

The DTSA and Tradeoffs Between Patents and Trade Secrets

Presented to the 2016 Advanced Patent Law Institute
December 8, 2016

James Pooley



Classical decision between patents and trade secrets



- Risk of reverse engineering
- Projected period of value
- Patent strength
- Critical need to use the invention (avoid forfeiture or later patentee)
- Costs to procure and maintain
- Value of patent as leverage or message

Increasing anxiety over patent rights



- Patent scope narrows in some technologies
 - KSR, Bilski, Mayo, Nautilus, Alice
- Patent enforcement becomes more difficult and risky
 - eBay, Sandisk, LaserDynamics, Octane Fitness
- AIA introduces new ways to challenge patent validity
- Patents remain valuable, but focus now on quality

AIA also boosted trade secrets



- Best mode requirement now toothless
- Forfeiture doctrine almost certainly dead
- Prior user rights extended to all technologies
- Result: lowered trade secret anxiety

What animated the DTSA



- Growing importance of data as an asset
- Shift from local, paper to global, digital
- Trade secret rights not territorial; they travel
- Federal courts can provide procedural advantage



- Essentially the same as UTSA and TRIPS
- Does not preempt state law; choose one or both
- Seizure provisions caused angst, but are seldom used
- Threatened misappropriation by departing employees
- Whistleblower immunity
- For most cases, state court may still be the better choice

DTSA effects on the patent/TS choice



- DTSA provides stronger, more reliable enforcement
- DTSA has significant extraterritorial reach
- Management attention focused on secrecy

Recent trade secret litigation outcomes and filings



**Miller v.
Caterpillar**

(E.D. Ill. Dec. 2015)

**\$74
million**



**Epic Systems
v. Tata**

(W.D. Wisc. Apr. 2016)

**\$940
million**



**Move v.
Zillow**

(Wash. June 2016)

**\$130
million
settlement**

**U.S. Steel v.
Chinese companies**

(ITC May 2016)

Alleged price fixing
informed by government
hacking

Space Data v. Google

(DTSA filing June 2016)

2007 visit with exposure to
confidential information

Thank you.

James Pooley

jpooley@orrick.com

+1 650 285 8520

