

No.

In the Supreme Court of the United States

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PETITIONER

v.

ARTHREX, INC., ET AL.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PETITIONER

v.

POLARIS INNOVATIONS LIMITED, ET AL.

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

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

NOEL J. FRANCISCO
*Solicitor General
Counsel of Record*

JOSEPH H. HUNT
Assistant Attorney General

MALCOLM L. STEWART
Deputy Solicitor General

JONATHAN C. BOND
JONATHAN Y. ELLIS
*Assistants to the Solicitor
General*

SCOTT R. MCINTOSH
MELISSA N. PATTERSON
COURTNEY L. DIXON
*Attorneys
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001
SupremeCtBriefs@usdoj.gov
(202) 514-2217*

NICHOLAS T. MATICH
Acting General Counsel
THOMAS W. KRAUSE
Solicitor
FARHEENA Y. RASHEED
Deputy Solicitor
MOLLY R. SILFEN
DANIEL KAZHDAN
*Associate Solicitors
United States Patent and
Trademark Office
Alexandria, Va. 22314*

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether, for purposes of the Appointments Clause, U.S. Const. Art. II, § 2, Cl. 2, administrative patent judges of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office are principal officers who must be appointed by the President with the Senate's advice and consent, or "inferior Officers" whose appointment Congress has permissibly vested in a department head.

2. Whether the court of appeals erred by adjudicating an Appointments Clause challenge brought by a litigant that had not presented the challenge to the agency.

(I)

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

The petitioner in this Court is the United States of America, which intervened in the court of appeals in both Nos. 2018-2140 and 2018-1831 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2403(a).

The respondents in this Court are Arthrex, Inc., which was the appellant in the court of appeals in No. 2018-2140; Smith & Nephew, Inc., and Arthrocare Corp., which were the appellees in the court of appeals in No. 2018-2140; Polaris Innovations Limited, which was the appellant in the court of appeals in No. 2018-1831; and Kingston Technology Company, Inc., which was the appellee in the court of appeals in No. 2018-1831.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

United States Court of Appeals (Fed. Cir.):

Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc., No. 2018-2140
(Oct. 31, 2019)

Polaris Innovations Limited v. Kingston Technology Company, Inc., No. 2018-1831 (Jan. 31, 2020)

(II)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Opinions below 2

Jurisdiction 2

Constitutional and statutory provisions involved..... 3

Statement 3

 A. Statutory background..... 3

 B. The present controversies..... 8

Reasons for granting the petition 13

 I. The court of appeals’ holding that the Board’s administrative patent judges are principal officers warrants this Court’s review 14

 A. The Federal Circuit’s decision invalidates an act of Congress and will have substantial practical effects 14

 B. The Federal Circuit erred in holding that administrative patent judges are principal officers..... 16

 II. The court of appeals’ forfeiture holding warrants this Court’s review..... 26

 A. The Federal Circuit’s forfeiture ruling presents a question of substantial practical importance 27

 B. The Federal Circuit erred in excusing Arthrex’s failure to raise its Appointments Clause challenge before the USPTO..... 28

 III. The Court should grant certiorari in both *Arthrex* and *Polaris*.....33

Conclusion 34

Appendix A — Court of appeals opinion (Oct. 31, 2019) 1a

Appendix B — Court of appeals opinion (Jan. 31, 2020).... 34a

Appendix C — USPTO decision (May 10, 2017)..... 60a

Appendix D — USPTO final written decision (May 2, 2018)..... 83a

Appendix E — USPTO decision (Mar. 29, 2017) 130a

(III)

IV

Table of Contents—Continued:	Page
Appendix F — USPTO final written decision (Feb. 13, 2018).....	165a
Appendix G — USPTO general order (2019).....	223a
Appendix H — Court of appeals order (Mar. 23, 2020).....	229a
Appendix I — Court of appeals order (Mar. 16, 2020)	296a
Appendix J — Constitutional and statutory provisions....	298a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

<i>BioDelivery Scis. Int’l, Inc. v. Aquestive Therapeutics, Inc.</i> , 935 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	21
<i>Blodgett v. Holden</i> , 275 U.S. 142 (1927)	15
<i>Brown v. Department of the Navy</i> , 229 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2000), cert. denied, 533 U.S. 949 (2001)	19
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)	6, 32
<i>DBC, In re</i> , 545 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	8, 29
<i>Edmond v. United States</i> , 520 U.S. 651 (1997).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Elgin v. Department of the Treasury</i> , 567 U.S. 1 (2012)	32, 33
<i>Free Enterprise Fund v. Public Co. Accounting Oversight Bd.</i> , 561 U.S. 477 (2010).....	4, 19, 24
<i>Freytag v. Commissioner</i> , 501 U.S. 868 (1991)	29, 30, 31
<i>Hormel v. Helvering</i> , 312 U.S. 552 (1941).....	28, 30
<i>McCarthy v. Madigan</i> , 503 U.S. 140 (1992).....	28, 29
<i>Rostker v. Goldberg</i> , 453 U.S. 57 (1981)	15
<i>SAS Inst. Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018)	7

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.