

No. 15-446

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

CUOZZO SPEED TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

MICHELLE K. LEE, UNDER SECRETARY OF
COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND
DIRECTOR, PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE,
Respondent.

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

**BRIEF OF PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE AS *AMICUS*
CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT**

CHARLES DUAN
Counsel of Record
PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE
1818 N Street NW, Suite 410
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 861-0020
cduan@publicknowledge.org
Counsel for amicus curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i>	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
ARGUMENT	5
I. Petitioner’s Desired Claim Construction Standard Is Not Appropriate for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	5
A. The Proffered Standard Is Not “Correct,” but Rather Driven by Litigation-Specific Policy Concerns	6
B. The Volatility of That Standard Further Proves That It Is Policy-Driven	10
C. The Public Interest Purpose of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Justifies Use of a Different Standard	13
II. Changing the Claim Construction Standard Will Encourage Improper Behavior in <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	16
A. The Facts of This Case Illustrate Needless Gamesmanship Before the Courts and Patent Office	16
B. Petitioner’s Desired Standard Would Increase Costs and Facilitate Undue Manipulation of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	23
III. Petitioner Likely Has No Standing to Raise the Claim Construction Question	25
A. <i>Cuozzo</i> ’s Injury Is Not Redressable	26
B. Dismissal Would Comport with the Rationale for the Standing Doctrine	28

(ii)

CONCLUSION 32
APPENDIX A: Excerpt of Oral Argument Before
the Federal Circuit 1a
APPENDIX B: Excerpt of Oral Argument Before
the Patent Trial and Appeal Board 3a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank International,
134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014) 1
Blonder-Tongue Laboratories, Inc.
v. University of Illinois Foundation,
402 U.S. 313 (1971) 14
Brenner v. Manson,
383 U.S. 519 (1966) 15
Callaway Golf Co. v. Acushnet Co.,
576 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 20
Cardinal Chemical Co.
v. Morton International, Inc.,
508 U.S. 83 (1993) 14
CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.,
288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 6
Cuozzo Speed Technologies LLC
v. General Motors LLC,
No. 2:12-cv-3624 (D.N.J. filed June 15, 2012) 22
Cuozzo Speed Technologies, LLC, In re,
793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 18–19, 21, 27–28

(iii)

<i>CVI/Beta Ventures, Inc. v. Tura LP</i> , 112 F.3d 1146 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	11, 30
<i>Dow Chemical Co. v. Sumitomo Chemical Co.</i> , 257 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	8
<i>Exxon Research & Engineering Co.</i> <i>v. United States</i> , 265 F.3d 1371 (2001)	9–10
<i>Garmin International, Inc.</i> <i>v. Cuozzo Speed Technologies LLC</i> , No. IPR2012-1 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 13, 2013)	17–20, 22, 27–28
<i>Group One, Ltd. v. Hallmark Cards, Inc.</i> , 407 F.3d 1297 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	8
<i>Halo Electronics, Inc. v. Pulse Electronics, Inc.</i> , Nos. 14-1513, -1520 (U.S. argued Feb. 23, 2016)	1
<i>Hans v. Louisiana</i> , 134 U.S. 1 (1890)	30
<i>Holmes Group, Inc.</i> <i>v. Vornado Air Circulation Systems, Inc.</i> , 535 U.S. 826 (2002)	12
<i>H-W Technology, LC v. Overstock.com, Inc.</i> , 758 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	8
<i>Kimble v. Marvel Entertainment, LLC</i> , 135 S. Ct. 2401 (2015)	1
<i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife</i> , 504 U.S. 555 (1992)	26
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996)	15

(iv)

<i>Medrad, Inc. v. MRI Devices Corp.</i> , 401 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	8
<i>Multiform Desiccants, Inc. v. Medzam, Ltd.</i> , 133 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	8
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014)	9, 15, 24
<i>Nystrom v. Trex Co.</i> , 424 F.3d 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	7
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Technology, Inc.</i> , 498 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	21
<i>Pacing Technologies, LLC</i> <i>v. Garmin International, Inc.</i> , 778 F.3d 1021 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	20
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	5–6, 8–10, 12–13, 16–18, 23, 25, 28, 30
<i>Photo Electronics Corp. v. England</i> , 581 F.2d 772 (9th Cir. 1978)	10
<i>Podlesak & Podlesak v. McInnerney</i> , 123 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 1989 (1906), <i>avail-</i> <i>able at</i> http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=wu.89094999596;view=1up;seq=325	16
<i>Power-One, Inc. v. Artesyn Technologies, Inc.</i> , 599 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	9
<i>PPC Broadband, Inc.</i> <i>v. Corning Optical Communications RF, LLC</i> , No. 15-1361 et al., 2016 WL 692368 (Feb. 22, 2016)	30

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.