

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 AMICUS CURIAE TAIWAN SEMI-  
CONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING CO., LTD.  
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

---

Michael Shen  
Willy Chang  
TSMC, LTD.  
8 Li-Hsin Rd.  
Hsinchu, Taiwan

Bas de Blank  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON &  
SUTCLIFFE LLP  
1000 Marsh Road  
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Mark S. Davies  
*Counsel of Record*  
Katherine M. Kopp  
Jeremy Peterman  
Randall Smith  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON &  
SUTCLIFFE LLP  
1152 15th Street NW  
Washington, DC 10019  
(202) 339-8400  
mark.davies@orrick.com

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT .....	3
I. NPEs Often Assert Worthless Patents Against Manufacturers’ Customers and Products. ....	3
A. Some worthless patents are an inevitable feature of any patent system.....	4
B. Owners of worthless patents often sue manufacturers’ customers. ....	5
II. To Promote Progress, Congress Has Provided Manufacturers With An Effective Mechanism To Defend Against NPE Suits. ....	9
A. For many years, manufacturers could not defend their customers and their products from suits based on worthless patents. ....	10
B. IPRs provide manufacturers with a mechanism to defend their customers and products from suits based on worthless patents. ....	16
CONCLUSION .....	19

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Adobe Sys. Inc. v. Kelora Sys. LLC</i> , No. C 11-3938 CW, 2011 WL 6101545 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 7, 2011) .....	14
<i>Allied Mineral Prods., Inc. v. Osmi, Inc.</i> , 870 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	13
<i>Autogenomics, Inc. v. Oxford Gene Tech. Ltd.</i> , 566 F.3d 1012 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	14
<i>Benitec Australia, Ltd. v. Nucleonics, Inc.</i> , 495 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	13
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010) .....	4
<i>Bridgelux, Inc. v. Cree, Inc.</i> , No. C 06-6495 PJH, 2007 WL 2022024 (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2007) .....	12
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Alberta Telecomms. Research Ctr.</i> , 538 F. App'x 894 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	11
<i>Cocona, Inc. v. Sheex, Inc.</i> , 92 F. Supp. 3d 1032 (D. Colo. 2015).....	12
<i>Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 1920 (2015) .....	2, 15

<i>Creative Compounds, LLC v. Starmark Labs.,</i> 651 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	11
<i>Dorman Prods., Inc. v. Paccar, Inc.,</i> 201 F. Supp. 3d 663 (E.D. Pa. 2016).....	15
<i>Glenayre Elecs., Inc. v. Jackson,</i> 443 F.3d 851 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	8
<i>Innovative Therapies, Inc. v. Kinetic Concepts, Inc.,</i> 599 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	13
<i>Integrated Glob. Concepts, Inc. v. j2 Glob., Inc.,</i> No. C-12-03434-RMW, 2013 WL 3297108 (N.D. Cal. June 28, 2013) .....	12
<i>Kahn v. Gen. Motors Corp.,</i> 889 F.2d 1078 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	7
<i>Kappos v. Hyatt,</i> 566 U.S. 431 (2012) .....	4
<i>Katz v. Lear Siegler, Inc.,</i> 909 F.2d 1459 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	7
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,</i> 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	2
<i>Lear, Inc. v. Adkins,</i> 395 U.S. 653 (1969) .....	4
<i>Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.,</i> 580 F.3d 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	8

<i>Matthews Int’l Corp. v. Biosafe Eng’g, LLC</i> , 695 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	12
<i>Md. Cas. Co. v. Pac. Coal &amp; Oil Co.</i> , 312 U.S. 270 (1941) .....	10
<i>MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , 549 U.S. 118 (2007) .....	10
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. DataTern, Inc.</i> , 755 F.3d 899 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	12, 13
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Ltd. P’ship</i> , 564 U.S. 91 (2011) .....	4
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. LBS Innovations LLC</i> , No. 12-CV-0848 CCC JAD, 2012 WL 6028857 (D.N.J. Nov. 8, 2012) .....	13
<i>MPHJ Tech. Invs., LLC v. Ricoh Americas Corp.</i> , 847 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	18
<i>Ours Tech., Inc. v. Data Drive Thru, Inc.</i> , 645 F. Supp. 2d 830 (N.D. Cal. 2009) .....	13
<i>Pennoyer v. Neff</i> , 95 U.S. 714 (1877) .....	14
<i>Pope Mfg. Co. v. Gormully</i> , 144 U.S. 224 (1892) .....	4
<i>Proofpoint, Inc. v. InNova Patent Licensing, LLC</i> , No. 5:11-CV-02288-LHK, 2011 WL 4915847 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2011).....	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.