

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 BSA | THE SOFTWARE ALLIANCE
AS *AMICUS CURIAE*
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

ANDREW J. PINCUS

Counsel of Record

PAUL W. HUGHES

MATTHEW A. WARING

Mayer Brown LLP

1999 K Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 263-3000

apincus@mayerbrown.com

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Table of Authorities.....	ii
Interest of the <i>Amicus Curiae</i>	1
Introduction and Summary of Argument.....	2
Argument.....	5
I. Inter Partes Review Enables The PTO To Correct Its Own Errors And Cancel Wrongfully-Issued Patents That Otherwise Would Deter Innovation And Chill Competition.....	5
A. Patent quality is essential to innovation.....	5
B. Inter partes review weeds out wrongfully-granted patents.....	7
1. The PTO faces a daunting task in assessing the validity of patent applications.....	7
2. Post-grant administrative procedures—such as inter partes review—enable the PTO to correct erroneous patent grants.....	9
II. The Seventh Amendment Does Not Render Inter Partes Review Unconstitutional.....	14
III. Patents May Be Canceled In Administrative Proceedings.....	18
Conclusion	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Aronson v. Quick Point Pencil Co.</i> , 440 U.S. 257 (1979).....	5
<i>Atlas Roofing v. Occupational Safety & Health Rev. Comm’n</i> , 430 U.S. 442 (1977).....	18
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010).....	6
<i>Block v. Hirsh</i> , 256 U.S. (1921).....	18
<i>Brown v. Duchesne</i> , 60 U.S. (19 How.) 183 (1856).....	22
<i>Cox v. United States</i> , 332 U.S. 442 (1947).....	18
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	7, 11, 17
<i>Feltner v. Columbia Pictures Television, Inc.</i> , 523 U.S. 340 (1998).....	14
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	5
<i>Granfinanciera, S.A. v. Nordberg</i> , 492 U.S. 33 (1989).....	18, 19
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	8
<i>Hecht Co. v. Bowles</i> , 321 U.S. 321 (1944).....	17
<i>Horne v. Dep’t of Agric.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 2419 (2015).....	22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—continued

	Page(s)
<i>Hunt v. Howe</i> , 12 F. Cas. 918 (C.C.D.D.C. 1855)	20
<i>James v. Campbell</i> , 104 U.S. 356 (1882)	22
<i>Kimble v. Marvel Entm't, LLC</i> , 135 S. Ct. 2401 (2015)	5
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	8
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	13
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996)	14
<i>Massachusetts Inst. of Tech. v. AB Fortia</i> , 774 F.2d 1104 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	8
<i>Mayo Collaborative Servs. v.</i> <i>Prometheus Labs., Inc.</i> , 566 U.S. 66 (2012)	5
<i>McClurg v. Kingsland</i> , 42 U.S. (1 How.) 202 (1843)	19
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Ltd. P'ship</i> , 564 U.S. 91 (2011)	13
<i>N. Pipeline Const. Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co.</i> , 458 U.S. 50 (1982)	21
<i>Pernell v. Southall Realty</i> , 416 U.S. 363 (1974)	18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—continued

	Page(s)
<i>Precision Instrument Mfg. Co. v. Automotive Maintenance Machinery Co.</i> , 324 U.S. 806 (1945).....	12
<i>Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Stiffel Co.</i> , 376 U.S. 225 (1964).....	23
<i>Stern v. Marshall</i> , 564 U.S. 462 (2011).....	19, 21, 23
<i>Thomas v. Union Carbide Agricultural Prods. Co.</i> , 473 U.S. 568 (1985).....	21, 23
<i>Tull v. United States</i> , 481 U.S. 412 (1987).....	18
<i>United States v. Line Materials Co.</i> , 333 U.S. 287 (1948).....	23
Constitutional Provisions, Statutes, and Regulations	
U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 8.....	19
35 U.S.C.	
§ 2(a).....	20
§ 101.....	19
§ 102.....	6, 19
§ 103.....	6, 19
§ 154(a)(2).....	23
§ 261.....	24
§ 282(a).....	13
§ 302.....	9
§ 304.....	9
§ 311.....	16, 17
§ 316(a).....	12

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.