

No. 10-290

---

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

**On Writ Of Certiorari  
To The United States Court Of Appeals  
For The Federal Circuit**

---

**BRIEF FOR PETITIONER**

---

MATTHEW D. POWERS  
WEIL, GOTSHAL &  
MANGES LLP  
201 Redwood Shores Parkway  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
(650) 802-3000

T. ANDREW CULBERT  
ISABELLA FU  
MICROSOFT CORPORATION  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond, WA 98052  
(425) 882-8080

THEODORE B. OLSON  
THOMAS G. HUNGAR  
*Counsel of Record*  
MATTHEW D. MCGILL  
SCOTT P. MARTIN  
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 955-8500  
thungar@gibsondunn.com

*Counsel for Petitioner*

*[Additional Counsel Listed on Inside Cover]*

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION .....	1
STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	1
STATEMENT .....	2
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	8
ARGUMENT .....	13
I. SECTION 282 DOES NOT IMPOSE A HEIGHTENED STANDARD FOR PROVING PATENT INVALIDITY .....	14
A. THE APPROPRIATE STANDARD FOR PROVING INVALIDITY OF A PATENT IS A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE.....	14
B. SECTION 282 DID NOT CODIFY A HEIGHTENED STANDARD OF PROOF.....	18
1. The Statutory Text And Purpose Foreclose A Heightened Standard Of Proof For Patent Invalidity .....	20
2. This Court’s Precedents Did Not Impose A Heightened Standard For Proving Invalidity In All Cases .....	25
3. A Heightened Standard Of Proof Is Particularly Inappropriate Where The PTO Did Not Consider Relevant Prior Art.....	33
C. CONGRESS HAS NOT IMPLICITLY RATIFIED THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT’S DEPARTURE FROM REGIONAL CIRCUIT PRECEDENT .....	36

II. A HEIGHTENED STANDARD FOR PROVING PATENT INVALIDITY IS NOT JUSTIFIED BY PRINCIPLES OF AGENCY DEFERENCE .....	40
A. THE PTO’S DECISION TO ISSUE A PATENT DOES NOT WARRANT A HEIGHTENED STANDARD OF PROOF.....	41
1. The APA’s Standards Of Review Do Not Apply To Validity Issues Raised In Infringement Suits.....	41
2. Even If The APA’s Standards Of Review Applied, De Novo Review Would Be Warranted .....	44
B. A HEIGHTENED STANDARD OF PROOF COULD CONCEIVABLY BE JUSTIFIED ONLY WHEN THE PTO EXERCISED ITS EXPERTISE .....	51
CONCLUSION .....	54

No. 10-290

---

---

**In the  
Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,  
*Respondents.*

---

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

---

**BRIEF OF PROFESSOR LEE A. HOLLAAR  
AS AMICUS CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF  
PETITIONER MICROSOFT CORPORATION**

---

DAVID M. BENNION  
*Counsel of Record*  
PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER  
201 SOUTH MAIN STREET  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111  
(801) 532-1234  
DBennion@parsonsbehle.com

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae  
Professor Hollaar*

January 31, 2011

---

---

**Table of Contents**

Table of Authorities ..... iii

Interest Of The *Amicus Curiae* ..... 1

Summary Of The Argument ..... 2

Argument ..... 4

    The presumption of administrative correctness  
    is different from the Presumption of Validity  
    required by Section 282 ..... 5

    Under the presumption of administrative  
    correctness, evidence not considered by the PTO  
    does not receive deference ..... 7

    Showing invalidity of a patent is often based on  
    a number of facts, only some of which were  
    considered by the PTO ..... 10

    Deference should be given only to the facts  
    determined by the PTO in its examination of  
    the patent ..... 12

    The problem illustrated by this case is real,  
    especially for patents on software-based  
    inventions, and will only grow worse if the  
    Federal Circuit rule is not changed ..... 14

    Adoption by this Court of the suggested  
    approach will promote sound policy objectives 16

    Although some suggest that no deference be  
    given to the PTO because of their overall

impression of the quality of the PTO's work, the  
proposed approach properly looks instead to the  
quality of examination of patent-in-suit . . . . . 18

Adopting the proposed approach should not  
affect the requirement of proving inequitable  
conduct by clear and convincing evidence . . . 22

Conclusion . . . . . 24

No. 10-290

---

---

In The  
Supreme Court of the United States

-----◆-----  
MICROSOFT CORPORATION, PETITIONER,

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL., RESPONDENTS

-----◆-----

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

-----◆-----

**BRIEF OF SYNERX PHARMA, LLC AS AMICUS  
CURIAE SUPPORTING PETITIONER**

-----◆-----

DOUGLASS C. HOCHSTETLER  
SCHIFF HARDIN LLP  
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE  
SUITE 6600  
CHICAGO, IL 60606  
[DHOCHSTETLER@SCHIFFHARDIN.COM](mailto:DHOCHSTETLER@SCHIFFHARDIN.COM)  
(312) 258-5500  
*COUNSEL FOR AMICUS CURIAE*

D. CHRISTOPHER OHLY  
*COUNSEL OF RECORD*  
SCHIFF HARDIN LLP  
1666 K STREET, N.W.  
SUITE 300  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006  
[DCOHLY@SCHIFFHARDIN.COM](mailto:DCOHLY@SCHIFFHARDIN.COM)  
(202) 778-6458  
*COUNSEL FOR AMICUS  
CURIAE*

FEBRUARY 1, 2011

---

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

QUESTION PRESENTED ..... i

RULE 29.6 STATEMENT..... ii

INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE ..... 1

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT..... 4

ARGUMENT ..... 5

The Burden of Persuasion Placed Upon a Party Who Asserts the Invalidity of a Claimed Invention, Based Upon Prior Art, Should be Satisfied by a Preponderance of Evidence..... 5

A. The Patent Clause Strikes An Even Balance. 5

B. The Preponderance Standard Allocates The Risk of Error In Line With The Competing Societal Interests..... 7

C. The Language and Legislative History of 35 U.S.C. § 282 Do Not Require Application of the Clear and Convincing Standard..... 12

CONCLUSION..... 17

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
Supreme Court of the United States

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL.,

*Respondents.*

---

On Writ of Certiorari  
To the United States Court of Appeals  
For the Federal Circuit

=====

**BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE  
ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION,  
PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE, AND APACHE  
SOFTWARE FOUNDATION IN SUPPORT OF  
PETITIONER**

=====

MICHAEL BARCLAY  
*Counsel of Record*

JULIE P. SAMUELS

CORYNNE MCSHERRY

JAMES S. TYRE

ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION

454 Shotwell Street

San Francisco, CA 94110

Telephone: (415) 436-9333

michael@eff.org

*Attorneys For Amici Curiae*

*[Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]*

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE.....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	3
ARGUMENT .....	6
I. THE CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE STANDARD IMPEDES THE DEVELOPMENT OF OPEN SOURCE SOFTWARE AND HARMS SMALL SOFTWARE INNOVATORS .....	6
A. The Standard Impedes the Development of Open Source Software .....	6
B. The Standard Harms Small Software Innovators .....	10
II. FINDING CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE OF PATENT INVALIDITY IS A RECURRING PROBLEM IN COMPUTER SOFTWARE PATENT CASES .....	13
A. Patent Owners Assert that Accused Infringers Must Use the Prior Art’s Source Code to Prove Invalidity, But That Source Code Is Often Unavailable Years After the Fact ....	13
B. The Growth in the Number of Issued Patents and of Patent Lawsuits Since the Formation of the Federal Circuit	

Exacerbates the Problem..... 18

III. THE COURT SHOULD INTERPRET  
SECTION 282 OF THE PATENT ACT  
ACCORDING TO ITS PLAIN MEANING AND  
THE COURT’S PRECEDENTS.....23

A. The Federal Circuit’s Standard Exceeds  
Congress’ Statutory Mandate .....23

B. Traditional Rules Governing Standard  
of Proof Should Apply .....26

C. The Federal Circuit’s Standard Results  
from a Misapplication of This Court’s  
Precedent.....28

CONCLUSION .....33

**In The  
Supreme Court of the United States**

—◆—  
MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, *et al.*,

*Respondents.*

—◆—  
**On Writ Of Certiorari To The  
United States Court Of Appeals  
For The Federal Circuit**

—◆—  
**BRIEF OF THE PUBLIC PATENT  
FOUNDATION AS *AMICUS CURIAE*  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

—◆—  
DANIEL B. RAVICHER  
*Counsel of Record*  
PUBLIC PATENT FOUNDATION, INC.  
BENJAMIN N. CARDOZO  
SCHOOL OF LAW  
55 Fifth Avenue, #928  
New York, New York 10003  
(212) 790-0442  
ravicher@yu.edu

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

February 1, 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
INTEREST OF THE <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	3
I. THE COURT OF APPEALS' HEIGHTENED PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY HARMS THE PUBLIC INTEREST BY EXACERBATING POOR PATENT QUALITY .....	4
A. Patent Quality In The United States Today Is Extremely Poor .....	4
B. Undeserved Patents Cause Substantial Public Harm .....	7
C. A Heightened Presumption Of Validity Exacerbates Poor Patent Quality ....	9
CONCLUSION.....	12

In The  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, *et al.*,

*Respondents.*

---

---

**On Writ Of Certiorari To The  
United States Court Of Appeals  
For The Federal Circuit**

---

---

**AMICI CURIAE BRIEF OF INTERNET RETAILERS  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

---

PETER J. BRANN  
(*Counsel of Record*)  
DAVID SWETNAM-BURLAND  
STACY O. STITHAM  
BRANN & ISAACSON  
184 Main St., P.O. Box 3070  
Lewiston, Maine 04243-3070  
(207) 786-3566  
pbrann@brannlaw.com

*Attorneys for Amici Curiae*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	4
THE COURT SHOULD APPLY THE USUAL PREPONDERENCE OF THE EVIDENCE STANDARD TO EVALUATE THE VALIDITY OF PATENTS .....	4
A. The Statutory Language, Past Practice, And Public Policy Do Not Support Imposition Of A Heightened Standard To Evaluate The Validity Of Patents .....	4
1. Plain Language .....	5
2. Past Practice.....	8
3. Public Policy .....	10
B. Heightened Standard To Evaluate Patent Invalidity Protects Weak Patents And Harms Legitimate Companies And Consumers .....	12
1. Patent Reexamination.....	13
2. PTO Problems.....	15
3. Unassailable Weak Patents.....	18
4. Consumer Harm .....	23
CONCLUSION.....	24

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

Page

APPENDIX

U.S. Statutes Containing “Clear and Convincing” Standard .....App. 1

No. 10-290

---

---

In the  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION, INC.

*Respondents.*

---

---

*On Writ of Certiorari*  
To The United States Court Of Appeals  
For the Federal Circuit

---

---

**BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE***  
**SECURITIES INDUSTRY AND FINANCIAL MARKETS**  
**ASSOCIATION AND**  
**THE CLEARING HOUSE ASSOCIATION**  
**IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

Ira D. Hammerman  
Kevin Carroll  
Securities Industry and  
Financial Markets Association  
1101 New York Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20005

Mark Zingale  
Joseph R. Alexander  
The Clearing House Association  
450 West 33rd Street  
New York, New York 10001

John A. Squires  
*Counsel of Record*  
jsquires@chadbourne.com  
Dennis Hopkins  
Charles M. Fish  
Kate McSweeny  
Chadbourne & Parke LLP  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10012  
(212) 408-8072

*Attorneys for Amici Curiae*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES. . . . .	iv
INTERESTS OF THE <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> . . . . .	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT. . . . .	4
ARGUMENT . . . . .	8
I. “Clear and Convincing” Should Not Be The Evidentiary Standard For Proving Invalidity When The Owner Of A Questionable Patent Relies On Prior Art That Was Never Seen By The Patent Examiner. . . . .	8
A. The Presumption Of Validity Is “Much Diminished” When The Patent Examiner Never Saw The Prior Art Evidence; Therefore, No Heightened Deference Is Owed . . . . .	10
B. The Explosion Of Business Method Patents Post- <i>State Street</i> Has Made The Financial Industry Particularly Vulnerable To Predatory Patent Assertions . . . . .	17
II. Establishing “Preponderance Of the Evidence” As The General Rule Would Be The Wisest Course In All Patent Disputes Except Where Congress Or This Court Expressly Determines Otherwise . . . . .	22

A.	Congress Has Never Required A Heightened Standard Of Proof For Patent Invalidity; The Federal Circuit’s Incorrect Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. § 282 Defeats Congress’s Goal Of Uniform Interpretation Of The Patent Laws . . . . .	.24
B.	Congress Codified A “Clear And Convincing” Evidentiary Standard To Apply Only To An Optional, Specific Defense Found In 35 U.S.C. § 273(b); It Did Not Set The Same Standard Under 35 U.S.C. § 282 . . . . .	.25
C.	Establishing “Preponderance Of The Evidence” As the General Rule Will Benefit Patentees And The Patent System Overall. .	.28
III.	A Trial Court’s Vital Role In The Patent Process Is At Risk Of Being Reduced When A Higher Evidentiary Burden Is Placed On The Party Challenging The Validity of A Patent . . .	.30
A.	The Present System Sends Signals To The Jury Unfairly Favoring The Patentee. . . . .	.31
B.	Predatory Patentees Reap The Dual Benefits Of The Presumption And Also The Unequal Burden Of Proof Placed On The Party Asserting Invalidity, Which Was Not Congress’s Intent . . . . .	.34

IV.	It Is In The Public Interest To Establish “Preponderance Of The Evidence” As The Standard Either Pursuant To <i>KSR</i> Or, Preferably, As The General Rule, As The Financial Services Industry Is A Favorite Target Of Patentees Seeking Exorbitant License Fees Or Money Settlements Based Upon Questionable Patents. . . . .	36
A.	Decisions And Settlements Affecting The Financial Services Industry Impact The Global Economy . . . . .	36
B.	Lawsuits Based On Questionable Patents Are A Plague Upon The Financial Industry, Which Risks Stifling Innovation . . . . .	37
	CONCLUSION . . . . .	41

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

*v.*

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION, INC.,  
*Respondents.*

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

**BRIEF OF EMC CORPORATION AS *AMICUS  
CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

PAUL T. DACIER  
*Counsel of Record*  
KRISHNENDU GUPTA  
WILLIAM R. CLARK  
PHILLIP W. CITROEN  
JOSEPH D'ANGELO  
JASON A. REYES  
GERALD P. KAZANJIAN  
ROBERT K. PERKINS  
SCOTT A. OUELLETTE  
DEEPIKA BHAYANA  
EMC CORPORATION  
176 South Street  
Hopkinton, MA 01748  
508-293-7257  
paul.t.dacier@emc.com

*Attorneys for Amicus Curiae*

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
STATEMENT OF INTEREST .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT .....	5
I. A HEIGHTENED EVIDENTIARY STANDARD FRUSTRATES THE CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATE OF PROMOTING THE PROGRESS OF THE USEFUL ARTS .....	5
II. THE PROPER EVIDENTIARY STANDARD FOR PROVING PATENT INVALIDITY IS THE PREPONDERANCE-OF-THE-EVIDENCE STANDARD .....	10
A. SECTION 282 OF THE PATENT ACT DOES NOT REQUIRE A HEIGHTENED STANDARD OF PROOF.....	11
B. TO ALIGN PATENT LAW WITH OTHER AREAS OF THE LAW, THE PREPONDERANCE-OF-THE-EVIDENCE STANDARD SHOULD APPLY TO QUESTIONS OF INVALIDITY.....	14
III. AT A MINIMUM, THE PREPONDERANCE-OF-THE-EVIDENCE STANDARD SHOULD CONTROL WHERE AN INVALIDITY DEFENSE RESTS ON EVIDENCE THAT THE USPTO NEVER CONSIDERED.....	17

A. THIS COURT IN <i>KSR</i> , THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT IN <i>AMERICAN HOIST</i> , AND THE COURTS OF APPEALS BEFORE THE FORMATION OF THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT, ALL STATED THAT THERE SHOULD BE A LOWER STANDARD OF REVIEW TO INVALIDATE A PATENT BASED ON PRIOR ART NOT CONSIDERED BY THE USPTO .....	18
B. THE REEXAMINATION PROCESS IS NOT ALWAYS A VIABLE ALTERNATIVE FOR CHALLENGING THE VALIDITY OF A PATENT.....	20
C. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW SUPPORTS A FINDING THAT ART NOT CONSIDERED BY THE USPTO SHOULD BE CONSIDERED USING A PREPONDERANCE-OF-THE-EVIDENCE STANDARD .....	21
CONCLUSION.....	23

No. 10-290

---

---

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION, INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

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

---

**BRIEF OF APOTEX, INC.,  
AS *AMICUS CURIAE*  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

SHASHANK UPADHYE  
*Vice President – Global  
Intellectual Property  
Apotex, Inc.  
150 Signet Drive  
Toronto, ON Canada  
M9L 1T9  
(416) 401-7701*

ROY T. ENGLERT, JR.\*  
MARK T. STANCIL  
DANIEL N. LERMAN  
*Robbins, Russell, Englert,  
Orseck, Untereiner &  
Sauber LLP  
1801 K Street, N.W., Suite 411  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 775-4500  
renglert@robbinsrussell.com*

*\*Counsel of Record*

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT .....	5
I. THE CLEAR-AND-CONVINCING- EVIDENCE STANDARD UNDERMINES THE PURPOSES OF THE PATENT ACT BY INHIBITING RATHER THAN ADVANCING INNOVATION .....	5
A. The Framers Recognized That The “Embarrassment of the Exclusive Patent” Is Justified Only If An Invention Was Not Already Known To The Public .....	5
B. The Clear-and-Convincing-Evidence Standard Undermines The Crucial Corrective Role Litigation Plays In Weeding Out Invalid Patents .....	9

**TABLE OF CONTENTS—cont’d**

	<b>Page</b>
II. THE CLEAR-AND-CONVINCING-EVIDENCE STANDARD IS UNJUSTIFIED, ESPECIALLY WHEN THE PATENT OFFICE DID NOT CONSIDER PRIOR ART INTRODUCED IN LITIGATION .....	15
A. The Presumption Of Validity Simply Allocates The Burden Of Proof And Does Not Raise The Quantum Of Proof Necessary To Invalidate A Patent .....	15
B. Bedrock Principles Of Administrative Law Weigh Against Deference To The Patent Office’s Validity Determination When The Patent Office Did Not Consider The Prior Art Raised In Litigation .....	21
CONCLUSION .....	30

---

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE FOR INFORMATION, INC.,  
*Respondents.*

---

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

---

**BRIEF OF CTIA – THE WIRELESS ASSOCIATION®  
AS *AMICUS CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

MICHAEL F. ALTSCHUL  
CTIA – THE WIRELESS  
ASSOCIATION®  
1400 16th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 785-0081

MICHAEL K. KELLOGG  
*Counsel of Record*  
GREGORY G. RAPAWY  
KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN,  
TODD, EVANS & FIGEL,  
P.L.L.C.  
1615 M Street, N.W.  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 326-7900

February 2, 2011

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY .....	3
ARGUMENT .....	7
I. THE CLEAR-AND-CONVINCING-EVIDENCE STANDARD INJURES INNOVATION.....	7
A. The Standard Has Made Validity Challenges Significantly Less Likely To Succeed.....	7
B. The Standard Leads to Lower Quality Jury Decisions .....	10
C. The Standard Increases the Value of Weak Patents.....	17
1. The Settlement Value of Weak Patents Increases when They Cannot Be Reliably Invalidated .....	17
2. Increasing the Value of Weak Patents Encourages Applications for More of Them .....	20
II. THE CURRENT PATENT LANDSCAPE IMPEDES INNOVATION IN THE WIRELESS INDUSTRY .....	23
III. GIVING FULL EFFECT TO <i>KSR</i> REQUIRES REJECTING THE CLEAR-AND-CONVINCING-EVIDENCE STANDARD .....	27
CONCLUSION.....	30

No. 10-290

---

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

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

---

**BRIEF OF BUSINESS SOFTWARE ALLIANCE  
AS *AMICUS CURIAE*  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

ANDREW J. PINCUS

*Counsel of Record*

PAUL W. HUGHES

*Mayer Brown LLP*

*1999 K Street, NW*

*Washington, DC 20006*

*(202) 263-3000*

*apincus@mayerbrown.com*

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
INTEREST OF THE <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	1
ARGUMENT .....	3
THE PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE STANDARD APPLIES TO A CLAIM OF INVALIDITY BASED ON PRIOR ART NOT CONSIDERED BY THE PATENT OFFICE.....	3
A. The Federal Circuit’s Clear And Convincing Evidence Rule Deters Innovation.....	6
1. The PTO is often unaware of relevant prior art.....	6
2. It is dangerous to insulate poor patents from review. ....	9
B. Precedent And General Principles Of Administrative Review Require Application Of The Preponderance Standard To Invalidity Claims Based On Prior Art Not Considered By The Patent Office. ....	12
1. There is no basis for substantial deference when the PTO did not consider the prior art at issue.....	16
2. The patentee’s property interest in a granted patent does not justify the Federal Circuit’s rule. ....	23
CONCLUSION .....	28

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE FOR INFORMATION, INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

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

---

**BRIEF OF THE  
HERCULES OPEN-SOURCE PROJECT  
AS AMICUS CURIAE  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

MARK S. DAVIES  
RICHARD A. RINKEMA  
JOHANNA HARTWIG  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON &  
SUTCLIFFE LLP  
1152 15<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005

E. JOSHUA ROSENKRANZ  
*Counsel of Record*  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON &  
SUTCLIFFE LLP  
51 West 52<sup>nd</sup> Street  
New York, NY 10019  
(212) 506-5000  
jrosenkranz@orrick.com

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE ..... 1

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT..... 4

ARGUMENT ..... 5

    I.    THE PATENT SYSTEM IS EASILY  
          EXPLOITED BY THOSE WHO HAVE  
          INVENTED NOTHING..... 6

        A.    Patents Are Too Easy To Obtain ..... 6

        B.    Jurors Favor Patent Owners ..... 10

    II.   THE “CLEAR AND CONVINCING  
          EVIDENCE” STANDARD IS CON-  
          TRIBUTING TO EXPLOITATION OF  
          THE PATENT SYSTEM ..... 17

CONCLUSION..... 22

No. 10-290

---

---

In The  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

—◆—  
MICROSOFT CORPORATION, PETITIONER,

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL.  
—◆—

*ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT*  
—◆—

**BRIEF OF APPLE INC. AND INTEL  
CORPORATION AS AMICI CURIAE  
SUPPORTING REVERSAL**  
—◆—

DEANNE E. MAYNARD  
*Counsel of Record*  
SETH M. GALANTER  
MARC A. HEARRON  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
2000 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
dmaynard@mofa.com  
(202) 887-8740

*Counsel for Amici Curiae  
Apple Inc. and  
Intel Corporation*

FEBRUARY 2, 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTION PRESENTED.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE.....	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY.....	2
ARGUMENT.....	5
CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE SHOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO PROVE A PATENT'S INVALIDITY BASED ON PRIOR ART THAT WAS NOT CONSIDERED BY THE PATENT OFFICE.....	5
A. A Clear And Convincing Evidence Stan- dard Should Not Apply When The Prior Art Was Not Considered By The Patent Office.....	5
1. When the Patent Office did not con- sider the prior art, a preponderance standard is appropriate.....	5
2. Congress effectively ratified pre-1952 judicial decisions applying different evidentiary standards depending on whether the prior art was considered by the Patent Office.....	9
B. Applying A Preponderance Standard For Unconsidered Art Supports The Strong Public Interest In Eliminating Invalid Patents.....	13

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

	Page
C. Practical Experience Shows That The Evidentiary Standard Has A Compelling, And Often Dispositive, Effect On Jurors .....	15
1. <i>OPTi Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> .....	15
2. <i>Abbott Laboratories v. Syntron Bioresearch, Inc.</i> .....	17
3. Additional empirical evidence.....	18
CONCLUSION.....	19

No. 10-290

---

In the  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

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

---

**BRIEF OF GOOGLE INC., VERIZON  
COMMUNICATIONS INC., CONSUMER ELECTRONICS  
ASSOCIATION, COMCAST CORP., DELL COMPUTER  
CORP., HEWLETT-PACKARD CO., HTC CORP., INTUIT  
INC., L-3 COMMUNICATIONS CORP., LINKEDIN  
CORP., LOCKHEED MARTIN CORP., MASTERCARD  
WORLDWIDE, THE NEW YORK TIMES COMPANY,  
RACKSPACE HOSTING INC., RED HAT, INC.,  
SHUTTERFLY, INC., SOFTWARE & INFORMATION  
INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION, TIME WARNER INC., WAL-  
MART STORES, INC., AND ZYNGA INC. AS *AMICI  
CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

JOHN THORNE  
GAIL F. LEVINE  
VERIZON  
COMMUNICATIONS INC.  
1320 North Courthouse Road  
Arlington, VA 22201  
(703) 351-3900  
*Counsel for Verizon  
Communications Inc.*

PAUL D. CLEMENT  
*Counsel of Record*  
DARYL JOSEFFER  
ADAM CONRAD  
KING & SPALDING LLP  
1700 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 737-0500  
PClement@kslaw.com  
*Counsel for Amici Curiae*

February 2, 2011

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE .....	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	6
THE STANDARD OF PROOF FOR PATENT INVALIDITY SHOULD ALWAYS BE A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE .....	6
I. The Federal Circuit’s Imposition Of The Clear-And-Convincing Standard Puts Patent Law At Odds With General Principles Of Law .....	6
A. The Patent Act does not require a heightened standard of proof .....	6
B. The nature of the patent right does not warrant a heightened standard of proof .....	9
II. Deference To The PTO’s Expertise Does Not Warrant A Heightened Standard Of Proof .....	15
A. Federal Circuit law and PTO practice tilt the scales heavily in favor of granting patent applications based on incomplete analyses .....	16
B. Patent litigation provides an essential de novo test of patents’ validity .....	23
III. The Standard Of Proof Should Always Be The Preponderance Of The Evidence .....	29

IV. Neither This Court's Precedents Nor Congressional Inaction Requires A Heightened Standard Of Proof .....	32
CONCLUSION.....	37

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

*v.*

I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

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

---

---

**BRIEF OF SAP AMERICA, INC., ACUSHNET COM-  
PANY, FACEBOOK, INC., GENERAL MOTORS LLC,  
PREGIS CORPORATION, SYMANTEC CORPORA-  
TION, TEREX CORPORATION, AND YAHOO! INC.  
AS *AMICI CURIAE* SUPPORTING PETITIONER**

---

---

JOHN F. DUFFY  
FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS,  
SHRIVER & JACOBSON LLP  
1001 Pennsylvania Ave. NW  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
(202) 639-7000

JAMES W. DABNEY  
*Counsel of Record*  
STEPHEN S. RABINOWITZ  
HENRY C. LEBOWITZ  
FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS,  
SHRIVER & JACOBSON LLP  
One New York Plaza  
New York, N.Y. 10004  
(212) 859-8000  
James.Dabney@  
friedfrank.com

*Counsel for SAP America, Inc., Acushnet Company,  
Facebook, Inc., General Motors LLC, Pregis Corporation,  
Symantec Corporation, Terex Corporation,  
and Yahoo! Inc.*

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
QUESTION PRESENTED.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iv
INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE .....	1
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT .....	1
ARGUMENT .....	5
I.    The Judicial Review Authorized by the Patent Act Is Subject to the Standards of Review in the APA. ....	7
II.   The APA Requires <i>De Novo</i> Review Where the PTO Has Not Exercised Reasoned Decisionmaking on an Issue or Where a Trial Record Contains Substantial New or Different Evidence Concerning an Issue of Fact Relevant to a Defense of Invalidity. ....	13
III.  The Text and Structure of the Patent Act Both Support <i>De Novo</i> Review in This Case. ....	17
IV.  The Rule of Decision Applied Below Conflicts With This Court’s Precedents.....	21
A.   Patent Law Precedents .....	21
B.   Federal Civil Procedure Precedents.....	22
1.    Standard of Proof Precedents .....	22
2.    Res Judicata Precedents .....	24
C.   Evidence Precedents.....	26

V. The Approach to Judicial Review of Patent Validity Decisions Outlined Here Constitutes a Fair, Balanced, and Symmetric Approach.....	28
CONCLUSION .....	29

**In The  
Supreme Court of the United States**

—◆—  
MICROSOFT CORP.,

*Petitioner,*

v.

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, et al.,

*Respondents.*

—◆—  
**On Writ Of Certiorari To The  
United States Court Of Appeals  
For The Federal Circuit**

—◆—  
**BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE* COMPUTER &  
COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

—◆—

BRIAN KAHIN	JONATHAN BAND
MATTHEW SCHRUERS	<i>Counsel of Record</i>
COMPUTER & COMMUNICATIONS	JONATHAN BAND PLLC
INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION	21 Dupont Circle, NW
900 17th Street, NW	8th Floor
Suite 1100	Washington, DC 20036
Washington, DC 20006	(202) 296-5675
(202) 783-0070	jband@policybandwidth.com

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

February 2, 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	4
I. THE ENHANCED PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY IS A LEGACY OF A DIS- CREDITED MODEL IN WHICH BAD PATENTS CAN DO NO HARM.....	4
II. THE NATURE OF PATENT EXAMI- NATION DOES NOT JUSTIFY AN ENHANCED PRESUMPTION OF VA- LIDITY.....	6
A. The burden is on the examiner to show why a patent should not be granted .....	7
B. The patent examiner is not ordinarily an expert.....	9
C. The resources devoted to the exami- nation process are small – and for good reason.....	12
D. The examiner is encouraged to grant rather than deny applications.....	15
E. Unlike other administrative proceed- ings, patent examination is conducted <i>ex parte</i> .....	17
F. The costs of evaluating the patent are most efficiently born by the appli- cant.....	18

## TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

	Page
III. AN ARTIFICIALLY ENHANCED PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY SUBSIDIZES INVALID PATENTS, UNBALANCING THE PATENT SYSTEM AND DISTORTING THE MARKET.....	20
A. The enhanced presumption creates an artificial incentive and subsidy for invalid patents.....	21
B. An artificially enhanced presumption of validity exacerbates the problem of invalidating bad patents .....	22
C. Widespread liability and costs lead to strategic behavior.....	23
IV. BY ENCOURAGING DUBIOUS PATENTS, AN ENHANCED PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY ADDS TO THE PROBLEM OF PATENT THICKETS, THE OVERALL OPACITY OF THE SYSTEM, AND THE BACKLOG OF APPLICATIONS.....	27
CONCLUSION.....	28

No. 10-290

---

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

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

---

---

**BRIEF OF TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA,  
INC. AS *AMICUS CURIAE* SUGGESTING  
VACATION**

---

---

HENRY C. DINGER

*Counsel of Record*

ELAINE HERRMANN BLAIS

GOODWIN PROCTER LLP

Exchange Place

Boston, MA 02109

(617) 570-1000

hdinger@goodwinprocter.com

*Attorneys for Amicus Curiae*

February 2, 2011

---

---

234519



COUNSEL PRESS

(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT.....	4
I. Introduction .....	4
II. Application of a clear and convincing standard to prove invalidity even where material, non-cumulative prior art was not before the Patent Office, encourages applicants to conceal such prior art from the Patent Office .....	5
A. Informed patent examination often requires information that only the applicant will be in a position to supply.....	5
B. The application of a clear and convincing standard of proof across the board exacerbates powerful incentives not to discover problematic prior art and not to disclose such prior art to the patent examiner.....	7

*Table of Contents*

	<i>Page</i>
C. The inequitable conduct defense does little to reduce the incentives to conceal problematic prior art . . . . .	11
III. The standard of proof required to establish invalidity should be preponderance of the evidence unless the trial court finds that all of the prior art and other information on which the accused infringer relies was before the patent examiner . . . . .	15
A. Where all material, non-cumulative prior art was before the examiner, a higher standard of proof for invalidity defenses will encourage full disclosure by applicants and appropriately defer to informed administrative action. . . . .	15
B. Applying a clear and convincing standard only where the invalidity challenge is based on information that was before the examiner is workable . . . . .	17
CONCLUSION . . . . .	22

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

*v.*

141 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

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

---

**BRIEF OF CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., EBAY INC.,  
NETFLIX, INC., OFFICE DEPOT, INC.,  
TOYOTA MOTOR CORPORATION, AND TRIMBLE  
NAVIGATION LIMITED AS *AMICI CURIAE* IN  
SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

---

PROFESSOR JOSEPH MILLER  
LEWIS & CLARK LAW SCHOOL  
10015 S.W. Terwilliger Blvd.  
Room 321  
Portland, OR 97219

*Of Counsel for Amici Curiae*

JOHN D. VANDENBERG  
*Counsel of Record*  
JOSEPH T. JAKUBEK  
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP  
One World Trade Center  
121 S.W. Salmon Street  
Suite 1600  
Portland, OR 97204-2988  
(503) 595-5300  
john.vandenberg@  
klarquist.com

February 2, 2011

*Counsel for Amici Curiae*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	3
ARGUMENT.....	5
I. THE BURDEN OF PROOF FOR PATENT INVALIDITY SHOULD BE CONSISTENT WITH THE OVERALL STATUTORY SCHEME .....	5
II. THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT’S HEIGHTENED STANDARD IGNORES THE STATUTORY SOURCES OF PRIOR ART THE PTO RARELY LEARNS OF DURING ROUTINE PATENT EXAMINATION.....	8
III. THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT’S HEIGHTENED STANDARD IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE PTO’S APPLICATION OF THE “PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE” STANDARD WHEN REVIEWING SUBSTANTIAL NEW QUESTIONS OF PATENTABILITY.....	11

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
IV. A FAILED VALIDITY CHALLENGE IN LITIGATION UNDER THE “CLEAR AND CONVINCING STANDARD” THWARTS THE LITIGANT’S RESORT TO <i>INTER PARTES</i> REEXAMINATION AND THE LOWER BURDEN OF PROOF.....	14
V. THE HIGHER STANDARD THWARTS CONGRESS’S INTENT IN PROVIDING FOR STAYS OF LITIGATION IN FAVOR OF REEXAMINATIONS AND PTO EXPERTISE.....	18
VI. THE HIGHER STANDARD CAN AND HAS LED TO DUPLICATION OF EFFORTS AND UNFAIR AND INCONSISTENT RESULTS UNDER IDENTICAL FACTUAL SITUATIONS .....	20
VII.A PREPONDERANCE STANDARD BETTER REFLECTS THE LEGISLATIVE RECOGNITION OF THE HARM CAUSED BY UNWORTHY PATENTS .....	22
CONCLUSION .....	24

No. 10-290

---

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

*v.*

141 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

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

---

---

**BRIEF *AMICI CURIAE* OF 37 LAW,  
BUSINESS, AND ECONOMICS PROFESSORS  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

---

MARK A. LEMLEY

*Counsel of Record*

STANFORD LAW SCHOOL

559 Nathan Abbott Way

Stanford, CA 94305

(650) 723-4605

mlemley@law.stanford.edu

*Counsel for Amici Curiae*

---

---

234533



COUNSEL PRESS

(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
QUESTION PRESENTED .....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF APPENDICES .....	iii
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES .....	iv
STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF THE <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
ARGUMENT.....	1
I. The PTO Is Subject to Significant Constraints.....	3
II. The Quantum of Proof for Invalidity Should Reflect the Reality of the Patent Prosecution Process.....	7
A. The Administrative Procedure Act Does Not Compel Deference to Patent Grants.....	7
B. Clear and Convincing Evidence is Not the Proper Rule in All Cases.....	10
C. Deference May Be Appropriate, But Only to Decisions Actually Made on the Record.....	13
III. A Realistic Standard of Proof Will Not Weaken the Patent System or Threaten Innovation.....	15
IV. Conclusion .....	17

**TABLE OF APPENDICES**

	<i>Page</i>
APPENDIX — LIST OF SIGNATORIES . . . . .	1a

No. 10-290

---

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

*v.*

141 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION INC.,

*Respondents.*

---

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

---

---

**BRIEF OF TIMEX GROUP USA, INC.,  
MACDERMID, INC., GEM MANUFACTURING, INC.,  
PERFECT 10 ANTENNA COMPANY, INC.,  
CARSON OPTICAL, INC. AS *AMICI CURIAE*  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

---

JOHN R. HORVACK, JR.

*Counsel of Record*

FATIMA LAHNIN

CARMODY & TORRANCE LLP

195 Church Street

New Haven, CT 06509

(203) 777-5501

[jhorvack@carmodylaw.com](mailto:jhorvack@carmodylaw.com)

*Counsel for Amici Curiae*

---

---

234594



COUNSEL PRESS

(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
QUESTION PRESENTED .....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	ii
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES .....	v
INTERESTS OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	3
I. THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT’S FOUNDATIONAL CASE ESTABLISHING THE CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE STANDARD WAS WRONGLY DECIDED .....	3
A. Important Distinctions Must Be Drawn Between Burdens of Proof, Standards of Review, and Collateral Deference .....	3
B. The Federal Circuit Confused Standards of Review With Standards of Proof and Thereby Misinterpreted This Court’s Precedent .....	5

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
II. A DEFENDANT SHOULD BEAR THE BURDEN TO PROVE INVALIDITY WITH A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE BUT PART OF THE COUNTERVAILING EVIDENCE MAY INCLUDE DEFERENCE TO THE PTO .....	11
A. The Burden of Proof Must Be Preponderance of the Evidence .....	11
B. The Federal Circuit Has Established Doctrine Regarding The Standard for Administrative Deference That Should Be Preserved as Consistent With This Court’s Holding in <i>United States v. Mead</i> .....	17
1. Federal Circuit Precedent, While Incorrect in Setting the Burden of Proof, Properly Provides For Administrative Deference To PTO Determinations In the Form of Evidentiary Weight .....	17
2. Federal Circuit Precedent On Administrative Deference Accords With This Court’s Decision in <i>United States v. Mead</i> .....	18

*Table of Contents*

	<i>Page</i>
C. The Proposed Standard Better Aligns Applicants' Incentives with the Interests of the PTO In a Manner That Is Impossible Within the Confines of Inequitable Conduct .....	21
III. SECTION 282 MUST BE INTERPRETED ONLY TO REQUIRE PROOF OF INVALIDITY TO A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE BECAUSE A CLEAR AND CONVINCING STANDARD WOULD RAISE SERIOUS CONSTITUTIONAL CONCERNS.....	24
A. A Clear and Convincing Standard Violates the Due Process Clause By Unfairly Infecting a Defendant's Adjudication With <i>Ex Parte</i> Determinations of the PTO .....	24
B. A Clear and Convincing Standard Violates the Due Process Clause By Unfairly Infecting a Defendant's Adjudication With Potentially Impartial Determinations of the PTO .....	28
CONCLUSION .....	31

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL.  
*Respondents.*

---

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

---

**BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE,  
AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW  
ASSOCIATION IN SUPPORT OF NEITHER PARTY**

---

WILLIAM G. BARBER,  
President-Elect  
AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL  
PROPERTY LAW  
ASSOCIATION  
241 18<sup>th</sup> Street, South  
Suite 700  
Arlington, VA 22202  
(703) 415-0780

DONALD R. WARE  
*Counsel of Record*  
BARBARA A. FIACCO  
JAMES M. FLAHERTY, JR.  
STACY A. ANDERSON  
FOLEY HOAG LLP  
155 Seaport Boulevard  
Boston, MA 02210  
(617) 832-1000  
dware@foleyhoag.com

February 2, 2011

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....iii

STATEMENT OF INTEREST ..... 1

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT..... 3

ARGUMENT ..... 6

    I.    The Common Law Development of  
          the Presumption of Validity and the  
          Heightened Standard of Proving  
          Facts Supporting Patent Invalidity. ....6

    II.   The Heightened Standard of Proof  
          Reflects Not Only Deference to the  
          USPTO but also the Importance of  
          Protecting the Statutory Patent  
          Grant as a Carefully-Crafted  
          Bargain Between the Inventor and  
          the Public. ....14

    III.  The 1952 Patent Act Codified the  
          Common Law Presumption of  
          Validity and Did Not Alter the  
          Heightened Standard of Proof for  
          Facts Supporting Invalidity. ....20

    IV.  Regional Circuit Case Law in  
          Conflict with Section 282 and

Supreme Court Precedent Should be Disregarded.....	24
V. Federal Circuit Case Law Conforms with Long-Standing Supreme Court Precedent and the Principles Underlying the Heightened Standard for Proving Facts Supporting Patent Invalidity .....	28
VI. This Court Should Reaffirm the “Clear and Convincing” Evidentiary Standard for Proving the Facts in Support of an Invalidity Defense. ....	37
CONCLUSION.....	40

No. 10-290

---

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION, PETITIONER,  
v.  
I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL., RESPONDENTS.

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

---

**BRIEF FOR *AMICUS CURIAE* BAR  
ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
PATENT, TRADEMARK & COPYRIGHT SECTION  
IN SUPPORT OF NEITHER PARTY**

JOHN E. DUBIANSKY  
*Counsel of Record*  
1919 Gallows Road  
Vienna, VA 22182  
(703) 496-5000  
john.dubiansky@  
echelaw.com

*Attorney for Amicus  
Curiae Bar Association of  
the District of Columbia*

---

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	5
I.    THERE SHOULD BE NO PRESUMPTION THAT THE EXAMINER GAVE FULL CONSIDERATION TO EACH CITED REFERENCE.....	5
II.   INCREASED INCENTIVES FOR APPLICANT SUBMISSION OF PRIOR ART WOULD NOT IMPROVE PATENT QUALITY .....	9
CONCLUSION .....	14

No. 10-290

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

I4I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE FOR INFORMATION, INC.,  
*Respondents.*

**On Writ Of Certiorari  
To The United States Court Of Appeals  
For The Federal Circuit**

**BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE* INTERNATIONAL  
BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION  
IN SUPPORT OF NEITHER PARTY**

RONALD A. LAUDERDALE  
MANNY W. SCHECTER  
MARIAN UNDERWEISER  
MARC A. EHRLICH  
IBM CORPORATION  
One North Castle Drive  
Armonk, NY 10504  
(914) 765-4343

KENNETH R. ADAMO  
*Counsel of Record*  
JONES DAY  
North Point  
901 Lakeside Avenue  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
(216) 586-3939  
kradamo@jonesday.com

LAWRENCE D. ROSENBERG  
JONES DAY  
51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20001-2113  
(202) 879-3939

TRACI L. LOVITT  
JONES DAY  
175 Federal Street  
Suite 501  
Boston, MA 02110  
(617) 342-8117

February 2, 2011

---

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
QUESTION PRESENTED.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iv
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
STATEMENT .....	3
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT .....	4
ARGUMENT.....	7
I. THE CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE STANDARD IS ESSENTIAL TO A WORKABLE PATENT SYSTEM AND SHOULD BE MAINTAINED. ....	9
A. The Clear And Convincing Evidence Standard Accords Appropriate Deference To The PTO’s Expertise And Procedures. ....	9
B. The Clear And Convincing Evidence Standard Promotes Invention Creation, Disclosure, And Commercialization. ....	14
II. A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE STANDARD OR DUAL STANDARD WOULD BE UNWORKABLE AND WOULD THWART INNOVATION. ....	16
A. Lowering The Burden For All Validity Challenges Would	

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
Eviscerate The Deference Owed To The PTO. ....	17
B. Creating A Dual Standard Is Not The Answer. ....	18
C. Changing The Evidentiary Standard for Proving Patent Invalidity Would Inject Uncertainty And Upset The Balance In The Patent System. ....	23
III. TRIAL COURTS CAN USE APPROPRIATE JURY INSTRUCTIONS TO ENABLE A MORE COMPLETE AND PRECISE EVALUATION OF EVIDENCE PERTINENT TO INVALIDITY. ....	24
A. Jury Instructions Are Effective Tools For Managing The Jury's Use Of The Evidence Presented. ....	25
B. Appropriate Jury Instructions Are The Best Tools For Addressing Questions Regarding Consideration Of Prior Art. ....	31
CONCLUSION .....	37

No. 10-290

---

In the Supreme Court of the United States

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

14I LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, *ET AL.*,  
*Respondent.*

---

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

---

**BRIEF OF FÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE  
DES CONSEILS EN PROPRIÉTÉ  
INDUSTRIELLE AS *AMICUS CURIAE* IN  
SUPPORT OF NEITHER PARTY**

JOHN P. SUTTON  
*Counsel of Record*  
123 RACE STREET  
GRASS VALLEY, CA 95945  
530-477-8538  
JOHNPSUTTON@EARTHLINK.NET  
FEBRUARY 2, 2011

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	3
ARGUMENT .....	4
I.    BRIGHT LINE EVIDENTIARY STANDARDS ARE IMPROPER FOR AN INVALIDITY ANALYSIS.....	4
A.    The Case Law Does Not Call For a Bright-Line Standard .....	4
B.    Definitional Vagaries Make Bright-Line Standards Impractical and Confusing .....	5

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
C. A Default Preponderance Standard Fails to Afford Issued Patents their Congressionally-Mandated Presumption of Validity .....	7
D. The Shifting Burden of Proof Urged by Petitioner Fails To Balance the Interests of Patentee and Alleged Infringer.....	7
E. A Bright-Line Clear and Convincing Standard Fails to Account for Dissimilar Procedures by Which Patents are Issued .....	8
F. The Proper Standard of Proof Must Be Determined on a Case-By-Case Basis .....	9
CONCLUSION.....	10

No. 10-290

---

---

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

i4i LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND  
INFRASTRUCTURES FOR INFORMATION, INC.,  
*Respondents.*

---

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

---

BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE*  
**ROBERTA J. MORRIS, ESQ., PH.D.**  
IN SUPPORT OF NEITHER PARTY

ROBERTA J. MORRIS, ESQ., PH.D.  
*Counsel of Record*  
200 Stanford Avenue  
Menlo Park, CA 94025  
650-234-9523  
rjmorris@alumni.brown.edu

February 2, 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTEREST OF THE <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	1
ARGUMENT .....	2
I. HOW MANY STANDARDS OF PROOF: ONE OR TWO?.....	2
A. Introduction.....	2
B. Advantages of a Binary Standard .....	6
C. Problems with a Binary Standard .....	7
1. Which Facts Do What.....	7
2. Diverting Resources from the Core Issues .....	9
D. Advantage of a Single Standard: Keeping Attention and Resources on the Core Issues .....	10
E. Problems with a Single Lower Standard.....	11
II. CURRENT PRACTICE .....	13
A. Two Standards, as a Practical Matter .....	13
B. Two Standards, Without the Disadvantages .....	14

III.	THE PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY AND RELATED MATTERS .....	15
A.	What Does the Statute Say and Not Say? .....	15
1.	Section 282 .....	16
2.	Legislative History and Other Clues .....	16
B.	Presumptions and Facts (and Law) .....	18
C.	The Federal Circuit v. The Regional Circuits on the Presumption of Validity .....	21
D.	Deference to Agency Review .....	22
E.	The Reversal Rate on Appeal .....	24
1.	A Thought Experiment .....	24
2.	Litigation and Jury Verdict Rates ...	25
IV.	WHERE TO DRAW THE LINE FOR A BINARY STANDARD .....	28
A.	Invalidity over the Prior Art .....	28
1.	Art "Considered" by the Examiner ..	29
2.	"More Pertinent Art" and the Predecessor Courts .....	30
	The Court of Claims .....	31
	The CCPA .....	33
	The Federal Circuit .....	33
B.	Non-prior art Prosecution History .....	34
V.	THE STANDARD OF PROOF DURING LITIGATION .....	34
VI.	RETROSPECTIVE v. PROSPECTIVE APPLICATION .....	35
VII.	CONCLUSION .....	37