

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

**On Writ Of Certiorari  
To The United States Court Of Appeals  
For The Federal Circuit**

---

**BRIEF FOR PETITIONER**

---

MATTHEW D. POWERS  
WEIL, GOTSHAL &  
MANGES LLP  
201 Redwood Shores Parkway  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
(650) 802-3000

T. ANDREW CULBERT  
ISABELLA FU  
MICROSOFT CORPORATION  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond, WA 98052  
(425) 882-8080

THEODORE B. OLSON  
THOMAS G. HUNGAR  
*Counsel of Record*  
MATTHEW D. MCGILL  
SCOTT P. MARTIN  
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 955-8500  
thungar@gibsondunn.com

*Counsel for Petitioner*  
*[Additional Counsel Listed on Inside Cover]*

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION .....	1
STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	1
STATEMENT .....	2
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	8
ARGUMENT .....	13
I. SECTION 282 DOES NOT IMPOSE A HEIGHTENED STANDARD FOR PROVING PATENT INVALIDITY .....	14
A. THE APPROPRIATE STANDARD FOR PROVING INVALIDITY OF A PATENT IS A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE.....	14
B. SECTION 282 DID NOT CODIFY A HEIGHTENED STANDARD OF PROOF.....	18
1. The Statutory Text And Purpose Foreclose A Heightened Standard Of Proof For Patent Invalidity .....	20
2. This Court’s Precedents Did Not Impose A Heightened Standard For Proving Invalidity In All Cases .....	25
3. A Heightened Standard Of Proof Is Particularly Inappropriate Where The PTO Did Not Consider Relevant Prior Art.....	33
C. CONGRESS HAS NOT IMPLICITLY RATIFIED THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT’S DEPARTURE FROM REGIONAL CIRCUIT PRECEDENT .....	36

II. A HEIGHTENED STANDARD FOR PROVING PATENT INVALIDITY IS NOT JUSTIFIED BY PRINCIPLES OF AGENCY DEFERENCE .....	40
A. THE PTO’S DECISION TO ISSUE A PATENT DOES NOT WARRANT A HEIGHTENED STANDARD OF PROOF.....	41
1. The APA’s Standards Of Review Do Not Apply To Validity Issues Raised In Infringement Suits.....	41
2. Even If The APA’s Standards Of Review Applied, De Novo Review Would Be Warranted .....	44
B. A HEIGHTENED STANDARD OF PROOF COULD CONCEIVABLY BE JUSTIFIED ONLY WHEN THE PTO EXERCISED ITS EXPERTISE .....	51
CONCLUSION .....	54

No. 10-290

---

**In the  
Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

141 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

*On Writ of Certiorari to the United States  
Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit*

---

**BRIEF OF PROFESSOR LEE A. HOLLAAR  
AS AMICUS CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF  
PETITIONER MICROSOFT CORPORATION**

---

DAVID M. BENNION

*Counsel of Record*

PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER

201 SOUTH MAIN STREET

SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

(801) 532-1234

DBennion@parsonsbehle.com

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

*Professor Hollaar*

January 31, 2011

---

Becker Gallagher • Cincinnati, OH • Washington, D.C. • 800.890.5001

## Table of Contents

Table of Authorities .....	iii
Interest Of The <i>Amicus Curiae</i> .....	1
Summary Of The Argument .....	2
Argument .....	4
The presumption of administrative correctness is different from the Presumption of Validity required by Section 282 .....	5
Under the presumption of administrative correctness, evidence not considered by the PTO does not receive deference .....	7
Showing invalidity of a patent is often based on a number of facts, only some of which were considered by the PTO .....	10
Deference should be given only to the facts determined by the PTO in its examination of the patent .....	12
The problem illustrated by this case is real, especially for patents on software-based inventions, and will only grow worse if the Federal Circuit rule is not changed .....	14
Adoption by this Court of the suggested approach will promote sound policy objectives	16
Although some suggest that no deference be given to the PTO because of their overall	

impression of the quality of the PTO's work, the proposed approach properly looks instead to the quality of examination of patent-in-suit . . . . .	18
Adopting the proposed approach should not affect the requirement of proving inequitable conduct by clear and convincing evidence . . .	22
Conclusion . . . . .	24

No. 10-290

=====

In The  
Supreme Court of the United States

----- ♦ -----  
MICROSOFT CORPORATION, PETITIONER,

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL., RESPONDENTS

----- ♦ -----  
*ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT*

----- ♦ -----  
**BRIEF OF SYNERX PHARMA, LLC AS AMICUS  
CURIAE SUPPORTING PETITIONER**

----- ♦ -----  
DOUGLASS C. HOCHSTETLER  
SCHIFF HARDIN LLP  
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE  
SUITE 6600  
CHICAGO, IL 60606  
[DHochstetler@SchiffHardin.com](mailto:DHochstetler@SchiffHardin.com)  
(312) 258-5500  
*COUNSEL FOR AMICUS CURIAE*

D. CHRISTOPHER OHLY  
*COUNSEL OF RECORD*  
SCHIFF HARDIN LLP  
1666 K STREET, N.W.  
SUITE 300  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006  
[DCOhly@SchiffHardin.com](mailto:DCOhly@SchiffHardin.com)  
(202) 778-6458  
*COUNSEL FOR AMICUS  
CURIAE*

FEBRUARY 1, 2011

=====

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION PRESENTED .....	i
RULE 29.6 STATEMENT.....	ii
INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	4
ARGUMENT .....	5
The Burden of Persuasion Placed Upon a Party Who Asserts the Invalidity of a Claimed Invention, Based Upon Prior Art, Should be Satisfied by a Preponderance of Evidence.....	5
A. The Patent Clause Strikes An Even Balance.	5
B. The Preponderance Standard Allocates The Risk of Error In Line With The Competing Societal Interests.....	7
C. The Language and Legislative History of 35 U.S.C. § 282 Do Not Require Application of the Clear and Convincing Standard.....	12
CONCLUSION.....	17



No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
Supreme Court of the United States

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL.,

*Respondents.*

---

On Writ of Certiorari  
To the United States Court of Appeals  
For the Federal Circuit

=====

**BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE  
ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION,  
PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE, AND APACHE  
SOFTWARE FOUNDATION IN SUPPORT OF  
PETITIONER**

=====

MICHAEL BARCLAY

*Counsel of Record*

JULIE P. SAMUELS

CORYNNE MCSHERRY

JAMES S. TYRE

ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION

454 Shotwell Street

San Francisco, CA 94110

Telephone: (415) 436-9333

michael@eff.org

*Attorneys For Amici Curiae*

*[Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]*

---

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE.....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	3
ARGUMENT .....	6
 I. THE CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE STANDARD IMPEDES THE DEVELOPMENT OF OPEN SOURCE SOFTWARE AND HARMS SMALL SOFTWARE INNOVATORS .....	       6
A. The Standard Impedes the Development of Open Source Software .....	 6
B. The Standard Harms Small Software Innovators .....	 10
 II. FINDING CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE OF PATENT INVALIDITY IS A RECURRING PROBLEM IN COMPUTER SOFTWARE PATENT CASES .....	    13
A. Patent Owners Assert that Accused Infringers Must Use the Prior Art's Source Code to Prove Invalidity, But That Source Code Is Often Unavailable Years After the Fact ....	     13
B. The Growth in the Number of Issued Patents and of Patent Lawsuits Since the Formation of the Federal Circuit	

	Exacerbates the Problem.....	18
III.	THE COURT SHOULD INTERPRET SECTION 282 OF THE PATENT ACT ACCORDING TO ITS PLAIN MEANING AND THE COURT'S PRECEDENTS.....	23
	A. The Federal Circuit's Standard Exceeds Congress' Statutory Mandate .....	23
	B. Traditional Rules Governing Standard of Proof Should Apply .....	26
	C. The Federal Circuit's Standard Results from a Misapplication of This Court's Precedent.....	28
	CONCLUSION .....	33

**In The  
Supreme Court of the United States**

—◆—  
MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, *et al.*,

*Respondents.*

—◆—  
**On Writ Of Certiorari To The  
United States Court Of Appeals  
For The Federal Circuit**

—◆—  
**BRIEF OF THE PUBLIC PATENT  
FOUNDATION AS *AMICUS CURIAE*  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

—◆—  
DANIEL B. RAVICHER  
*Counsel of Record*  
PUBLIC PATENT FOUNDATION, INC.  
BENJAMIN N. CARDOZO  
SCHOOL OF LAW  
55 Fifth Avenue, #928  
New York, New York 10003  
(212) 790-0442  
ravicher@yu.edu

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

February 1, 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
INTEREST OF THE <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	3
I. THE COURT OF APPEALS' HEIGHT- ENED PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY HARMS THE PUBLIC INTEREST BY EXACERBATING POOR PATENT QUAL- ITY .....	4
A. Patent Quality In The United States Today Is Extremely Poor .....	4
B. Undeserved Patents Cause Substan- tial Public Harm .....	7
C. A Heightened Presumption Of Validi- ty Exacerbates Poor Patent Quality ....	9
CONCLUSION.....	12

In The  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, *et al.*,

*Respondents.*

---

**On Writ Of Certiorari To The  
United States Court Of Appeals  
For The Federal Circuit**

---

**AMICI CURIAE BRIEF OF INTERNET RETAILERS  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

PETER J. BRANN  
(*Counsel of Record*)  
DAVID SWETNAM-BURLAND  
STACY O. STITHAM  
BRANN & ISAACSON  
184 Main St., P.O. Box 3070  
Lewiston, Maine 04243-3070  
(207) 786-3566  
pbrann@brannlaw.com

*Attorneys for Amici Curiae*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	4
THE COURT SHOULD APPLY THE USUAL PREPONDERENCE OF THE EVIDENCE STANDARD TO EVALUATE THE VALIDITY OF PATENTS .....	4
A. The Statutory Language, Past Practice, And Public Policy Do Not Support Imposition Of A Heightened Standard To Evaluate The Validity Of Patents .....	4
1. Plain Language .....	5
2. Past Practice.....	8
3. Public Policy .....	10
B. Heightened Standard To Evaluate Patent Invalidity Protects Weak Patents And Harms Legitimate Companies And Consumers .....	12
1. Patent Reexamination.....	13
2. PTO Problems.....	15
3. Unassailable Weak Patents.....	18
4. Consumer Harm .....	23
CONCLUSION.....	24

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

Page

APPENDIX

U.S. Statutes Containing “Clear and Convincing” Standard .....	App. 1
--	--------



No. 10-290

---

---

In the  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION, INC.

*Respondents.*

---

On *Writ of Certiorari*  
To The United States Court Of Appeals  
For the Federal Circuit

---

**BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE*  
SECURITIES INDUSTRY AND FINANCIAL MARKETS  
ASSOCIATION AND  
THE CLEARING HOUSE ASSOCIATION  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

Ira D. Hammerman  
Kevin Carroll  
Securities Industry and  
Financial Markets Association  
1101 New York Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20005

Mark Zingale  
Joseph R. Alexander  
The Clearing House Association  
450 West 33rd Street  
New York, New York 10001

John A. Squires  
*Counsel of Record*  
jsquires@chadbourne.com  
Dennis Hopkins  
Charles M. Fish  
Kate McSweeny  
Chadbourne & Parke LLP  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10012  
(212) 408-8072

*Attorneys for Amici Curiae*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES. . . . .	iv
INTERESTS OF THE <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> . . . . .	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT. . . . .	4
ARGUMENT . . . . .	8
I.    “Clear and Convincing” Should Not Be The Evidentiary Standard For Proving Invalidity When The Owner Of A Questionable Patent Relies On Prior Art That Was Never Seen By The Patent Examiner. . . . .	8
A. The Presumption Of Validity Is “Much Diminished” When The Patent Examiner Never Saw The Prior Art Evidence; Therefore, No Heightened Deference Is Owed . . . . .	10
B. The Explosion Of Business Method Patents Post- <i>State Street</i> Has Made The Financial Industry Particularly Vulnerable To Predatory Patent Assertions . . . . .	17
II.   Establishing “Preponderance Of the Evidence” As The General Rule Would Be The Wisest Course In All Patent Disputes Except Where Congress Or This Court Expressly Determines Otherwise . . . . .	22

A.	Congress Has Never Required A Heightened Standard Of Proof For Patent Invalidity; The Federal Circuit’s Incorrect Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. § 282 Defeats Congress’s Goal Of Uniform Interpretation Of The Patent Laws . . . . .	24
B.	Congress Codified A “Clear And Convincing” Evidentiary Standard To Apply Only To An Optional, Specific Defense Found In 35 U.S.C. § 273(b); It Did Not Set The Same Standard Under 35 U.S.C. § 282 . . . . .	25
C.	Establishing “Preponderance Of The Evidence” As the General Rule Will Benefit Patentees And The Patent System Overall. .	28
III.	A Trial Court’s Vital Role In The Patent Process Is At Risk Of Being Reduced When A Higher Evidentiary Burden Is Placed On The Party Challenging The Validity of A Patent . .	30
A.	The Present System Sends Signals To The Jury Unfairly Favoring The Patentee. . . . .	31
B.	Predatory Patentees Reap The Dual Benefits Of The Presumption And Also The Unequal Burden Of Proof Placed On The Party Asserting Invalidity, Which Was Not Congress’s Intent . . . . .	34

IV.	It Is In The Public Interest To Establish “Preponderance Of The Evidence” As The Standard Either Pursuant To <i>KSR</i> Or, Preferably, As The General Rule, As The Financial Services Industry Is A Favorite Target Of Patentees Seeking Exorbitant License Fees Or Money Settlements Based Upon Questionable Patents. . . . .	36
A.	Decisions And Settlements Affecting The Financial Services Industry Impact The Global Economy . . . . .	36
B.	Lawsuits Based On Questionable Patents Are A Plague Upon The Financial Industry, Which Risks Stifling Innovation . . . . .	37
	CONCLUSION . . . . .	41

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

*v.*

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION, INC.,  
*Respondents.*

**On Writ of Certiorari to the United States  
Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit**

**BRIEF OF EMC CORPORATION AS *AMICUS  
CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

PAUL T. DACIER  
*Counsel of Record*  
KRISHNENDU GUPTA  
WILLIAM R. CLARK  
PHILLIP W. CITROEN  
JOSEPH D'ANGELO  
JASON A. REYES  
GERALD P. KAZANJIAN  
ROBERT K. PERKINS  
SCOTT A. OUELLETTE  
DEEPIKA BHAYANA  
EMC CORPORATION  
176 South Street  
Hopkinton, MA 01748  
508-293-7257  
paul.t.dacier@emc.com

*Attorneys for Amicus Curiae*

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Page

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
STATEMENT OF INTEREST .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	5
I. A HEIGHTENED EVIDENTIARY STANDARD FRUSTRATES THE CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATE OF PROMOTING THE PROGRESS OF THE USEFUL ARTS .....	5
II. THE PROPER EVIDENTIARY STANDARD FOR PROVING PATENT INVALIDITY IS THE PREPONDERANCE-OF-THE-EVIDENCE STANDARD .....	10
A. SECTION 282 OF THE PATENT ACT DOES NOT REQUIRE A HEIGHTENED STANDARD OF PROOF .....	11
B. TO ALIGN PATENT LAW WITH OTHER AREAS OF THE LAW, THE PREPONDERANCE-OF-THE-EVIDENCE STANDARD SHOULD APPLY TO QUESTIONS OF INVALIDITY .....	14
III. AT A MINIMUM, THE PREPONDERANCE-OF-THE-EVIDENCE STANDARD SHOULD CONTROL WHERE AN INVALIDITY DEFENSE RESTS ON EVIDENCE THAT THE USPTO NEVER CONSIDERED .....	17

A. THIS COURT IN <i>KSR</i> , THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT IN <i>AMERICAN HOIST</i> , AND THE COURTS OF APPEALS BEFORE THE FORMATION OF THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT, ALL STATED THAT THERE SHOULD BE A LOWER STANDARD OF REVIEW TO INVALIDATE A PATENT BASED ON PRIOR ART NOT CONSIDERED BY THE USPTO .....	18
B. THE REEXAMINATION PROCESS IS NOT ALWAYS A VIABLE ALTERNATIVE FOR CHALLENGING THE VALIDITY OF A PATENT.....	20
C. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW SUPPORTS A FINDING THAT ART NOT CONSIDERED BY THE USPTO SHOULD BE CONSIDERED USING A PREPONDERANCE-OF-THE-EVIDENCE STANDARD .....	21
CONCLUSION.....	23

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION, INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

**On Writ of Certiorari to the  
United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit**

---

**BRIEF OF APOTEX, INC.,  
AS *AMICUS CURIAE*  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

SHASHANK UPADHYE  
*Vice President – Global  
Intellectual Property  
Apotex, Inc.  
150 Signet Drive  
Toronto, ON Canada  
M9L 1T9  
(416) 401-7701*

ROY T. ENGLERT, JR.\*  
MARK T. STANCIL  
DANIEL N. LERMAN  
*Robbins, Russell, Englert,  
Orseck, Untereiner &  
Sauber LLP  
1801 K Street, N.W., Suite 411  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 775-4500  
renglert@robbinsrussell.com*

*\*Counsel of Record*

---

---



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	5
I. THE CLEAR-AND-CONVINCING- EVIDENCE STANDARD UNDERMINES THE PURPOSES OF THE PATENT ACT BY INHIBITING RATHER THAN ADVANCING INNOVATION .....	5
A. The Framers Recognized That The “Embarrassment of the Exclusive Patent” Is Justified Only If An Invention Was Not Already Known To The Public .....	5
B. The Clear-and-Convincing-Evidence Standard Undermines The Crucial Corrective Role Litigation Plays In Weeding Out Invalid Patents .....	9

**TABLE OF CONTENTS—cont’d**

	<b>Page</b>
II. THE CLEAR-AND-CONVINCING-EVIDENCE STANDARD IS UNJUSTIFIED, ESPECIALLY WHEN THE PATENT OFFICE DID NOT CONSIDER PRIOR ART INTRODUCED IN LITIGATION .....	15
A. The Presumption Of Validity Simply Allocates The Burden Of Proof And Does Not Raise The Quantum Of Proof Necessary To Invalidate A Patent .....	15
B. Bedrock Principles Of Administrative Law Weigh Against Deference To The Patent Office’s Validity Determination When The Patent Office Did Not Consider The Prior Art Raised In Litigation .....	21
CONCLUSION .....	30

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE FOR INFORMATION, INC.,  
*Respondents.*

---

**On Writ of Certiorari  
to the United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit**

---

**BRIEF OF CTIA – THE WIRELESS ASSOCIATION®  
AS *AMICUS CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

MICHAEL F. ALTSCHUL  
CTIA – THE WIRELESS  
ASSOCIATION®  
1400 16th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 785-0081

February 2, 2011

MICHAEL K. KELLOGG  
*Counsel of Record*  
GREGORY G. RAPAWY  
KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN,  
TODD, EVANS & FIGEL,  
P.L.L.C.  
1615 M Street, N.W.  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 326-7900

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY .....	3
ARGUMENT .....	7
I. THE CLEAR-AND-CONVINCING-EVIDENCE STANDARD INJURES INNOVATION.....	7
A. The Standard Has Made Validity Challenges Significantly Less Likely To Succeed.....	7
B. The Standard Leads to Lower Quality Jury Decisions .....	10
C. The Standard Increases the Value of Weak Patents.....	17
1. The Settlement Value of Weak Patents Increases when They Cannot Be Reliably Invalidated .....	17
2. Increasing the Value of Weak Patents Encourages Applications for More of Them .....	20
II. THE CURRENT PATENT LANDSCAPE IMPEDES INNOVATION IN THE WIRELESS INDUSTRY .....	23
III. GIVING FULL EFFECT TO <i>KSR</i> REQUIRES REJECTING THE CLEAR-AND-CONVINCING-EVIDENCE STANDARD .....	27
CONCLUSION.....	30

No. 10-290

---

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

**On Writ of Certiorari to the  
United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit**

---

**BRIEF OF BUSINESS SOFTWARE ALLIANCE  
AS *AMICUS CURIAE*  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

ANDREW J. PINCUS

*Counsel of Record*

PAUL W. HUGHES

*Mayer Brown LLP*

*1999 K Street, NW*

*Washington, DC 20006*

*(202) 263-3000*

*apincus@mayerbrown.com*

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
INTEREST OF THE <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	1
ARGUMENT .....	3
THE PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE STANDARD APPLIES TO A CLAIM OF INVALIDITY BASED ON PRIOR ART NOT CONSIDERED BY THE PATENT OFFICE.....	3
A. The Federal Circuit’s Clear And Convincing Evidence Rule Deters Innovation.....	6
1. The PTO is often unaware of relevant prior art.....	6
2. It is dangerous to insulate poor patents from review. ....	9
B. Precedent And General Principles Of Administrative Review Require Application Of The Preponderance Standard To Invalidity Claims Based On Prior Art Not Considered By The Patent Office. ....	12
1. There is no basis for substantial deference when the PTO did not consider the prior art at issue.....	16
2. The patentee’s property interest in a granted patent does not justify the Federal Circuit’s rule. ....	23
CONCLUSION .....	28

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE FOR INFORMATION, INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

**On Writ of Certiorari  
to the United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit**

---

**BRIEF OF THE  
HERCULES OPEN-SOURCE PROJECT  
AS AMICUS CURIAE  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

MARK S. DAVIES  
RICHARD A. RINKEMA  
JOHANNA HARTWIG  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON &  
SUTCLIFFE LLP  
1152 15<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005

E. JOSHUA ROSENKRANZ  
*Counsel of Record*  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON &  
SUTCLIFFE LLP  
51 West 52<sup>nd</sup> Street  
New York, NY 10019  
(212) 506-5000  
jrosenkrantz@orrick.com

---

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	4
ARGUMENT .....	5
I.    THE PATENT SYSTEM IS EASILY EXPLOITED BY THOSE WHO HAVE INVENTED NOTHING.....	6
A.    Patents Are Too Easy To Obtain .....	6
B.    Jurors Favor Patent Owners .....	10
II.   THE “CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE” STANDARD IS CON- TRIBUTING TO EXPLOITATION OF THE PATENT SYSTEM .....	17
CONCLUSION.....	22



**In The  
Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION, PETITIONER,

*v.*

I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL.

---

*ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT*

---

**BRIEF OF APPLE INC. AND INTEL  
CORPORATION AS AMICI CURIAE  
SUPPORTING REVERSAL**

---

DEANNE E. MAYNARD  
*Counsel of Record*  
SETH M. GALANTER  
MARC A. HEARRON  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
2000 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
dmaynard@mofo.com  
(202) 887-8740

*Counsel for Amici Curiae  
Apple Inc. and  
Intel Corporation*

FEBRUARY 2, 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTION PRESENTED.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE.....	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY.....	2
ARGUMENT.....	5
CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE SHOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO PROVE A PATENT'S INVALIDITY BASED ON PRIOR ART THAT WAS NOT CONSIDERED BY THE PATENT OFFICE.....	5
A. A Clear And Convincing Evidence Stan- dard Should Not Apply When The Prior Art Was Not Considered By The Patent Office.....	5
1. When the Patent Office did not con- sider the prior art, a preponderance standard is appropriate.....	5
2. Congress effectively ratified pre-1952 judicial decisions applying different evidentiary standards depending on whether the prior art was considered by the Patent Office.....	9
B. Applying A Preponderance Standard For Unconsidered Art Supports The Strong Public Interest In Eliminating Invalid Patents.....	13

## TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

	Page
C. Practical Experience Shows That The Evidentiary Standard Has A Compelling, And Often Dispositive, Effect On Jurors .....	15
1. <i>OPTi Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> .....	15
2. <i>Abbott Laboratories v. Syntron Bioresearch, Inc.</i> .....	17
3. Additional empirical evidence.....	18
CONCLUSION.....	19

No. 10-290

---

In the  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

**On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of  
Appeals for the Federal Circuit**

---

**BRIEF OF GOOGLE INC., VERIZON  
COMMUNICATIONS INC., CONSUMER ELECTRONICS  
ASSOCIATION, COMCAST CORP., DELL COMPUTER  
CORP., HEWLETT-PACKARD CO., HTC CORP., INTUIT  
INC., L-3 COMMUNICATIONS CORP., LINKEDIN  
CORP., LOCKHEED MARTIN CORP., MASTERCARD  
WORLDWIDE, THE NEW YORK TIMES COMPANY,  
RACKSPACE HOSTING INC., RED HAT, INC.,  
SHUTTERFLY, INC., SOFTWARE & INFORMATION  
INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION, TIME WARNER INC., WAL-  
MART STORES, INC., AND ZYNGA INC. AS *AMICI  
CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

JOHN THORNE  
GAIL F. LEVINE  
VERIZON  
COMMUNICATIONS INC.  
1320 North Courthouse Road  
Arlington, VA 22201  
(703) 351-3900  
*Counsel for Verizon  
Communications Inc.*

PAUL D. CLEMENT  
*Counsel of Record*  
DARYL JOSEFFER  
ADAM CONRAD  
KING & SPALDING LLP  
1700 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 737-0500  
PClement@kslaw.com  
*Counsel for Amici Curiae*

February 2, 2011

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE .....	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT .....	6
THE STANDARD OF PROOF FOR PATENT INVALIDITY SHOULD ALWAYS BE A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE .....	6
I. The Federal Circuit’s Imposition Of The Clear-And-Convincing Standard Puts Patent Law At Odds With General Principles Of Law .....	6
A. The Patent Act does not require a heightened standard of proof .....	6
B. The nature of the patent right does not warrant a heightened standard of proof .....	9
II. Deference To The PTO’s Expertise Does Not Warrant A Heightened Standard Of Proof.....	15
A. Federal Circuit law and PTO practice tilt the scales heavily in favor of granting patent applications based on incomplete analyses.....	16
B. Patent litigation provides an essential de novo test of patents’ validity .....	23
III. The Standard Of Proof Should Always Be The Preponderance Of The Evidence .....	29

IV. Neither This Court's Precedents Nor Congressional Inaction Requires A Heightened Standard Of Proof .....	32
CONCLUSION.....	37

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

*v.*

I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

**BRIEF OF SAP AMERICA, INC., ACUSHNET COM-  
PANY, FACEBOOK, INC., GENERAL MOTORS LLC,  
PREGIS CORPORATION, SYMANTEC CORPORA-  
TION, TEREX CORPORATION, AND YAHOO! INC.  
AS *AMICI CURIAE* SUPPORTING PETITIONER**

---

JOHN F. DUFFY  
FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS,  
SHRIVER & JACOBSON LLP  
1001 Pennsylvania Ave. NW  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
(202) 639-7000

JAMES W. DABNEY  
*Counsel of Record*  
STEPHEN S. RABINOWITZ  
HENRY C. LEBOWITZ  
FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS,  
SHRIVER & JACOBSON LLP  
One New York Plaza  
New York, N.Y. 10004  
(212) 859-8000  
James.Dabney@  
friedfrank.com

*Counsel for SAP America, Inc., Acushnet Company,  
Facebook, Inc., General Motors LLC, Pregis Corporation,  
Symantec Corporation, Terex Corporation,  
and Yahoo! Inc.*

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
QUESTION PRESENTED.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iv
INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE .....	1
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT .....	1
ARGUMENT .....	5
I.    The Judicial Review Authorized by the Patent Act Is Subject to the Standards of Review in the APA. ....	7
II.   The APA Requires <i>De Novo</i> Review Where the PTO Has Not Exercised Reasoned Decisionmaking on an Issue or Where a Trial Record Contains Substantial New or Different Evidence Concerning an Issue of Fact Relevant to a Defense of Invalidity. ....	13
III.  The Text and Structure of the Patent Act Both Support <i>De Novo</i> Review in This Case. ....	17
IV.  The Rule of Decision Applied Below Conflicts With This Court’s Precedents.....	21
A.   Patent Law Precedents .....	21
B.   Federal Civil Procedure Precedents.....	22
1.    Standard of Proof Precedents .....	22
2.    Res Judicata Precedents .....	24
C.   Evidence Precedents.....	26



V.	The Approach to Judicial Review of Patent Validity Decisions Outlined Here Constitutes a Fair, Balanced, and Symmetric Approach.....	28
CONCLUSION .....		29

**In The  
Supreme Court of the United States**

—◆—  
MICROSOFT CORP.,

*Petitioner,*

v.

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, et al.,

*Respondents.*

—◆—  
**On Writ Of Certiorari To The  
United States Court Of Appeals  
For The Federal Circuit**

—◆—  
**BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE* COMPUTER &  
COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

—◆—

BRIAN KAHIN	JONATHAN BAND
MATTHEW SCHRUEERS	<i>Counsel of Record</i>
COMPUTER & COMMUNICATIONS	JONATHAN BAND PLLC
INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION	21 Dupont Circle, NW
900 17th Street, NW	8th Floor
Suite 1100	Washington, DC 20036
Washington, DC 20006	(202) 296-5675
(202) 783-0070	jband@policybandwidth.com

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

February 2, 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	4
I. THE ENHANCED PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY IS A LEGACY OF A DIS- CREDITED MODEL IN WHICH BAD PATENTS CAN DO NO HARM.....	4
II. THE NATURE OF PATENT EXAMI- NATION DOES NOT JUSTIFY AN ENHANCED PRESUMPTION OF VA- LIDITY.....	6
A. The burden is on the examiner to show why a patent should not be granted .....	7
B. The patent examiner is not ordinarily an expert.....	9
C. The resources devoted to the exami- nation process are small – and for good reason.....	12
D. The examiner is encouraged to grant rather than deny applications.....	15
E. Unlike other administrative proceed- ings, patent examination is conducted <i>ex parte</i> .....	17
F. The costs of evaluating the patent are most efficiently born by the appli- cant .....	18

## TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

	Page
III. AN ARTIFICIALLY ENHANCED PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY SUBSIDIZES INVALID PATENTS, UNBALANCING THE PATENT SYSTEM AND DISTORTING THE MARKET.....	20
A. The enhanced presumption creates an artificial incentive and subsidy for invalid patents.....	21
B. An artificially enhanced presumption of validity exacerbates the problem of invalidating bad patents .....	22
C. Widespread liability and costs lead to strategic behavior.....	23
IV. BY ENCOURAGING DUBIOUS PATENTS, AN ENHANCED PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY ADDS TO THE PROBLEM OF PATENT THICKETS, THE OVERALL OPACITY OF THE SYSTEM, AND THE BACKLOG OF APPLICATIONS.....	27
CONCLUSION.....	28

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

---

**BRIEF OF TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA,  
INC. AS *AMICUS CURIAE* SUGGESTING  
VACATION**

---

HENRY C. DINGER

*Counsel of Record*

ELAINE HERRMANN BLAIS

GOODWIN PROCTER LLP

Exchange Place

Boston, MA 02109

(617) 570-1000

hdinger@goodwinprocter.com

*Attorneys for Amicus Curiae*

February 2, 2011

---

234519



COUNSEL PRESS

(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT.....	4
I. Introduction .....	4
II. Application of a clear and convincing standard to prove invalidity even where material, non- cumulative prior art was not before the Patent Office, encourages applicants to conceal such prior art from the Patent Office .....	5
A. Informed patent examination often requires information that only the applicant will be in a position to supply.....	5
B. The application of a clear and convincing standard of proof across the board exacerbates powerful incentives not to discover problematic prior art and not to disclose such prior art to the patent examiner.....	7

*Table of Contents*

	<i>Page</i>
C. The inequitable conduct defense does little to reduce the incentives to conceal problematic prior art . . . . .	11
III. The standard of proof required to establish invalidity should be preponderance of the evidence unless the trial court finds that all of the prior art and other information on which the accused infringer relies was before the patent examiner . . . . .	15
A. Where all material, non-cumulative prior art was before the examiner, a higher standard of proof for invalidity defenses will encourage full disclosure by applicants and appropriately defer to informed administrative action. . . . .	15
B. Applying a clear and convincing standard only where the invalidity challenge is based on information that was before the examiner is workable. . . . .	17
CONCLUSION . . . . .	22

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

*v.*

141 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

**BRIEF OF CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., EBAY INC.,  
NETFLIX, INC., OFFICE DEPOT, INC.,  
TOYOTA MOTOR CORPORATION, AND TRIMBLE  
NAVIGATION LIMITED AS *AMICI CURIAE* IN  
SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

PROFESSOR JOSEPH MILLER  
LEWIS & CLARK LAW SCHOOL  
10015 S.W. Terwilliger Blvd.  
Room 321  
Portland, OR 97219

*Of Counsel for Amici Curiae*

JOHN D. VANDENBERG  
*Counsel of Record*  
JOSEPH T. JAKUBEK  
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP  
One World Trade Center  
121 S.W. Salmon Street  
Suite 1600  
Portland, OR 97204-2988  
(503) 595-5300  
john.vandenberg@  
klarquist.com

February 2, 2011

*Counsel for Amici Curiae*





**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	3
ARGUMENT.....	5
I. THE BURDEN OF PROOF FOR PATENT INVALIDITY SHOULD BE CONSISTENT WITH THE OVERALL STATUTORY SCHEME .....	5
II. THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT’S HEIGHTENED STANDARD IGNORES THE STATUTORY SOURCES OF PRIOR ART THE PTO RARELY LEARNS OF DURING ROUTINE PATENT EXAMINATION.....	8
III. THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT’S HEIGHTENED STANDARD IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE PTO’S APPLICATION OF THE “PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE” STANDARD WHEN REVIEWING SUBSTANTIAL NEW QUESTIONS OF PATENTABILITY.....	11

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
IV. A FAILED VALIDITY CHALLENGE IN LITIGATION UNDER THE “CLEAR AND CONVINCING STANDARD” THWARTS THE LITIGANT’S RESORT TO <i>INTER PARTES</i> REEXAMINATION AND THE LOWER BURDEN OF PROOF.....	14
V. THE HIGHER STANDARD THWARTS CONGRESS’S INTENT IN PROVIDING FOR STAYS OF LITIGATION IN FAVOR OF REEXAMINATIONS AND PTO EXPERTISE.....	18
VI. THE HIGHER STANDARD CAN AND HAS LED TO DUPLICATION OF EFFORTS AND UNFAIR AND INCONSISTENT RESULTS UNDER IDENTICAL FACTUAL SITUATIONS .....	20
VII.A PREPONDERANCE STANDARD BETTER REFLECTS THE LEGISLATIVE RECOGNITION OF THE HARM CAUSED BY UNWORTHY PATENTS .....	22
CONCLUSION .....	24

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

*v.*

141 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

**BRIEF *AMICI CURIAE* OF 37 LAW,  
BUSINESS, AND ECONOMICS PROFESSORS  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

MARK A. LEMLEY

*Counsel of Record*

STANFORD LAW SCHOOL

559 Nathan Abbott Way

Stanford, CA 94305

(650) 723-4605

mlemley@law.stanford.edu

*Counsel for Amici Curiae*

---

234533



COUNSEL PRESS

(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
QUESTION PRESENTED .....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF APPENDICES .....	iii
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES .....	iv
STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF THE <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
ARGUMENT.....	1
I. The PTO Is Subject to Significant Constraints.....	3
II. The Quantum of Proof for Invalidity Should Reflect the Reality of the Patent Prosecution Process.....	7
A. The Administrative Procedure Act Does Not Compel Deference to Patent Grants.....	7
B. Clear and Convincing Evidence is Not the Proper Rule in All Cases.....	10
C. Deference May Be Appropriate, But Only to Decisions Actually Made on the Record.....	13
III. A Realistic Standard of Proof Will Not Weaken the Patent System or Threaten Innovation.....	15
IV. Conclusion .....	17

**TABLE OF APPENDICES**

	<i>Page</i>
APPENDIX — LIST OF SIGNATORIES . . . . .	1a

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

*v.*

141 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

**BRIEF OF TIMEX GROUP USA, INC.,  
MACDERMID, INC., GEM MANUFACTURING, INC.,  
PERFECT 10 ANTENNA COMPANY, INC.,  
CARSON OPTICAL, INC. AS *AMICI CURIAE*  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

JOHN R. HORVACK, JR.

*Counsel of Record*

FATIMA LAHNIN

CARMODY & TORRANCE LLP

195 Church Street

New Haven, CT 06509

(203) 777-5501

[jhorvack@carmodylaw.com](mailto:jhorvack@carmodylaw.com)

*Counsel for Amici Curiae*

---

234594



COUNSEL PRESS

(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
QUESTION PRESENTED .....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	ii
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES .....	v
INTERESTS OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	3
I.    THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT’S FOUNDATIONAL CASE ESTABLISHING THE CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE STANDARD WAS WRONGLY DECIDED .....	3
A.  Important Distinctions Must Be Drawn Between Burdens of Proof, Standards of Review, and Collateral Deference .....	3
B.  The Federal Circuit Confused Standards of Review With Standards of Proof and Thereby Misinterpreted This Court’s Precedent .....	5

*Table of Contents*

	<i>Page</i>
II. A DEFENDANT SHOULD BEAR THE BURDEN TO PROVE INVALIDITY WITH A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE BUT PART OF THE COUNTERVAILING EVIDENCE MAY INCLUDE DEFERENCE TO THE PTO .....	11
A. The Burden of Proof Must Be Preponderance of the Evidence .....	11
B. The Federal Circuit Has Established Doctrine Regarding The Standard for Administrative Deference That Should Be Preserved as Consistent With This Court’s Holding in <i>United States v. Mead</i> .....	17
1. Federal Circuit Precedent, While Incorrect in Setting the Burden of Proof, Properly Provides For Administrative Deference To PTO Determinations In the Form of Evidentiary Weight .....	17
2. Federal Circuit Precedent On Administrative Deference Accords With This Court’s Decision in <i>United States v. Mead</i> .....	18



*Table of Contents*

	<i>Page</i>
C. The Proposed Standard Better Aligns Applicants' Incentives with the Interests of the PTO In a Manner That Is Impossible Within the Confines of Inequitable Conduct .....	21
III. SECTION 282 MUST BE INTERPRETED ONLY TO REQUIRE PROOF OF INVALIDITY TO A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE BECAUSE A CLEAR AND CONVINCING STANDARD WOULD RAISE SERIOUS CONSTITUTIONAL CONCERNS.....	24
A. A Clear and Convincing Standard Violates the Due Process Clause By Unfairly Infecting a Defendant's Adjudication With <i>Ex Parte</i> Determinations of the PTO .....	24
B. A Clear and Convincing Standard Violates the Due Process Clause By Unfairly Infecting a Defendant's Adjudication With Potentially Impartial Determinations of the PTO .....	28
CONCLUSION .....	31

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
Petitioner,

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND INFRASTRUCTURES FOR  
INFORMATION INC.,  
Respondents.

---

On Writ of Certiorari to the  
Supreme Court of the  
United States

---

BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE*  
WILLIAM MITCHELL COLLEGE OF LAW  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY INSTITUTE  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER

---

R. CARL MOY

*Counsel of Record*

JAY ERSTLING

William Mitchell College of Law

Intellectual Property Institute

875 Summit Avenue

Saint Paul, MN 55105

(651) 290-6344

---

February 2, 2011

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	3
A. Requiring All Invalidity Issues to be Proved by Clear and Convincing Evidence is Historically Anomalous .....	3
1. The Rule Was Extended to Issues Not Before the USPTO Only Recently .....	3
2. The Rule Conflicts With the Judiciary's Primary Role in Determining Patent Eligibility .....	4
3. Congress Did Not Specify an Elevated Standard of Proof in Section 282 .....	8
B. Insisting That Patent Invalidity Be Proved by Clear And Convincing Evidence Conflicts with General Legal Principles .....	12
CONCLUSION .....	14

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

V.

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL.  
*Respondents.*

---

**On Writ of Certiorari to the  
United States Court of Appeals  
For the Federal Circuit**

---

**BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE,  
AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW  
ASSOCIATION IN SUPPORT OF NEITHER PARTY**

---

WILLIAM G. BARBER,  
President-Elect  
AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL  
PROPERTY LAW  
ASSOCIATION  
241 18<sup>th</sup> Street, South  
Suite 700  
Arlington, VA 22202  
(703) 415-0780

DONALD R. WARE  
*Counsel of Record*  
BARBARA A. FIACCO  
JAMES M. FLAHERTY, JR.  
STACY A. ANDERSON  
FOLEY HOAG LLP  
155 Seaport Boulevard  
Boston, MA 02210  
(617) 832-1000  
dware@foleyhoag.com

February 2, 2011

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
STATEMENT OF INTEREST .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	3
ARGUMENT .....	6
I.    The Common Law Development of the Presumption of Validity and the Heightened Standard of Proving Facts Supporting Patent Invalidity. ....	6
II.   The Heightened Standard of Proof Reflects Not Only Deference to the USPTO but also the Importance of Protecting the Statutory Patent Grant as a Carefully-Crafted Bargain Between the Inventor and the Public. ....	14
III.  The 1952 Patent Act Codified the Common Law Presumption of Validity and Did Not Alter the Heightened Standard of Proof for Facts Supporting Invalidity. ....	20
IV.   Regional Circuit Case Law in Conflict with Section 282 and	

Supreme Court Precedent Should be Disregarded.....	24
V. Federal Circuit Case Law Conforms with Long-Standing Supreme Court Precedent and the Principles Underlying the Heightened Standard for Proving Facts Supporting Patent Invalidity .....	28
VI. This Court Should Reaffirm the “Clear and Convincing” Evidentiary Standard for Proving the Facts in Support of an Invalidity Defense. ....	37
CONCLUSION.....	40

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION, PETITIONER,  
V.  
I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL., RESPONDENTS.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

**BRIEF FOR *AMICUS CURIAE* BAR  
ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
PATENT, TRADEMARK & COPYRIGHT SECTION  
IN SUPPORT OF NEITHER PARTY**

JOHN E. DUBIANSKY  
*Counsel of Record*  
1919 Gallows Road  
Vienna, VA 22182  
(703) 496-5000  
john.dubiansky@  
echelaw.com

*Attorney for Amicus  
Curiae Bar Association of  
the District of Columbia*

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	5
I.    THERE SHOULD BE NO PRESUMPTION THAT THE EXAMINER GAVE FULL CONSIDERATION TO EACH CITED REFERENCE.....	5
II.   INCREASED INCENTIVES FOR APPLICANT SUBMISSION OF PRIOR ART WOULD NOT IMPROVE PATENT QUALITY .....	9
CONCLUSION .....	14



No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE FOR INFORMATION, INC.,  
*Respondents.*

---

**On Writ Of Certiorari  
To The United States Court Of Appeals  
For The Federal Circuit**

---

**BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE* INTERNATIONAL  
BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION  
IN SUPPORT OF NEITHER PARTY**

---

RONALD A. LAUDERDALE  
MANNY W. SCHECTER  
MARIAN UNDERWEISER  
MARC A. EHRLICH  
IBM CORPORATION  
One North Castle Drive  
Armonk, NY 10504  
(914) 765-4343

KENNETH R. ADAMO  
*Counsel of Record*  
JONES DAY  
North Point  
901 Lakeside Avenue  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
(216) 586-3939  
kradamo@jonesday.com

LAWRENCE D. ROSENBERG  
JONES DAY  
51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20001-2113  
(202) 879-3939

TRACI L. LOVITT  
JONES DAY  
175 Federal Street  
Suite 501  
Boston, MA 02110  
(617) 342-8117

February 2, 2011

---

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTION PRESENTED.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iv
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
STATEMENT .....	3
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.....	4
ARGUMENT.....	7
I. THE CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE STANDARD IS ESSENTIAL TO A WORKABLE PATENT SYSTEM AND SHOULD BE MAINTAINED. ....	9
A. The Clear And Convincing Evidence Standard Accords Appropriate Deference To The PTO's Expertise And Procedures. ....	9
B. The Clear And Convincing Evidence Standard Promotes Invention Creation, Disclosure, And Commercialization. ....	14
II. A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE STANDARD OR DUAL STANDARD WOULD BE UNWORKABLE AND WOULD THWART INNOVATION. ....	16
A. Lowering The Burden For All Validity Challenges Would	

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(continued)**

	<b>Page</b>
Eviscerate The Deference Owed To The PTO. ....	17
B. Creating A Dual Standard Is Not The Answer. ....	18
C. Changing The Evidentiary Standard for Proving Patent Invalidity Would Inject Uncertainty And Upset The Balance In The Patent System. ....	23
III. TRIAL COURTS CAN USE APPROPRIATE JURY INSTRUCTIONS TO ENABLE A MORE COMPLETE AND PRECISE EVALUATION OF EVIDENCE PERTINENT TO INVALIDITY. ....	24
A. Jury Instructions Are Effective Tools For Managing The Jury's Use Of The Evidence Presented. ....	25
B. Appropriate Jury Instructions Are The Best Tools For Addressing Questions Regarding Consideration Of Prior Art. ....	31
CONCLUSION .....	37

No. 10-290

---

In the Supreme Court of the United States

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, *ET AL.*,  
*Respondent.*

---

On Writ of Certiorari to the  
United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit

---

**BRIEF OF FÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE  
DES CONSEILS EN PROPRIÉTÉ  
INDUSTRIELLE AS *AMICUS CURIAE* IN  
SUPPORT OF NEITHER PARTY**

JOHN P. SUTTON  
*Counsel of Record*  
123 RACE STREET  
GRASS VALLEY, CA 95945  
530-477-8538  
JOHNPSUTTON@EARTHLINK.NET  
FEBRUARY 2, 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	3
ARGUMENT .....	4
I.    BRIGHT LINE EVIDENTIARY STANDARDS ARE IMPROPER FOR AN INVALIDITY ANALYSIS.....	4
A.    The Case Law Does Not Call For a Bright-Line Standard .....	4
B.    Definitional Vagaries Make Bright-Line Standards Impractical and Confusing .....	5

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
C. A Default Preponderance Standard Fails to Afford Issued Patents their Congressionally-Mandated Presumption of Validity .....	7
D. The Shifting Burden of Proof Urged by Petitioner Fails To Balance the Interests of Patentee and Alleged Infringer.....	7
E. A Bright-Line Clear and Convincing Standard Fails to Account for Dissimilar Procedures by Which Patents are Issued .....	8
F. The Proper Standard of Proof Must Be Determined on a Case-By-Case Basis .....	9
CONCLUSION.....	10

No. 10-290

---

---

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION, INC.,  
*Respondents.*

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE*  
**ROBERTA J. MORRIS, ESQ., PH.D.**  
IN SUPPORT OF NEITHER PARTY

ROBERTA J. MORRIS, ESQ., PH.D.  
*Counsel of Record*  
200 Stanford Avenue  
Menlo Park, CA 94025  
650-234-9523  
rjmorris@alumni.brown.edu

February 2, 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF THE <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	1
ARGUMENT .....	2
I. HOW MANY STANDARDS OF PROOF: ONE OR TWO?.....	2
A. Introduction.....	2
B. Advantages of a Binary Standard .....	6
C. Problems with a Binary Standard .....	7
1. Which Facts Do What.....	7
2. Diverting Resources from the Core Issues .....	9
D. Advantage of a Single Standard: Keeping Attention and Resources on the Core Issues .....	10
E. Problems with a Single Lower Standard.....	11
II. CURRENT PRACTICE .....	13
A. Two Standards, as a Practical Matter .....	13
B. Two Standards, Without the Disadvantages .....	14



III.	THE PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY AND RELATED MATTERS .....	15
A.	What Does the Statute Say and Not Say? .....	15
1.	Section 282 .....	16
2.	Legislative History and Other Clues .....	16
B.	Presumptions and Facts (and Law) .....	18
C.	The Federal Circuit v. The Regional Circuits on the Presumption of Validity .....	21
D.	Deference to Agency Review .....	22
E.	The Reversal Rate on Appeal .....	24
1.	A Thought Experiment .....	24
2.	Litigation and Jury Verdict Rates ...	25
IV.	WHERE TO DRAW THE LINE FOR A BINARY STANDARD .....	28
A.	Invalidity over the Prior Art .....	28
1.	Art "Considered" by the Examiner ..	29
2.	"More Pertinent Art" and the Predecessor Courts .....	30
	The Court of Claims .....	31
	The CCPA .....	33
	The Federal Circuit .....	33
B.	Non-prior art Prosecution History .....	34
V.	THE STANDARD OF PROOF DURING LITIGATION .....	34
VI.	RETROSPECTIVE v. PROSPECTIVE APPLICATION .....	35
VII.	CONCLUSION .....	37

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

*v.*

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,  
*Respondents.*

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

**BRIEF FOR RESPONDENTS**

---

DONALD R. DUNNER  
DON R. BURLEY  
ERIK PUKNYS  
KARA F. STOLL  
JASON W. MELVIN  
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,  
FARABOW, GARRETT &  
DUNNER, L.L.P.  
901 New York Avenue N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 408-4000

SETH P. WAXMAN  
*Counsel of Record*  
PAUL R.Q. WOLFSON  
DANIEL S. VOLCHOK  
FRANCESCO VALENTINI  
ARTHUR COVIELLO  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
1875 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 663-6000  
seth.waxman@wilmerhale.com

(Additional counsel listed on inside cover)

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
RULE 29.6 STATEMENT.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	vi
INTRODUCTION .....	1
STATEMENT .....	4
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	7
ARGUMENT.....	12
CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE IS RE- QUIRED TO INVALIDATE A PATENT IN LITIGA- TION.....	12
A. In Enacting §282, Congress Codified This Court’s Precedent Adopting A Clear-And-Convincing Standard To Prove Invalidity .....	12
1. By 1952, this Court had made clear that the presumption of validity could only be overcome with clear and convincing evidence .....	12
2. Section 282 codified this Court’s precedent .....	14
3. Microsoft’s arguments regarding codification are meritless.....	16
a. This case does not involve con- gressional “silence” .....	16

## TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

	Page
b. This Court’s pre-1952 holdings were not limited to cases involving previously litigated issues or exclusively oral evidence of invalidity .....	18
c. Microsoft’s reliance on pre-1952 lower-court cases is misplaced .....	22
4. Other statutory-interpretation arguments raised by Microsoft and its amici are without merit .....	25
a. The presumption of validity in §282 does not merely impose a burden of production .....	25
b. Section 282’s purpose supports i4i’s position.....	27
c. Section 273(b) is irrelevant.....	28
d. Analogies to trademark and copyright law are unpersuasive.....	29
B. The Clear-And-Convincing Standard Is Common In Civil Litigation And Is Warranted Here By Important Public Interests .....	30
1. The clear-and-convincing standard “is no stranger to the civil law” .....	31
2. The clear-and-convincing standard promotes strong, stable patent rights .....	32

## TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

	Page
3. The clear-and-convincing standard preserves the function of the PTO in both initial examinations and re-examinations .....	38
4. Microsoft’s proposed hybrid standard is unprecedented, unworkable, and unnecessary .....	43
C. The Federal Circuit’s Longstanding Construction Of §282 Confirms The Clear-And-Convincing Standard .....	48
1. The Federal Circuit’s interpretation has applied nationwide for 28 years, without disapproval by Congress .....	48
2. Microsoft’s own acquiescence argument fails .....	51
3. The settled expectations that have arisen from the Federal Circuit’s longstanding holding mean that any changes should come from Congress .....	53
D. Microsoft’s Administrative-Law Arguments Lack Merit .....	55
CONCLUSION .....	59
APPENDIX	

No. 10–290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*  
*v.*

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION, INC.,  
*Respondents.*

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

**AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF**  
**elcommerce.com.inc.**  
**IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

---

CHRISTOPHER M. PERRY  
*Counsel of Record*  
BRENDAN J. PERRY & ASSOCIATES, P.C.  
95 Elm Street  
P.O. Box 6938  
Holliston, Massachusetts 01746  
cperry@issbiz.com  
508.429.2000

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>PAGE</b>
QUESTION PRESENTED.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iv
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	1
ARGUMENT .....	3
I.    SEPARATION OF POWERS PRINCIPLES AND THE DIC- TATE OF THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT COMPEL THE USE OF THE CLEAR AND CONVINCING STANDARD OF REVIEW, AT MINIMUM, REL- ATIVE TO ALL CONDITION FOR PATENTABILITY INVA- LIDITY DEFENSES.....	3
II.   THE    CONSTITUTIONALLY PREMISED BURDEN OF PROOF PRECEDENT OF THIS COURT COMPELS, AT MINI- MUM, USE OF THE CLEAR AND CONVINCING STAN- DARD OF REVIEW.....	27
CONCLUSION.....	34
APPENDIX.....	1a

No. 10-290

---

---

In The  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP and  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,  
*Respondents.*

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

**BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE*  
AMICOUR IP GROUP, LLC  
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

---

ROBERT ROWAN  
NIXON & VANDERHYE  
901 North Glebe Road  
11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203  
703-816-4000

KIRSTIN M. JAHN  
*Counsel of Record*  
JAHN & ASSOCIATES,  
1942 Broadway Suite 314  
Boulder, CO 80304  
303-545-5128  
Kirstin@jahnlaw.com

March 17, 2011

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

---

---



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	1
 I. A LOWER STANDARD OF PROOF WILL UNDERMINE THE INTEGRITY OF U.S. PATENTS, CAUSING A SIGNIFICANT DECLINE IN THE VALUE OF U.S. PATENTS .....	       4
A. The Inventing Community Relies On The Integrity Of A U.S. Patent Grant As A Valuable Capital Asset .....	   4
B. Meaningful Assessment Of The Fair Market Value of Patents Tied To The Statutory Presumption Of Validity And Confidence In Agency Decisions Is Greatly Diminished When Such Decisions Are Easily Undermined. ....	      7
C. Patent Valuations Will Necessarily Decrease .....	 10
D. Losses From Asset Impairment Will Be Recognized In Financial Reporting .....	  16

**TABLE OF CONTENTS—continued**

	Page
II. ANY LOWERING OF THE STANDARD OF PROOF TO INVALIDATE A PATENT SHOULD BE MADE BY CONGRESS BECAUSE OF THE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECT THE CHANGE WILL HAVE ON THE VALUATION OF U.S. PATENTS, THE U.S. ECONOMY, AND THE UNITED STATES' POSITION AS A TECHNOLOGY LEADER IN THE GLOBAL MARKETPLACE.....	20
CONCLUSION.....	22
APPENDIX.....	A-1
Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) Accounting Standards Codification™ .....	A-1
350-30-35-14.....	A-1
360-10-35-17.....	A-2
360-10-35-21.....	A-2
805-50-30-1 to 805-50-30-4 .....	A-3
820-10-35-2.....	A-6

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

*v.*

141 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

**BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE*  
TRIANTAFYLLOS TAFAS, PHD  
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

---

STEVEN J. MOORE

*Counsel of Record*

JAMES M. MORIARTY

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP

400 Atlantic Street

Stamford, Connecticut 06901

(203) 324-1400

smoore@kellydrye.com

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

---

235297



COUNSEL PRESS

(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	3
“Great Men Are Not Always Wise.” Job 32:9 ...	3
ARGUMENT.....	5
A. Congress Intended for the Presumption of Validity to be Overcome Only Upon a Showing of Invalidity by Clear and Convincing Evidence .....	5
B. In Order to Give all of the Words of Section 282 Meaning, the Clear and Convincing Evidence Standard Must be Incorporated Into the Statute .....	7
1. Cases cited by Petitioner do not Evidence an Alternative Congressional Intent ..	9
2. Congresses’ Failure to Amend Section 282 in the Face of Twenty-Five Years of Case Law Applying Clear and Convincing Evidence Further Demonstrates Congresses’ Intent in 1952 to Incorporate the Clear and Convincing Standard into Section 282.....	11

*Table of Contents*

	<i>Page</i>
C. This Court Should Refuse to Adopt a Sliding Scale Burden of Proof Based on Information Reviewed by the USPTO Prior to a Patent's Issuance.....	14
1. A Sliding Evidentiary Standard Would be Nearly Impossible to Administer Since Litigants can Never Truly Know what an Examiner Reviewed .....	14
2. A Sliding Evidentiary Standard Would Overwhelm the USPTO With References in the Examination Phase .....	16
D. The Preponderance of the Evidence Standard Gives no Deference to the USPTO's Expertise .....	18
E. A Lesser Burden of Proof on Invalidity Provides a Disincentive to Small Companies to Disclose their Inventions to the Public .....	19
CONCLUSION .....	21

In The  
Supreme Court of the United States

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION, INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

On Writ Of Certiorari To  
The United States Court of Appeals  
For The Federal Circuit

---

BRIEF OF GENENTECH, INC., CALIFORNIA  
HEALTHCARE INSTITUTE, ROCHE DIAGNOSTICS  
OPERATIONS, INC. AND ROCHE MOLECULAR  
SYSTEMS, INC. AS *AMICI CURIAE*  
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS

---

JEROME B. FALK, JR.  
*Counsel of Record*

DANIEL B. ASIMOW  
EDWARD A. BAYLEY  
HOWARD RICE NEMEROVSKI CANADY  
FALK & RABKIN  
A Professional Corporation  
Three Embarcadero Center, 7th Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4065  
Telephone: 415/434-1600  
jfalk@howardrice.com

GARY H. LOEB  
PAUL NAIK  
GENENTECH, INC.  
1 DNA Way  
South San Francisco,  
California 94080  
Telephone: 650/225-1000

*Attorneys For Amici Curiae  
Genentech, Inc., California Healthcare Institute, Roche  
Diagnostics Operations, Inc. and Roche Molecular  
Systems, Inc.*

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	4
ARGUMENT	6
I.    LOWERING THE EXISTING STANDARD OF PROOF WOULD DISCOURAGE FUTURE INVESTMENT IN INNOVATION.	6
A.    Obtaining A Patent Already Entails Significant Business Risks For Genentech.	8
B.    The Collateral Estoppel Rules Subject Genentech To Perpetual, Conclusive Validity Challenges.	11
C.    Final Validity Judgments Rest In The Hands Of Lay Juries With No Specialized Knowledge Of The Subject Matter.	12
D.    Any Change To The Existing Clear And Convincing Standard Will Fundamentally Upset The Current Patent System.	14

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
II. THE COURT SHOULD INTERPRET THE PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE REEXAMINATION STATUTES.	15
A. In Passing The Reexamination Statutes, Congress Expressed A Policy Preference For Having Validity Issues Resolved By Experts At The Patent Office.	17
B. The Reexamination Statutes Reflect Congress's Primary Concern With Restoring Confidence And Certainty To The Patent System.	19
C. Recent Amendments To The Reexamination Statutes Reinforce Congress's Preference For Fixing Patent Mistakes Within The PTO Itself, Rather Than In Litigation.	21
D. At Most, The Preponderance Standard Should Only Apply Where The Invalidity Challenge Is Based On Evidence That Could Not Be Brought Before The Patent Office On Reexamination.	26
CONCLUSION	28



No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

*v.*

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, *et al.*,

*Respondents.*

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

**BRIEF OF EAGLE HARBOR HOLDINGS,  
LLC AS *AMICUS CURIAE* SUPPORTING  
AFFIRMANCE**

---

KATHRYN E. KARCHER

*Counsel of Record*

JEFFREY E. HARMES

KARCHER HARMES LLP

11011 NE Boulder Place

Bainbridge Island, Washington 98110

(206) 335-1631

kathryn@karcherappeals.com

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

March 17, 2011

---

234950



COUNSEL PRESS

(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT.....	4
I.    HOW EAGLE HARBOR, AS A SMALL TECHNOLOGY COMPANY, DOES BUSINESS.....	4
A.    Eagle Harbor’s Business Model and Its Patented Technology. ....	4
B.    Small Technology Companies Like Eagle Harbor Create Innovation and Jobs Yet Constantly Struggle for Survival.....	7
II.  WEAKENING PATENT RIGHTS WILL STIFLE INNOVATION BY UNDERMINING INCENTIVES TO PATENT NEW INVENTIONS AND CAUSING OPERATING CAPITAL TO DRY UP. ....	9
A.    Background: Applicable Law. ....	9

*Table of Contents*

	<i>Page</i>
B. Imposing the Preponderance Standard for Proving Patent Invalidity at Trial Will Remove Financial Incentives to Create and Invest in Innovation . . . . .	10
C. Contrary to the Claims of Some of Microsoft’s Amici, the Marketplace Does Not Reward Poor-Quality Patents and the Current Patent Application Process Is Robust . . . . .	13
CONCLUSION . . . . .	15

No. 10-290

---

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL.  
*Respondents.*

---

On Writ of Certiorari to the  
United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit

---

**BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE*  
SEVEN RETIRED NAVAL OFFICERS  
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

---

ROBERT P. GREENSPOON  
*Counsel of Record*  
WILLIAM W. FLACHSBART  
FLACHSBART & GREENSPOON, LLC  
333 N. Michigan Ave., 27<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, IL 60601  
(312) 551-9500  
rpg@fg-law.com

*Attorneys for Amici Curiae*

March 17, 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF <i>AMICI</i> <i>CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	3
I. IMPACT OF THE BURDENS.....	3
II. EFFECTS ON NATIONAL SECURITY.....	5
A. NATIONAL SECURITY INNOVATION POLICY .....	5
B. CRADAs .....	7
C. PROCUREMENT .....	11
D. PERSONNEL AND MORALE .....	12
CONCLUSION .....	13
APPENDIX: SHORT BIOGRAPHIES OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	A-1

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION, PETITIONER

*v.*

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL.

---

*ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT*

---

**BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES  
AS AMICUS CURIAE SUPPORTING RESPONDENTS**

---

BERNARD J. KNIGHT, JR.  
*General Counsel*  
RAYMOND T. CHEN  
*Solicitor and Deputy  
General Counsel*  
ROBERT J. MCMANUS  
WILLIAM LAMARCA  
*Associate Solicitors  
U.S. Patent and Trademark  
Office  
Alexandria, Va. 22313*

NEAL KUMAR KATYAL  
*Acting Solicitor General  
Counsel of Record*  
TONY WEST  
*Assistant Attorney General*  
MALCOLM L. STEWART  
*Deputy Solicitor General*  
GINGER D. ANDERS  
*Assistant to the Solicitor  
General*  
SCOTT R. MCINTOSH  
JOSHUA WALDMAN  
*Attorneys  
Department of Justice  
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001  
SupremeCtBriefs@usdoj.gov  
(202) 514-2217*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Interest of the United States .....	1
Statement .....	1
Summary of argument .....	6
Argument .....	8
I. Section 282 codified a pre-existing judge-made presumption of validity that had long included a heightened standard of proof .....	8
A. In enacting Section 282 in the Patent Act of 1952, Congress intended to codify the existing presumption of validity .....	8
1. Before 1952, this Court applied a presumption of validity that required a party who challenged an issued patent to satisfy a heightened burden of proof .....	9
2. Section 282 codified the presumption of validity as it had previously been defined and applied by this Court .....	15
B. Congress's acquiescence in the Federal Circuit's longstanding construction of Section 282 further supports the clear-and-convincing-evidence standard .....	17
II. Applying the clear-and-convincing-evidence standard to all validity challenges best accommodates the competing interests implicated by such challenges and is most consistent with administrative-law principles .....	20
A. Challenges to the validity of an issued patent implicate administrative-deference and reliance interests .....	20
1. A validity challenge seeks to overturn the considered decision of the PTO .....	20

## IV

Table of Contents—Continued:	Page
2. Invalidity challenges implicate substantial reliance interests .....	25
B. The clear-and-convincing-evidence stan- dard should apply in all cases, including those involving “new” evidence of invalidity ....	26
Conclusion .....	33

### TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

#### Cases:

<i>Aluminum Fabricating Co. v. Season-All Window Corp.</i> , 259 F.2d 314 (2d Cir. 1958) .....	27
<i>American Hoist &amp; Derrick Co. v. Sowa &amp; Sons, Inc.</i> , 725 F.2d 1350 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 821 (1984) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Auer v. Robbins</i> , 519 U.S. 452 (1997) .....	22
<i>Blonder-Tongue Labs., Inc. v. University of Ill. Found.</i> , 402 U.S. 313 (1971) .....	25
<i>Cantrell v. Wallick</i> , 117 U.S. 689 (1886) .....	9, 13
<i>Chase Bank USA, N.A. v. McCoy</i> , 131 S. Ct. 871 (2011) .....	22
<i>Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe</i> , 401 U.S. 402 (1971) .....	31
<i>Coffin v. Ogden</i> , 85 U.S. (18 Wall.) 120 (1873) .....	9
<i>Consolo v. Federal Mar. Comm’n</i> , 383 U.S. 607 (1966) ..	27
<i>Cosmetic Ideas, Inc. v. IAC/Interactivecorp</i> , 606 F.3d 612 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 131 S. Ct. 686 (2010) .....	27
<i>Dickinson v. Zurko</i> , 527 U.S. 150 (1999) .....	3, 27



No. 10-290

---

---

IN THE  
*Supreme Court of the United States*

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,  
*Respondents.*

---

On Writ of Certiorari to the  
United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit

---

BRIEF OF PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH  
AND MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA AS *AMICUS*  
*CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS

---

DAVID E. KORN  
PHARMACEUTICAL  
RESEARCH AND  
MANUFACTURERS OF  
AMERICA  
950 F St., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
(202) 835-3400

HARRY J. ROPER  
*Counsel of Record*  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
353 N. Clark Street  
Chicago, IL 60654  
(312) 222-9350  
HRoper@jenner.com

PAUL M. SMITH  
ELAINE J. GOLDBERG  
LEAH J. TULIN  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
1099 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 900  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 639-6000

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	3
ARGUMENT .....	5
I. A Clear-and-Convincing Standard for Proving That A Patent Is Invalid Is Necessary To Protect The Public’s Interest In Promoting Innovation. ....	5
II. The Clear-And-Convincing Standard Should Apply Regardless Of Whether The Prior Art Is Proven To Have Been Considered By The PTO. ....	22
A. A Dual Standard Would Have Harmful Effects On Patent Litigation .....	23
B. A Dual Standard Would Have Harmful Effects On Patent Prosecution .....	28
CONCLUSION .....	34

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

*v.*

141 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

**BRIEF OF THE BOSTON PATENT LAW  
ASSOCIATION AS *AMICUS CURIAE*  
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS  
ON THE MERITS**

---

ERIK PAUL BELT  
*Counsel of Record*  
JERMAINE A. LAWRENCE  
McCARTER & ENGLISH LLP  
265 Franklin Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110  
ebelt@mccarter.com

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	1
ARGUMENT.....	6
I. PATENTS PROMOTE INNOVATION AND BENEFIT SOCIETY .....	6
A. Patents Foster Innovation.....	8
B. Patents Attract Investment .....	10
C. Patents Prevent Free Riders.....	15
II. PATENTS ARE GENERALLY SOUND; THUS, THERE IS NO DIRE NEED FOR LOWERING THE STANDARD OF PROOF FOR CHALLENGING PATENTS.....	18
A. The USPTO Issues Quality Patents .....	19

B. Reexaminations Confirm That Patents Are Sound .....	23
III. TILTING THE SCALES TOWARDS INFRINGERS WEAKENS PATENTS AND IN TURN, INHIBITS PROGRESS.....	25
A. Death by a Thousand Cuts. ....	26
B. Without Strong Patents, Innovation Will Decline .....	29
CONCLUSION .....	33

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION

*Petitioner,*

*v.*

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP and  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF  
APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

**BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE* IP ADVOCATE  
IN SUPPORT OF AFFIRMANCE**

---

CHARLES E. MILLER  
*Counsel of Record*  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1633 Broadway  
New York, NY 10019-6708  
(212) 277-6500/6559  
millercharles@dicksteinshapiro.com

*Attorneys for Amicus Curiae*

March 18, 2011

---

235258



COUNSEL PRESS

(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES .....	iv
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT.....	5
I. THE CLEAR-AND-CONVINCING EVIDENCE STANDARD IS ESSENTIAL TO PATENT-BASED INVESTMENT AND INNOVATION IN THE UNITED STATES .....	5
A. Patents Provide an Important Incentive to Investment in Job- Creating New Ventures; the Court Should Exercise Care to Avoid Disrupting Commercial Expectations .....	6
1. Patents are About Investment, Not Litigation.....	6
2. Patent-Based Investment is an Important Factor in Economic Growth; Patent Litigation is a Relatively Minor Factor .....	7

*Table of Contents*

	<i>Page</i>
3. Patent-Based Investment Flows Are Likely to be <i>Very</i> Sensitive to Any Change in the Law of Evidence Affecting Patent Validity Issues. . .	9
B. The Current Patent “Validity” Crisis is an Artifact of the Transition to the Internet Age, and Should Not Be a Driver of a Permanent Change in the Law of Evidence Affecting Patent Validity Issues .....	11
II. NEITHER A “PREPONDERANCE-OF- THE-EVIDENCE” STANDARD NOR A DUAL EVIDENTIARY STANDARD IS WORKABLE AND BOTH OF THEM WOULD THWART INNOVATION .....	12
A. Lowering of the Standard For Evaluating Evidence of Patent Invalidity Would Not Solve the Problem of Extortionate Patent Suits .....	12
B. The Current Standard of “Clear- and-Convincing” Evidence of Patent Invalidity Should Be Maintained Uniformly in All Court Cases .....	14



*Table of Contents*

	<i>Page</i>
1. A High Standard of Proof of Patent Invalidity is Appropriate in Evaluating Evidence Attacking an Important Property Right. . . . .	14
2. The Present High Standard of Proof Reflects the Comparative Risks Involved in Patent Litigation . . . . .	16
3. The Proceedings in the PTO That Resulted in the Granting of the ‘449 Patent Did Not Implicate Any of the Predicate Facts Involved in <i>This Appeal</i> . . . . .	16
4. A Uniformly-Applied “Clear-and-Convincing Evidence” Standard Regardless of Whether Proffered Evidence of Invalidity Was or Was Not Considered by the PTO During Administrative Pre-Grant Examination or Post-Grant Reexamination Proceedings Would Avoid a Hodge-Podge of Confusing Determinations in Patent Validity Trials. . . . .	17
III. CONCLUSION . . . . .	18

No. 10-0290

---

IN THE  
Supreme Court of the United States

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL.,  
*Respondents.*

---

On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of  
Appeals for the Federal Circuit

---

BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE* PROJECT FASTLANE, INC.  
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS

---

SCOTT S. KOKKA\*

\*Counsel of Record

KENNETH R. BACKUS, JR.

CHIEN-JU ALICE CHUANG

NICOLE H. CHIU

STEVEN L. CHANG

KOKKA & BACKUS, PC

703 High Street

Palo Alto, CA 94301-2447

(650) 566-9912

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities.....	iv
Interest of the <i>Amicus Curiae</i> .....	1
Question Presented.....	2
Summary of the Argument.....	3
Introduction.....	7
Argument.....	9
<b>I. THE PROPER EVIDENTIARY STANDARD TO INVALIDATE A PATENT IS CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE.....</b>	<b>9</b>
A. The Requirement that Patent Invalidity Be Proved by Clear and Convincing Evidence is Consistent with This Court’s Precedent. ....	9
B. The Heightened Evidentiary Standard Gives Proper Deference to the United States Patent and Trademark Office. ....	11
C. The Requirement of Clear and Convincing Evidence to Prove Patent Invalidity is Consistent with General Legal Principles of Standard of Proof. ....	13

<b>II. THE EVIDENTIARY STANDARD SHOULD NOT BE LOWERED IF THE UNITED STATES WISHES TO REMAIN A LEADER IN INNOVATION.....</b>	<b>18</b>
A. The United States is a Leading Forum for Foreign Investment, Which Supports Innovation. ....	18
B. Lowering the Evidentiary Standard for Invalidity Will Introduce Uncertainty in the United States Patent System, Thereby Discouraging Domestic and Foreign Investment in the United States. ....	20
<b>III. LOWERING OR BIFURCATING THE EVIDENTIARY STANDARD FOR INVALIDATING A UNITED STATES PATENT WILL HAVE UNDESIRABLE CONSEQUENCES FOR THE UNITED STATES AND ITS SOFTWARE-RELATED INDUSTRIES. ....</b>	<b>22</b>
A. The Long-Settled Expectation That Technology Firms Can Protect Software-Related Inventions Using Patents Will Be Weakened by Introducing Uncertainty Due To a Lowered Evidentiary Standard. ....	22
B. As an “Exclusive Right and Liberty,” an Issued United States Patent Bears a Strong Presumption of Validity, Which is a Powerful Incentive to Invest in Innovation. ....	26

C. By Lowering or Bifurcating the Evidentiary Standard, This Court Will Incorrectly Preempt Congress' Efforts to Combat Excessive Patent Litigation Trends and Create Other Undesirable Consequences. ....	28
Conclusion.....	33

**In The  
Supreme Court of the United States**

---

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, et al.,

*Respondents.*

---

---

**On Writ Of Certiorari To The  
United States Court Of Appeals  
For The Federal Circuit**

---

---

**BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE* SAN DIEGO  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW  
ASSOCIATION AND CONNECT  
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

---

---

\*DOUGLAS E. OLSON  
SAN DIEGO IP LAW GROUP LLP  
12526 High Bluff Dr., Suite 300  
San Diego, CA 92130  
(858) 792-3446  
dougolson@sandiegoplw.com

*Attorney for Amicus  
Curiae San Diego  
Intellectual Property  
Law Association*

TIMOTHY N. TARDIBONO  
Chief Counsel and Public  
Policy Director  
CONNECT  
8950 Villa LaJolla Drive  
Suite A124  
LaJolla, CA 92037

*Attorney for Amicus  
Curiae CONNECT*

*\*Counsel of Record*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTION PRESENTED.....	i
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	3
ARGUMENT.....	6
I. THE “CLEAR AND CONVINCING” BURDEN OF PROOF TRACES ITS ORIGIN TO THIS COURT’S DECISIONS .....	6
II. INNOVATORS RELYING ON STRONG PATENT ENFORCEMENT RIGHTS HAVE DISCLOSED INVENTIONS TO THE PUBLIC AND RISKED BILLIONS OF DOLLARS TO COMMERCIALIZE DISCOVERIES .....	9
A. Strong Patent Rights Inspire Innovation and Investment in Technology .....	10
B. This Court Has Previously Upheld Precedent to Realize Inventor Expectations.....	13
III. MAINTAINING THE “CLEAR AND CONVINCING” BURDEN OF PROOF WILL GIVE EFFECT TO THE SETTLED EXPECTATIONS OF INNOVATORS .....	16
IV. CONCLUSION .....	21

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

**MICROSOFT CORPORATION,**  
*Petitioner,*

v.

**14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL.,**  
*Respondents.*

---

On Writ Of Certiorari to the  
United States Court Of Appeals  
For The Federal Circuit

---

**BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE*  
DR. RON D. KATZNELSON  
IN SUPPORT OF AFFIRMANCE**

---

CHARLES E. MILLER  
*Counsel of Record*  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP.  
1633 Broadway  
New York, NY 10019  
Tel. (212) 277-6500/6559  
[millercharles@dicksteinshapiro.com](mailto:millercharles@dicksteinshapiro.com)

18 March 2011

---



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iii
STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS</i> <i>CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT .....	7
I. THE STANDARD OF PROOF IS SET ACCORDING TO THE BALANCE OF RISKS OF ERRORS IN FACTFINDING .....	7
I.A This Court’s precedents did apply the clear and convincing evidence standard when litigants’ countervailing risks of error were substantially asymmetric.....	11
II. THE COUNTERVAILING RISKS IN PATENT INVALIDITY FACTFINDING ERRORS ARE HIGHLY ASYMMETRIC .....	13
II.A Petitioner ignores entirely the balance of countervailing risks for the litigants in patent invalidity adjudications.....	16
II.B The highly asymmetric countervailing risks in patent invalidity decision errors are clearly distinguishable from the comparable risks in trademarks and copyrights.....	18
II.B.1 Trademarks .....	19

II.B.2	Copyrights.....	21
III.	THE HEIGHTENED STANDARD OF PROOF IS CONSISTENT WITH THE ASYMMETRIC COUNTERVAILING RISKS OF PATENT INVALIDITY ADJUDICATION ERRORS.....	23
III.A	This Court has consistently upheld the heightened standard required to prove invalidity.....	24
IV.	PETITIONER CONFLATES THE ATTRIBUTES OF EVIDENCE WITH THE STANDARD OF PROOF .....	27
V.	HEIGHTENED STANDARD OF PROOF IS THE UNDERLYING REASON FOR INSTITUTING PATENTABILITY EXAMINATION AND FOR CODIFYING THE PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY .....	29
	CONCLUSION .....	32

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

*v.*

141 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.

*Respondents.*

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

**BRIEF OF AN ASSOCIATION OF  
PRACTICING ENTITIES AS *AMICI CURIAE*  
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

---

WILLIAM W. COCHRAN  
COCHRAN FREUND &  
YOUNG LLC  
2026 Caribou Drive,  
Suite 201  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80525  
(970) 492-1100  
billc@patentlegal.com

DONALD E. LAKE, III,  
*Counsel of Record*  
AARON P. BRADFORD  
LATHROP & GAGE LLP  
US Bank Tower  
950 17th Street,  
Suite 2400  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
720-931-3214  
tlake@lathropgage.com

*Counsel for Amici Curiae*

---

235190



COUNSEL PRESS

(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	i
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	4
I. SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATORS RELY UPON A PREDICTABLE PATENT SYSTEM AND STRONG INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROTECTION .....	7
A. A Strong, Predicable Patent System that Encourages and Rewards Innovation is Part of This Nation’s History and is Critical to its Future. ....	7
B. Abandoning the Clear and Convincing Evidence Burden to Overcome a Patent’s Presumption of Validity Would Create Considerable Uncertainty by Abandoning Established Jurisprudence Created by This Court. ....	14

*Table of Contents*

	<i>Page</i>
II. WEAKENING THE PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY IS UNNECESSARY IN LIGHT OF EXISTING REMEDIES FOR PATENTS IN WHICH RELEVANT PRIOR ART WAS NOT BEFORE THE USPTO.....	17
A. The Doctrine of Inequitable Conduct Acts to Ensure All Reasonable Prior Art is Before the USPTO. ....	17
B. Congressionally Authorized Reexamination Serves as an Established and Effective Tool to Present Overlooked Prior Art to the USPTO.....	21
CONCLUSION .....	27

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION

*Petitioner,*

*v.*

141 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

**UNIVERSITY PATENT OWNERS AND LICENSEES  
AS *AMICI CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

---

LAWRENCE K. NODINE  
*Counsel of Record*  
KATRINA M. QUICKER  
BALLARD SPAHR, LLP  
999 Peachtree Street  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
(678) 420-9422  
nodinel@ballardspahr.com

March 18, 2011

*Counsel for Amici Curiae*

---

234949



COUNSEL PRESS  
(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES .....	ii
STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF THE <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	8
ARGUMENT.....	10
I.    STRONG PATENTS ARE VITAL TO MODERN RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES .....	10
II.   LOWERING THE STANDARD WILL INCREASE THE NUMBER OF PATENTS INVALIDATED. ....	13
III.  THE CLEAR AND CONVINCING STANDARD OF PROOF HAS BEEN POSITIVE. ....	22
CONCLUSION .....	34

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*  
v.

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,  
*Respondents.*

---

**On Writ of Certiorari to the  
United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit**

---

**BRIEF OF TESSERA, INC., LUMINEX  
CORPORATION, AND THE NATIONAL SMALL  
BUSINESS ASSOCIATION AS *AMICI CURIAE*  
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

---

BERNARD J. CASSIDY  
RENEE DUBORD BROWN  
TESSERA, INC.  
3025 Orchard Parkway  
San Jose, CA 95134  
(408) 321-6000

DAVID REITER  
LUMINEX CORPORATION  
12212 Technology Blvd.  
Austin, TX 78730  
(512) 219-8020

JOSEPH M. LIPNER  
*Counsel of Record*  
BENJAMIN W. HATTENBACH  
MARK A. KRESSEL  
IAN R. WASHBURN  
IRELL & MANELLA LLP  
1800 Ave. of the Stars  
Suite 900  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
(310) 277-1010  
jlipner@irell.com

*Counsel for Tessera, Inc. and Luminex Corporation*

KEITH A. ASHMUS  
FRANTZ WARD LLP  
2500 Key Center  
127 Public Square  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
(216) 515-1660

*Counsel for National Small  
Business Association*



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iii
INTERESTS OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT .....	4
ARGUMENT.....	7
I. THE “CLEAR AND CONVINCING” STANDARD HAS ROOTS IN THIS COURT’S PRECEDENT AND CON- GRESSIONAL DESIGN.....	7
II. LICENSING DRIVES OUR ECONOMY .....	10
A. History And Economics Pushed Licen- sing To The Economic Forefront .....	12
B. Licensing Is Our Leading Interna- tional Trade Surplus .....	16
C. Patent Enforcement Is Critical To The Licensing Industry .....	20
III. SETTLED EXPECTATIONS ARE NECESSARY FOR A ROBUST LICENSING INDUSTRY.....	22
A. This Court Has Long Recognized The Value Of Settled Expectations.....	23
B. The Licensing Industry Has Relied On The “Clear And Convincing” Standard .....	26

## TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

	Page
IV. PETITIONER’S PROPOSED BURDEN OF PROOF WOULD UNSETTLE EXPECTATIONS AND CAUSE UPHEAVAL .....	29
V. THE COURT SHOULD NOT DISTURB THE CURRENT STANDARD OF PROOF .....	33
CONCLUSION .....	37
APPENDIX	
Organization For Economic Co-Operation And Development (OECD), Stat Extracts, Trade in Services by Category of Services (March 11, 2011) .....	1a

No. 10-290

---

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION, PETITIONER

*v.*

I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE FOR INFORMATION INC.

---

***ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT***

---

**BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE VENTURE CAPITAL  
FIRMS ABERDARE VENTURES, AFFINITY  
CAPITAL, ALTA PARTNERS, ARCH VENTURES,  
ASSET MANAGEMENT COMPANY, ATLAS VEN-  
TURES, CANAAN PARTNERS, DELPHI VEN-  
TURES, HLM VENTURE PARTNERS, KEARNY  
VENTURE PARTNERS, LATTERELL VENTURE  
PARTNERS, NEW ENTERPRISE ASSOCIATES,  
PROSPECT VENTURE PARTNERS, THOMAS,  
MCNERNEY & PARTNERS, U.S. VENTURE PART-  
NERS, VENROCK, VENTURE INVESTORS, LLC,  
VERSANT VENTURES, AND THE VERTICAL  
GROUP, IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

---

THOMAS A. WANG  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
1900 UNIVERSITY AVENUE  
EAST PALO ALTO, CA 94303

RYAN MCMANUS  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
Prudential Tower  
800 Boylston Street  
Boston, MA 02199

DOUGLAS HALLWARD-DRIEMEIER

*Counsel of Record*

ROPES & GRAY LLP

One Metro Center

700 12th Street, N.W., Suite 900

Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 508-4600

*Douglas.Hallward-Driemeier@*

*ropesgray.com*

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Interest of amici curiae .....	1
Summary of argument .....	1
Argument.....	4
I.    Venture capital investment in innovative technologies, which accounts for much of the Nation’s economic growth, requires confidence that the innovation will have patent protection.....	5
A. Venture capital investment in innovative technology has a disproportionate impact on economic growth in the United States.....	5
B. In many sectors, the protection afforded by a patent is essential to a start-up company’s success .....	7
C. In industries requiring significant <i>ex ante</i> investment, venture capital firms will not invest without confidence that a company’s patents will be found valid ..	11
1. All venture capital investments are marginal, and therefore even a small increase in risk can result in rejection of a funding request.....	11
2. Venture capital firms conduct intensive patent analysis and will not invest in a company with patents of questionable validity .....	13

II. A shift from the clear-and-convincing standard to the preponderance standard would so weaken confidence in patents that venture capital firms would cease investing in innovative industries that rely on patented technology .....	17
A. Lowering the burden of proof of invalidity to a preponderance standard would weaken patents beyond the risk tolerance of venture capital investors .....	17
B. The increased risk of invalidation will cause capital to be reallocated away from venture capital and towards other asset classes with less economic impact ..	20
III. Microsoft’s proposed alternative of a hybrid system using two burdens of proof would have the same adverse impact on venture capital investment.....	21
A. Applying two different burdens of proof for patent validity issues will compound the confusion and uncertainty of patent litigation.....	22
B. District courts already have latitude to tailor jury instructions to account for uncited art .....	25
Conclusion.....	27
Addendum	
List of amici .....	1a

No. 10-290

---

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION, PETITIONER

*v.*

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL.

---

*ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT*

---

**BRIEF FOR BAYER AG  
AS AMICUS CURIAE SUPPORTING RESPONDENTS**

---

KANNON K. SHANMUGAM  
*Counsel of Record*  
BRUCE R. GENDERSON  
ADAM L. PERLMAN  
JOHN S. WILLIAMS  
DAVID M. KRINSKY  
CURTIS J. MAHONEY  
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP  
*725 Twelfth Street, N.W.*  
*Washington, DC 20005*  
*(202) 434-5000*  
*kshanmugam@wc.com*

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Interest of amicus curiae .....	1
Summary of argument .....	2
Argument.....	4
This Court should retain the clear-and-convincing-evidence standard for proving patent invalidity.....	4
A. The clear-and-convincing-evidence standard is necessary to ensure innovation in the pharmaceutical industry.....	4
B. If adopted by this Court, petitioner’s approach would exacerbate disparities between the American patent system and other leading patent systems.....	13
Conclusion.....	19

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases:

<i>American Hoist &amp; Derrick Co. v. Sowa &amp; Sons, Inc.</i> , 725 F.2d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1984) .....	12
<i>Fujitsu Ltd. v. Texas Instruments, Inc.</i> , Saiko Saibansho [Sup. Ct.] Apr. 11, 2000, Heisei 10 (O) 364, 54 Saiko Saibansho Minji Hanreishu [Minshu] 1268 (Japan) .....	17
<i>Glaxo, Inc. v. Novopharm, Ltd.</i> , 110 F.3d 1562 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	10
<i>Roche Products, Inc. v. Bolar Pharmaceutical Co.</i> , 733 F.2d 858 (Fed. Cir. 1984) .....	11
<i>Sanofi-Synthelabo v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 470 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	6
<i>United States v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001) .....	9

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

*v.*

141 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

**BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE*  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OWNERS  
ASSOCIATION IN SUPPORT OF  
RESPONDENTS**

---

DOUGLAS K. NORMAN, *President*  
KEVIN RHODES, *Chair*  
*Amicus Brief Committee*  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
OWNERS ASSOCIATION  
1501 M Street, N.W.  
Suite 1150  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 507-4500

PAUL H. BERGHOFF  
*Counsel of Record*  
JESSICA L. LUNNEY  
MCDONNELL BOEHNEN  
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 913-0001  
pberghoff@ipo.org

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT.....	2
1.  ASPLIT STANDARD FOR INVALIDITY WOULD UNNECESSARILY BURDEN THE PATENT SYSTEM .....	3
A.  Lowering the Standard for Some Invalidity Challenges Would Adversely Impact the USPTO .....	4
B.  A Split Standard for Validity Challenges Would Complicate the Work of Juries, Parties, and Courts in Patent Cases ..	5
2.  THE WELL-SETTLED EXPECTATIONS OF THE INVENTING COMMUNITY INCLUDE A HIGH PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY, AND CHANGING THE PRESUMPTION WOULD DESTROY THE LEGITIMATE EXPECTATIONS OF INVENTORS IN THEIR PROPERTY ...	7

*Table of Contents*

	<i>Page</i>
3. THE HIGH PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY SHOULD REMAIN IN PLACE TO CONTINUE TO ENCOURAGE INVESTMENT IN PATENTS AND INNOVATION .....	8
CONCLUSION .....	11
APPENDIX — MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION.....	1a

No. 10-0290

---

IN THE  
Supreme Court of the United States

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL.,  
*Respondents.*

---

On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of  
Appeals for the Federal Circuit

---

BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE* UNITY SEMICONDUCTOR  
CORPORATION IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS

---

SCOTT S. KOKKA\*

\*Counsel of Record

KENNETH R. BACKUS, JR.

CHIEN-JU ALICE CHUANG

NICOLE H. CHIU

STEVEN L. CHANG

KOKKA & BACKUS, PC

703 High Street

Palo Alto, CA 94301-2447

(650) 566-9912

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities.....	iv
Interest of the <i>Amicus Curiae</i> .....	1
Question Presented.....	2
Summary of the Argument.....	3
Argument.....	6
<b>I. SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT REQUIRES NO LESS THAN CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE TO SET ASIDE OR ANNUL A PATENT GRANT FOR FRAUD OR MISTAKE .....</b>	<b>6</b>
A. A Proceeding to Divest a Patent Grant Emanating from the United States Government Requires More than a Bare Preponderance of Evidence. ....	6
B. Art Not Considered by the United States Patent and Trademark Office Is an “Error” or a “Mistake” Requiring Testimony that Must Be Clear, Unequivocal, and Convincing to Set Aside or Annul a Patent. ....	13

II. CONGRESSIONAL DEBATES ABOUT PATENT REFORM DEMONSTRATE THAT THE CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE STANDARD IS THE APPROPRIATE STANDARD OF PROOF IN VIEW OF SECTION 282'S PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY.....	16
A. The Legislative History of Recent Patent Reform Bills Attests to Congress' Overarching Belief that the Standard of Proof Should Remain Heightened Where the Section 282 Presumption of Validity Applies. ....	16
1. Congress Considered and Rejected Proposals to Lower the Standard for Proving Patent Invalidity. ....	17
2. Congress Has Considered and Rejected Proposals to Lower the Standard for Proving Patent Invalidity Even in Certain Limited Circumstances. ....	19
B. The America Invents Act of 2011 Provides for a Lower Standard of Proof in <i>Inter</i> <i>Partes</i> and Post-grant Review Proceedings, Proceedings in Which the Presumption of Validity Would Not Apply, But Leaves the Presumption Intact in Section 282. ....	21

<b>III. START-UP COMPANIES WHOSE INNOVATIONS FORM THE FOUNDATION OF THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY RELY ON THE “CLEAR AND CONVINCING” STANDARD .....</b>	<b>23</b>
A. As the Backbone of Innovation, a Strong and Stable Patent System Is Crucial to the United States Economy. ....	23
B. Lowering the Standard for Proving Invalidity Will Engender Instability in the Patent System Without Much Effect on Case Outcomes. ....	28
C. The United States Patent and Trademark Office’s Efforts to Issue Good Patents Should Be Supported, and Not Undermined. ....	30
Conclusion.....	35

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
*Supreme Court of the United States*

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND INFRASTRUCTURES FOR  
INFORMATION, INC.,  
*Respondents.*

---

On Writ of Certiorari to the  
United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit

---

**BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE* BIOTECHNOLOGY  
INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION, ASSOCIATION OF  
UNIVERSITY TECHNOLOGY MANAGERS, AND  
CROPLIFE INTERNATIONAL IN SUPPORT OF  
RESPONDENTS**

---

Thomas DiLenge  
*General Counsel*  
Hans Sauer  
*Deputy General  
Counsel for Intellectual  
Property*  
BIOTECHNOLOGY  
INDUSTRY  
ORGANIZATION  
1201 Maryland Ave.,  
S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20024

Patricia A. Millett  
*Counsel of Record*  
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS  
HAUER & FELD LLP  
1333 New Hampshire  
Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 887-4000  
pmillett@akingump.com

Michael C. Small  
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS  
HAUER & FELD LLP  
2029 Century Park East  
Suite 2400  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
(310) 229-1000

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	6
The Clear and Convincing Evidence Standard For Proving Patent Invalidity Is Critical To Innovation	
A. Durable And Stable Patents Are Vital To Promoting Innovation.....	6
B. The Clear And Convincing Standard For Patent Invalidation Provides The Patent System The Reliability And Stability Upon Which Innovation Depends... ..	7
1. <i>The Clear And Convincing Standard Is Deeply Rooted In The Law</i> .....	7
2. <i>The Statutory Text Comports With Past Precedent</i> .....	12
3. <i>The “Clear And Convincing” Standard Provides Indispensable Security To Inventors, Developers, and Investors</i> .....	15
C. Innovation In The Biotechnology Industry Depends On The Stable And Durable Patent System That The Clear And Convincing Evidence Standard Fosters.....	21
1. <i>Biotechnology Innovation Is Vital</i> .....	21
2. <i>Biotechnology Depends On Secure And Reliable Patents</i> .....	24



D.	Allegations Of Undisclosed Prior Art Do Not Alter Application Of The “Clear and Convincing” Standard Of Proof.....	30
E.	Any Change In The Standard For Proving Invalidity Should Come From Congress.....	32
1.	<i>Stare Decisis Principles And The Reliance Of Third Parties On Court Decisions Weigh Against A Judicial Unsettling Of The Standard Of Proof.....</i>	32
2.	<i>Congress Has Prescribed Its Own Solution For Questionable Patents.....</i>	33
3.	<i>Congress Has Canvassed A Broad Range Of Vantage Points In Preserving The Clear And Convincing Standard.....</i>	36
	CONCLUSION.....	40

No. 10-290

---

---

IN THE  
*Supreme Court of the United States*

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,  
*Respondents.*

---

On Writ of Certiorari  
to the United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit

---

**BRIEF FOR 3M COMPANY, CATERPILLAR INC.,  
JOHNSON & JOHNSON, PROCTER & GAMBLE,  
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY, ELI LILLY AND  
CO., BP, E.I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND  
COMPANY, ECOLAB INC., DOLBY LABORATORIES  
BOSTON SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION, AND THE  
VALSPAR CORPORATION  
AS AMICI CURIAE  
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

---

Thomas C. Goldstein  
*Counsel of record*  
Tejinder Singh  
GOLDSTEIN, HOWE &  
RUSSELL, P.C.  
7272 Wisconsin Ave.  
Suite 300  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
(301) 941-1913  
tgoldstein@ghrfirm.com

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	3
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	4
ARGUMENT .....	9
I. The Presumption Of Validity Rests Substantially On The Need To Confer Strong Intellectual Property Rights, Not Merely On Deference To The Judgment Of The Patent Examiner. ....	9
II. Overturning The Clear And Convincing Evidence Standard Would Significantly Undermine The Functioning Of The U.S. Patent System. ....	18
CONCLUSION .....	29

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, *et al.*,  
*Respondents.*

---

**On Writ of Certiorari to the  
United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit**

---

**BRIEF AMICI CURIAE OF  
INTELLECTUAL VENTURES MANAGEMENT,  
DR. ANANDA CHAKRABARTY AND THE  
HONORABLE DR. G. WILLIAM FOSTER  
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

---

GREGORY P. LANDIS  
*General Counsel*  
MATTHEW RAINEY  
*Vice President and  
Chief Intellectual  
Property Policy Counsel*  
INTELLECTUAL VENTURES  
MANAGEMENT  
3150 139th Ave SE  
Building 4  
Bellevue, WA 98005  
(425) 467-2300

JUSTIN A. NELSON  
*Counsel of Record*  
BROOKE A.M. TAYLOR  
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
1201 Third Ave., Suite 3800  
Seattle, WA 98101  
(206) 516-3880  
jnelson@susmangodfrey.com  
MAKAN DELRAHIM  
BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER  
SCHRECK, LLP  
2029 Century Park East  
Suite 2100  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
(310) 500-4607  
ALLEN P. GRUNES  
BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER  
SCHRECK, LLP  
1350 I Street, NW, Suite 510  
Washington, DC 20005  
(206) 296-7353

*Counsel for Amici Curiae*

March 18, 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	3
ARGUMENT .....	7
I.    A STRONG AND STABLE PATENT PROPERTY RIGHT GRANT IS FUNDAMENTAL TO PROTECTING INNOVATION .....	7
A.  Patents Encourage and Promote Innovation .....	8
B.  Lowering the Standard of Proof Would Disrupt the Settled Expectations of Inventors and Investors .....	11
II.   LOWERING THE REQUISITE STANDARD OF PROOF TO A PREPONDERANCE WOULD EFFECTIVELY OVERRULE SECTION 282 .....	13

<b>III.</b>	<b>THE “CLEAR AND CONVINCING” STANDARD OF PROOF PROPERLY REFLECTS THE IMPORTANCE OF A PATENT’S PROPERTY RIGHT AND IS CONSISTENT WITH THE HISTORY OF OTHER WRITTEN INSTRUMENTS OF THE GOVERNMENT .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>ANY CHANGES TO THE STANDARD OF PROOF FOR CHALLENGES TO PATENT VALIDITY SHOULD COME FROM CONGRESS .....</b>	<b>22</b>
	<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>29</b>

No. 10-290

---

---

In The  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*  
v.

I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,  
*Respondents.*

---

On Writ Of Certiorari  
To The United States Court Of Appeals  
For The Federal Circuit

---

**AMICI CURIAE BRIEF OF FORMER USPTO  
COMMISSIONERS AND DIRECTORS  
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

<i>Amici Curiae</i>	Alexander C.D. Giza
Hon. Gerald J. Mossinghoff	<i>Counsel of Record</i>
Hon. Donald J. Quigg	Larry C. Russ
Hon. Harry F. Manbeck, Jr.	Jules L. Kabat
Hon. Bruce A. Lehman	Marc A. Fenster
Hon. Q. Todd Dickinson	Benjamin T. Wang
Mr. Nicholas P. Godici	Russ August & Kabat
	12424 Wilshire Blvd.,
	Suite 1200
	Los Angeles, CA 90025
	(310) 826-7474
	<a href="mailto:agiza@raklaw.com">agiza@raklaw.com</a>
March 18, 2011	<i>Counsel for Amici Curiae</i>

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF THE <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	6
ARGUMENT .....	8
I. THE LONG ESTABLISHED CLEAR-AND-CONVINCING-EVIDENCE STANDARD FOR INVALIDATING A PATENT IN LITIGATION IS FUNDAMENTAL TO A STRONG U.S. PATENT SYSTEM.....	8
II. THE SPECIAL, IMPARTIAL EXPERTISE AND ANALYSIS OF THE USPTO IS VITAL TO THE U.S. PATENT SYSTEM AND SHOULD NOT BE DISREGARDED OR IGNORED. .	12
A. The USPTO Examiners Are Best Situated To Determine Patentability.....	14
B. The USPTO's Analysis Is Robust And Extensive.....	16
C. The USPTO's Examination Of Patent Applications And The Quality Of Issued Patents Is Demonstrably And Continuously Improving. ....	22



III. CHANGING THE STANDARD OF PROOF FOR INVALIDITY WILL WEAKEN U.S. PATENTS AND DISCOURAGE INNOVATION AND INVESTMENT.....	25
A. A Shifting Standard Of Proof Is Unnecessary And Would Be Unworkable. ....	26
B. Dropping The Standard Of Proof For Invalidity Would Disregard the USPTO's Work And Disparately Impacts Small Entities And Independent Inventors.....	31
CONCLUSION.....	33

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

**On Writ Of Certiorari  
To The United States Court Of Appeals  
For The Federal Circuit**

---

**REPLY BRIEF FOR PETITIONER**

---

MATTHEW D. POWERS  
WEIL, GOTSHAL &  
MANGES LLP  
201 Redwood Shores Parkway  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
(650) 802-3000

T. ANDREW CULBERT  
ISABELLA FU  
MICROSOFT CORPORATION  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond, WA 98052  
(425) 882-8080

THEODORE B. OLSON  
THOMAS G. HUNGAR  
*Counsel of Record*  
MATTHEW D. MCGILL  
SCOTT P. MARTIN  
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 955-8500  
thungar@gibsondunn.com

*Counsel for Petitioner*

*[Additional Counsel Listed on Inside Cover]*

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
REPLY BRIEF FOR PETITIONER .....	1
I. SECTION 282 DOES NOT IMPOSE A CLEAR- AND-CONVINCING-EVIDENCE STANDARD.....	2
A. THE PREPONDERANCE STANDARD BEST ACCOUNTS FOR THE CAREFUL BALANCE STRUCK BY THE PATENT LAWS.....	3
B. THE STATUTORY PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY DOES NOT SUPPORT A HEIGHTENED STANDARD OF PROOF.....	4
C. THIS COURT’S PRE-1952 CASES DID NOT REQUIRE A HEIGHTENED STANDARD OF PROOF IN ALL CASES.....	6
II. APPLICATION OF AN ACROSS-THE-BOARD HEIGHTENED STANDARD IS INCONSISTENT WITH ADMINISTRATIVE-LAW PRINCIPLES .....	11
III. I4I’S POLICY ARGUMENTS DO NOT JUSTIFY THE CLEAR-AND-CONVINCING-EVIDENCE STANDARD .....	16
A. RELIANCE INTERESTS DO NOT JUSTIFY A HEIGHTENED STANDARD OF PROOF .....	16
B. THE POSSIBILITY OF REEXAMINATION IN SOME CASES DOES NOT SUPPORT A HEIGHTENED STANDARD OF PROOF.....	18
C. A DUAL-STANDARD REGIME WOULD NOT CREATE MANAGEABILITY PROBLEMS .....	20
IV. THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT’S HEIGHTENED STANDARD CANNOT BE SALVAGED THROUGH CURATIVE INSTRUCTIONS.....	22
CONCLUSION .....	23