

No. 15-_____

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., AND SAMSUNG
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,

Petitioners,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Respondent.

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

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MICHAEL T. ZELLER
B. DYLAN PROCTOR
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART
& SULLIVAN, LLP
865 S. Figueroa Street
10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 443-3000

VICTORIA F. MAROULIS
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART
& SULLIVAN, LLP
555 Twin Dolphin Drive
5th Floor
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
(650) 801-5000

KATHLEEN M. SULLIVAN
Counsel of Record
WILLIAM B. ADAMS
DAVID M. COOPER
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART
& SULLIVAN, LLP
51 Madison Avenue
22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
(212) 849-7000
kathleensullivan@
quinnemanuel.com

Counsel for Petitioners

December 14, 2015

WILSON-EPES PRINTING CO., INC. - (202) 789-0096 - WASHINGTON, D. C. 20002

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Design patents are limited to “any new, original and ornamental design for an article of manufacture.” 35 U.S.C. 171. A design-patent holder may elect infringer’s profits as a remedy under 35 U.S.C. 289, which provides that one who “applies the patented design ... to any article of manufacture ... shall be liable to the owner to the extent of his total profit, ... but [the owner] shall not twice recover the profit made from the infringement.”

The Federal Circuit held that a district court need not exclude unprotected conceptual or functional features from a design patent’s protected ornamental scope. The court also held that a design-patent holder is entitled to an infringer’s entire profits from sales of any product found to contain a patented design, without any regard to the design’s contribution to that product’s value or sales. The combined effect of these two holdings is to reward design patents far beyond the value of any inventive contribution. The questions presented are:

1. Where a design patent includes unprotected non-ornamental features, should a district court be required to limit that patent to its protected ornamental scope?
2. Where a design patent is applied to only a component of a product, should an award of infringer’s profits be limited to those profits attributable to the component?

(i)

RULE 29.6 STATEMENT

Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (“SEA”) is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (“SEC”), a publicly held corporation organized under the laws of the Republic of Korea. SEC is not owned by any parent corporation and no other publicly held corporation owns 10% or more of its stock. No other publicly held corporation owns 10% or more of SEA’s stock. Effective January 1, 2015, Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC (“STA”) merged with and into SEA, and therefore STA no longer exists as a separate corporate entity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| QUESTIONS PRESENTED | i |
| RULE 29.6 STATEMENT | ii |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| OPINIONS BELOW | 3 |
| JURISDICTION | 4 |
| CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED..... | 4 |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE | 4 |
| A. Statutory Background..... | 4 |
| B. The Smartphone Industry..... | 6 |
| C. Apple’s Asserted Design Patents And Trade Dresses | 10 |
| D. The District Court Proceedings..... | 14 |
| E. The Federal Circuit Decision | 17 |
| REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT | 20 |
| I. THIS COURT SHOULD REVIEW THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT’S HOLDING THAT A DISTRICT COURT NEED NOT LIMIT A DESIGN PATENT TO ITS PRO- TECTED ORNAMENTAL SCOPE | 21 |
| A. The Decision Below Conflicts With Section 171 Of The Patent Act..... | 21 |
| B. The Decision Below Conflicts With This Court’s Precedents Requiring Judicial Construction Of Patent Claims..... | 24 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

| | Page |
|---|------|
| II. THIS COURT SHOULD REVIEW THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT’S HOLDING THAT DESIGN-PATENT OWNERS ARE ENTITLED TO ALL PROFITS FROM A PRODUCT THAT CONTAINS AN INFRINGING DESIGN..... | 26 |
| A. The Decision Below Conflicts With Section 289 Of The Patent Act And Prior Decisions..... | 27 |
| B. The Decision Below Conflicts With Background Principles Of Causation And Equity..... | 32 |
| III. THE DECISION BELOW PRESENTS ISSUES OF RECURRING AND NATIONWIDE IMPORTANCE | 35 |
| CONCLUSION | 39 |
| APPENDIX A – Federal Circuit Opinion (May 18, 2015)..... | 1a |
| APPENDIX B – District Court Order Regarding Design Patent Claim Construction (July 27, 2012)..... | 37a |
| APPENDIX C – District Court Order Granting In Part And Denying In Part Motion For Judgment As A Matter Of Law (January 29, 2013)..... | 56a |
| APPENDIX D – District Court Order Regarding Damages (March 1, 2013) | 114a |
| APPENDIX E – Federal Circuit Order Denying Rehearing (August 13, 2015)..... | 154a |

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.