial before Chief Judge Gregory Sleet, the jury unanimously agreed, finding both asserted patents invalid and not infringed. In addition, the jury found all asserted claims were invalid and rendered obvious over several prior art references, including our client's own products developed years before their rival filed the claim. The lawsuit was unique in part because it involved global discovery efforts (US, UK, Israel, Czech Republic and France) and several interrelated lawsuits spanning multiple years.

T: 1 416 862 3382 bruce.stratton@dlapiper.com

RELATED SERVICES

- Antitrust and Competition
- International Trade, Regulatory and Government Affairs
- Litigation, Arbitration and Investigations

RELATED SECTORS

- Financial Services
- Energy and Natural Resources
- Life Sciences
- Technology
- Representing a US-based technology company as lead counsel in an ITC investigation, we helped our client prevail in an important
 case in which their competitor alleged that our client's SRAM chips infringed four patents. The Administrative Law Judge's Initial
 Determination found no violation of Section 337, finding that none of the four patents was infringed and that the Complainant had failed
 to establish a domestic industry as to any of the four patents. The Commission subsequently affirmed the finding of no violation on each
 of these grounds and additionally found the asserted claims of one of the patents invalid.
- Representing a worldwide airline in a high profile, cross-border patent litigation matter regarding three patents and design rights protecting its innovative seating system, we secured our client's success. In a complex web of cases involving the seat manufacturer and several airlines centred around the UK, we successfully halted sales of a rival seating system which took advantage of our client's innovation. Involving legally complex issues, these cases established legal precedent on a number of matters, going all the way to the UK Supreme Court. This matter demonstrated the value of our strong global patent team, as we were able to quickly (sometimes mid-hearing) and cost effectively investigate the legal position in other countries on issues where there was no settled position in the UK, including in France, Germany, The Netherlands, Spain, Italy, Australia and the US. Our comprehensive coverage enabled us to obtain foreign case law and commentary which supported our client's position and refute mischaracterisations of the foreign law position raised against our client.
- We successfully protected the exclusivity in Australia of one of the key products of a leading global pharmaceutical company, including obtaining an interlocutory injunction against a competitor preventing it from launching its generic products. The matter will proceed over the next year to final resolution of the infringement and patent validity issues
- Advising a global, NYSE-listed medical technology manufacturer of a drug delivery system in patent infringement proceedings in the UK, France and Germany, relating to patents for syringe pump drivers.

INSIGHTS

Publications

Can an AI system be named the inventor? In wake of EDVA decision, questions remain

23 September 2021 AI OUTLOOK

Artificial intelligence is notable among the new technologies posing fundamental questions about the viability of the inventor's oath.

Supreme Court Cor	
September 2021 The Court chose to enh	nance the Director's power to review PTAB decisions directly.
The Pharmaceutical	I Corner
September 2021 <i>Teva v. Amicus</i> is the fil	rst lawsuit to test the reach of the CREATES Act. Expect more.
Austin and Washing	gton, DC offices bolster patent litigation capabilities with new arrivals
lune 2021 lennifer Nall and Helen	a Kiepura have joined our Intellectual Property and Technology practice's patent litigation team.
Patent eligibility of FCAFC 101	diagnostic methods in Australia confirmed: Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc v Sequenom, Inc [2021]
eligible subject matter?	lowing question awaited judicial determination under Australian law: is a DNA-based diagnostic method patent The Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia has confirmed that diagnostic methods involving the practical henomena" can be patentable inventions in Australia.
Supreme Court Cor	ner
une 2021 The issue at hand in <i>Ur</i>	nicolors v. H&M turns on a question of inaccuracies in the copyright registration certificate.
he Pharmaceutica	I Corner
lune 2021 Ve look at the underlyii	ng decision in Immunex v. Sandoz and the potential implications on pharma patent licensing strategies.
Trial by eligibility	
une 2021	ted States, every single jury trial on patent eligibility under 35 U.S.C. § 101 has resulted in a defense verdict.

Numerous amici in American Axle urge the Supreme Court to take the case; update on USPTO v. Booking.com.

Supreme Court Corner

30 March 2021

30 March 2021 The opinion may render functional claiming more difficult, but functional claims that follow its guidance may still have an important role to play in pharmaceutical patents. Eligibility guidance in the wake of Alice: Clarity at the examiner stage, uncertainty in the Federal Circuit 22 December 2020 Competing approaches to patent-eligible subject matter at the Federal Circuit and the USPTO. Inventions behind the music: From Eddie Van Halen to Michael Jackson and beyond 22 December 2020 Music innovation offers fertile ground for patent protection. **Supreme Court Corner** 22 December 2020 A quick look at two cases. The Pharmaceutical Corner 22 December 2020 A precedential decision with potentially far-reaching impacts for future Hatch-Waxman litigation and generic-product launches. Constitutional challenges to inter partes review - Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc. 30 September 2020 This Appointments Clause challenge to the IPR process appears to have staying power. Coronavirus Resource Center: Our global repository of insights and events 30 September 2020 A central repository for our reports and commentary on the legal and regulatory concerns arising from the pandemic. Inventiveness+? Divergent theories of the "inventive concept" in patent-eligible subject matter 30 September 2020 What qualifies as an inventive concept? Even the Federal Circuit doesn't know for sure.

The Pharmaceutical Corner

Supreme Court Corner

30 September 2020
A quick look at two cases - USPTO v. Booking.com and American Axle & Manufacturing v. Neapco Holdings.
The Pharmaceutical Corner
30 September 2020 In this inaugural column, we look at the implications of IPR and PGR proceedings in Hatch Waxman litigation.
A go-to firm for defending patent cases
30 June 2020 Recognition from <i>Law360</i>
Atlanta expands privacy capabilities
30 June 2020 Lael Bellamy's arrival bolsters our data protection, privacy and security capabilities throughout the firm.
Intellectual property rights are a renewed focus as the world looks beyond a global viral outbreak
30 June 2020 A few key IP-related considerations for companies, whether they are seeking to expand into new markets or looking to preserve their pla in an existing market.
Northern California bolsters telecom and regulatory practice
30 June 2020 Regulatory and telecom attorney Kristin Jacobson has joined our Northern California office in Sacramento.

Supreme Court Corner

30 June 2020

A quick look at three cases: Thryv, Inc.; Lucky Brands; and Romag Fasteners.

Washington, DC grows technology capabilities with two new arrivals

30 June 2020

Marius Domokos and Justin Ilhwan Park have joined our Washington, DC practice.

The CARES Act and USPTO patent practitioner deadlines

6	Α	nr	il	2	N	2	٢

While the USTPO remains open for filing of documents and fees, Director lancu announced that parties may be eligible for extensions of certain deadlines if their inability to meet a current deadline is due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Are you ready for CCPA class action litigation?

30 March 2020

Many businesses may not have fully contemplated the major data breach class action litigation risk created by the California Consumer Privacy Act.

Supreme Court Corner

30 March 2020

Notable cases involve trademark protectability and federal preclusion principles.

Top franchise developments of 2019

30 March 2020

Two top franchise developments in 2019 stand out from the rest.

Top of Mind: Life Sciences

16 January 2020

Eight big topics that life sciences businesses have been thinking about and how DLA Piper has been covering those stories.

CCPA Rescue Kit arrives amid new privacy law change

19 December 2019

A series of integrated compliance offerings to help businesses begin the journey of compliance with this important new privacy bill.

Street art raises novel copyright issues - or does it?

19 December 2019

Is street art less entitled to copyright protection than are traditional art forms?

Supreme Court Corner

19 December 2019

We are watching two key cases - Romag Fasteners v. Fossil and Thryv, Inc. v. Click-to-Call Technologies.

US Congress may act again on patent reform

26 JUN 2014

Recent activity regarding patent trolls

Patent litigation heats up in the Southern District of Florida: practical implications for brand owners

26 MAR 2014

Patent litigation is on the rise nationally, with a record number of cases being filed every year. In 2013, over 6,800 cases were filed in the United States, the highest number ever and about a 10 percent increase from 2012.

Distributing patent rights between affiliates: guidelines to support enforcement rights around the world

16 NOV 2015

Considering a few issues at the outset when rights are distributed between Parent and Affiliate (or between multiple affiliates) may avoid difficulties in the future when a company wants to enforce patent rights.