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Steady erosion in patent protection

- America Invents Act (2011)
  - Effectively guts the 1-year Grace Period for “public use” and “on sale”
  - Established PGR/IPR/CBM at PTO to improve patent quality
- PTO (2014), denial of claim amendments in almost all IPR proceedings turned it into a patent “death squad”
- Supreme Court
  - Mayo v. Prometheus (2012) and Alice v. CLS (2014), damaging conflation and uncertainty on patent-eligible subject matter
  - Octane Fitness v. ICON Health & Fitness, and Highmark Inc. v. Allcare (2014), de facto “loser pays”
- Cumulative impact of these developments already making easier defeat of patents; chilling assertion of meritorious claims
Post-\textit{Alice} surge in patent invalidity decisions
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\caption{Chart showing the percent of patent claims invalidated before and after the \textit{Alice} decision.}
\end{figure}

Despite all these trends, lobbying for proposed patent legislation continues forcefully in the 114th Congress.
Fee shifting – “Loser pays”

- Awards costs and attorney fees to prevailing party unless position and conduct of non-prevailing party reasonably justified in law and fact

- If losing party unable to pay, court may join >5% investor as “Real party of interest” for recovery
  - “Good luck in getting investors for your tech company”

- Party asserting claim, who later settles and extends covenant not to sue, is deemed “non-prevailing party”
  - Discourages settlement of genuine disputes – increases number of cases tried in federal courts
One-sided barriers against patentees

- Heightened pleading obligations only on patentees – not on alleged infringers
  - Requires pleading with particularity each asserted patent claim, allegedly infringing product, and theory of how each accused item infringes each asserted claim, without benefit of discovery
  - “Watered Down:” No similar requirement in a declaratory action against patentee for pleading with particularity a theory of non-infringement for each accused item, or invalidity of each patent claim, identifying prior art relied upon

- Fee shifting joinder of “Real Party in Interest” applies only against non-prevailing patentees but not against non-prevailing filers of declaratory actions against patentees
Prospects for enduring patent rights are extinguished

- Piecemeal erosion of patent rights has become a fixture in every session of Congress and every patent decision of the Supreme Court.
- Uncertainty harm is created even by legislation that does not pass.
- For many startups the “Patent Bargain” is no longer credible.
- Substantial shift to business models that can rely on trade-secret protection.
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