

PATHFINDER

Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 122 S. Ct. 1831 (2002)

Cases:

1. Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 122 S. Ct. 1831 (2002).
2. Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 234 F.3d 558 (2000).
3. Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 172 F.3d 1361 (1999).
4. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co. v. Festo Corp., 520 U.S. 1111 (1997).
5. Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 72 F.3d 857 (1995).
6. Grave Tank & Mfg. Co., Inc. v. Linde Air Products Co., 339 U.S. 605 (1950).
7. Warner-Jenkinson Co. v. Hilton Davis Chem. Co., 520 U.S. 17 (1997).
8. Hurlburt v. Schillinger, 130 U.S. 456 (1889).
9. Exhibit Supply Co. v. Ace Patents Corp., 315 U.S. 126 (1942).
10. Winans v. Denmead, 56 U.S. 330 (1853).
11. Goodyear Dental Vulcanite Co. v. Davis, 102 U.S. 222 (1880).
12. Water Meter Co. v. Desper, 101 U.S. 332 (1879).
13. Greg v. Herring, 107 U.S. 640 (1883).
14. Leggett v. Avery, 101 U.S. 256 (1879).
15. Union Metallic Cartridge Co. v. United States Cartridge Co., 112 U.S. 624 (1884).
16. Sutter v. Robinson, 119 U.S. 530 (1886).
17. Hubbell v. United States, 179 U.S. 77 (1900).
18. Weber Electric Co. v. E.H. Freeman Electric Co., 256 U.S. 668 (1921).
19. Hughes Aircraft Co. v. United States, 717 F.2d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 1983).
20. Kinzenbaw v. Deere & Co., 741 F.2d 383 (Fed. Cir. 1984).
21. Johnson & Johnson Assoc. Inc. v. R.E. Services Co., 285 F.3d 1046 (Fed. Cir. 2002).
22. Environmental Instruments, Inc. v. Sutron Corp., 877 F.2d 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1989).
23. Sun Studs, Inc. v. ATA Equipment Leasing, Inc., 872 F.2d 978 (Fed. Cir. 1989).
24. Litton Systems, Inc. v. Honeywell, Inc., 238 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2001).
25. Cybor Corp. v. Fas Tech., Inc., 138 F.3d 1448 (Fed. Cir. 1998).
26. Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Space Systems/Loral, Inc., 249 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

Law Review Articles

1. Ted Apple, Enablement Estoppel: Should Prosecution History Estoppel Arise When Claims Are Amended To Overcome Enablement Rejections?, 13 Computer & High Tech. L.J. 107 (1997).
2. Mathew J. Conigliaro, Andrew C. Greenberg & Mark A. Lemley, Foreseeability in Patent Law, 16 Berkeley Tech. L.J. 1045 (2001).
3. Alan P. Klein, The Doctrine of Equivalents: Where It Is Now, What It Is, 83 J.Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y 514.
4. Glen P. Belvis, An Analysis of the En Banc Decision in Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co. and the Doctrine of Equivalents, 11 Fed. Circuit B.J. 59 (2002).

5. William M. Atkinson, Bruce. J. Rose & John A. Wasleff, Was Festo Really Necessary? 83 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y 111 (2001).
6. Faith S. Filman, Doctrine of Equivalents: Is Festo the Right Decision for the Biomedical Industry?, 33 St. Mary's L.J. 493 (2002).
7. Noreen Krall & Celesta B. Filoia, The Doctrine of Equivalents: An Analysis of the Festo Decision, 17 Computer & High Tech. L.J. 373 (2001).
8. Jay Alexander, Cabining the Doctrine of Equivalents in Festo: A Historic Perspective on the Relationship Between the Doctrine of Equivalents and Prosecution History Estoppel, 51 Am. U.L. Rev. 553 (2002).
9. R. Polk Wagner, Reconsidering Estoppel: Patent Administration and the Failure of Festo, 151 U. Pa. L. Rev. _ (2002).
10. Steven H. VerSteege, Parallel Applications to Preserve the Doctrine of Equivalents in a Post Festo World, 84 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y, 341 (2002);
11. Thomas P. Riley, Prosecution History Estoppel: The Choice Between Public Interest and Inventor's Property Rights, 36 Val. U.L. Rev. 239 (2001).
12. Mark A. Lemley, Rational Ignorance at the Patent Office, 95 Nw. U.L. Rev. 1495 (2001)

Treatise

1. Donald S. Chisum. Chisum on Patents (2000).

Statutes

1. U.S. CONST. art. I, § 8, cl. 8.
2. 35 U.S.C. §§ 1-376 (1994 & Supp. II 1996).

Amicus Briefs

1. Brief of Amicus Curie Chiron Corp in Support of Petitioner, 2001 WL 1025109.
2. Brief of Amicus Curie American Intellectual Property Law Association in Support of Petitioner, 2001 WL 1025096.
3. Brief for the United States as Amicus Curie Supporting Vacatur and Remand, 2001 WL 1025650.
4. Brief Amicus Curie of Genentech, Inc. in Support of Respondents Seeking Affirmance, 2001 WL 1480572.