

No. 16-712

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

OIL STATES ENERGY SERVICES, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

GREENE'S ENERGY GROUP, LLC, *ET AL.*,
Respondents.

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

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

JUSTIN B. WEINER
MOLOLAMKEN LLP
300 North LaSalle St.
Chicago, IL 60654

JAMES C. STANSEL
DAVID E. KORN
PHARMACEUTICAL
RESEARCH AND
MANUFACTURERS OF
AMERICA
950 F Street, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20004

JEFFREY A. LAMKEN
Counsel of Record
ERIC R. NITZ
JAMES A. BARTA
MOLOLAMKEN LLP
The Watergate, Suite 660
600 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 556-2000
jlamken@mololamken.com

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

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

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether *inter partes* review—an adversarial process used by the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) to analyze the validity of existing patents—violates the Constitution by extinguishing private property rights through a non-Article III forum without a jury.

(i)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Interest of <i>Amicus Curiae</i>	1
Summary of Argument	3
Argument	5
I. American Law Has Long Regarded Patent Rights as Private Property—Not Public Rights.....	7
A. For Centuries, the Courts, Congress, and Commentators Have Understood That Issued Patents Are Private Property	8
B. Common Sense Compels the Conclusion That Patents Are Private Property Rights.....	14
C. Analogous Areas of Law Confirm That Issued Patents Are Private Rights	16
D. The Federal Circuit Improperly Conflated the Process of Patent Issuance with the Status of Issued Patents	22
II. Constitutional Policy Recognizes Patents as Individual Property.....	28
III. Reversal Is Warranted	31
Conclusion.....	33

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Alden v. Maine</i> , 527 U.S. 706 (1999)	11
<i>Atlas Roofing Co. v. Occupational Safety & Health Review Comm'n</i> , 430 U.S. 442 (1977).....	3, 7, 14
<i>BFP v. Resolution Tr. Corp.</i> , 511 U.S. 531 (1994).....	29
<i>Brown v. Duchesne</i> , 60 U.S. (19 How.) 183 (1857).....	15
<i>Butler v. Pennsylvania</i> , 51 U.S. (10 How.) 402 (1851).....	16
<i>Cammeyer v. Newton</i> , 94 U.S. 225 (1877)	8, 15
<i>Cascades Projection LLC v. Epson Am., Inc.</i> , 864 F.3d 1309 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	22
<i>Cleveland v. United States</i> , 531 U.S. 12 (2000).....	7, 20, 21, 22
<i>Cleveland Bd. of Educ. v. Loudermill</i> , 470 U.S. 532 (1985).....	26
<i>Coll. Sav. Bank v. Fla. Prepaid Postsecondary Educ. Expense Bd.</i> , 527 U.S. 666 (1999)	14
<i>Colorado v. New Mexico</i> , 467 U.S. 310 (1984).....	29
<i>Commodity Futures Trading Comm'n v. Schor</i> , 478 U.S. 833 (1986)	27, 32
<i>Consol. Fruit-Jar Co. v. Wright</i> , 94 U.S. 92 (1877).....	8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
<i>Cont'l Paper Bag Co. v. E. Paper Bag Co.</i> , 210 U.S. 405 (1908).....	14
<i>Coombes v. Getz</i> , 285 U.S. 434 (1932).....	16
<i>Creede & Cripple Creek Mining & Milling Co. v. Uinta Tunnel Mining & Transp. Co.</i> , 196 U.S. 337 (1905).....	18
<i>Curtis v. Loether</i> , 415 U.S. 189 (1974)	32
<i>Dolan v. City of Tigard</i> , 512 U.S. 374 (1994).....	14
<i>Eldred v. Ashcroft</i> , 537 U.S. 186 (2003)	19
<i>Ex parte Bakelite Corp.</i> , 279 U.S. 438 (1929).....	14
<i>Ex parte Wood</i> , 22 U.S. (9 Wheat.) 603 (1824).....	8, 10
<i>Feltner v. Columbia Pictures Television, Inc.</i> , 523 U.S. 340 (1998).....	10, 19
<i>Fla. Prepaid Postsecondary Educ. Expense Bd. v. Coll. Sav. Bank</i> , 527 U.S. 627 (1999).....	7, 15, 32
<i>Fox Film Corp. v. Doyal</i> , 286 U.S. 123 (1932).....	20
<i>Fresenius USA, Inc. v. Baxter Int'l, Inc.</i> , 721 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	25
<i>Gutierrez-Brizuela v. Lynch</i> , 834 F.3d 1142 (10th Cir. 2016).....	25
<i>Halstead v. Grinnan</i> , 152 U.S. 412 (1894).....	29
<i>Horne v. Dep't of Agric.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 2419 (2015).....	15
<i>Hovey v. Henry</i> , 12 F. Cas. 603 (C.C.D. Mass. 1846)	8

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.