

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MODEL PATENT JURY INSTRUCTIONS

August 2017
(updated October 2019)

WORKING COMMITTEE:

Magistrate Judge Paul Grewal (Ret.)

Annette Hurst

Magistrate Judge Elizabeth Laporte

Professor Mark Lemley

Kathi Vidal

Matthew Powers

Ashok Ramani

Edward Reines

Senior District Judge Ronald Whyte (Ret.)

[Blank page for duplex printing.]

PREFACE TO THE 2017 VERSION

These Model Patent Jury Instructions have been drafted by a committee of judicial officers and members of the federal bar appointed by the Chief Judge of the Northern District of California. The current set has been revised to account for changes in the law as of July 1, 2016.

Congress amended the patent laws in the America Invents Act (“AIA”), signed by the President on September 16, 2011. Most notably, the First Inventor to File Provision of the AIA redefines Prior Art for those patent applications filed under the First Inventor to File system. The prior art jury instructions provided in this model set of instructions are therefore inapplicable to any claimed invention having an effective filing date on or after March 16, 2013.

The instructions have been prepared to assist judges in communicating effectively and in plain English with jurors in patent cases. The instructions are models and are not intended to be used without tailoring. They are not substitutes for the individual research and drafting that may be required in a particular case. The correctness of any given instruction may be the subject of a Federal Circuit opinion.

These instructions include only instructions on patent law. They will need to be supplemented with standard instructions on, among other things, the duties of the judge and jury, the consideration of evidence, the duty to deliberate, and the return of a verdict. The Ninth Circuit’s Manual of Model Civil Jury Instructions (download from www3.ce9.uscourts.gov/jury-instructions/model-civil) is a good reference for standard instructions for civil cases.

The instructions use the terms “patent holder” and “alleged infringer” in brackets. The names of the parties should be substituted for these terms as appropriate. Other language is bracketed as it may not be appropriate for a particular case. Empty brackets signify additional case specific information to be added, such as patent or claim numbers.

The court is indebted to the Working Committee, which spent many hours drafting the original model instructions and subsequent revisions. The instructions are now administered by the Patent Instructions and Rules Committee. Suggested revisions to these instructions may be sent to the Chair of that Committee, the Honorable Jon S. Tigar, at clerk_of_court@cand.uscourts.gov or at his court mailing address:

Hon. Jon S. Tigar
United States District Court
450 Golden Gate Avenue, 19th Floor
San Francisco, CA 9410

[Blank page for duplex printing.]

Contents

A.1. Preliminary Instructions.....	1
WHAT A PATENT IS AND HOW ONE IS OBTAINED	1
A.2. Preliminary Instructions.....	3
PATENT AT ISSUE.....	3
A.3. Preliminary Instructions.....	4
SUMMARY OF CONTENTIONS.....	4
A.4. Preliminary Instructions.....	5
OVERVIEW OF APPLICABLE LAW.....	5
A.5. Preliminary Instructions.....	6
OUTLINE OF TRIAL	6
B.1. Summary of Contentions.....	8
SUMMARY OF CONTENTIONS.....	8
B.2. Claim Construction	9
2.1 INTERPRETATION OF CLAIMS	9
B.3 Infringement.....	10
3.1 INFRINGEMENT—BURDEN OF PROOF	10
3.2 DIRECT INFRINGEMENT	11
3.3 LITERAL INFRINGEMENT.....	13
3.3a JOINT, LITERAL INFRINGEMENT.....	15
3.3b MEANS-PLUS-FUNCTION CLAIMS—LITERAL INFRINGEMENT	16
3.4 INFRINGEMENT UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS.....	18
3.4a MEANS-PLUS-FUNCTION CLAIMS—INFRINGEMENT UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS	20
3.5 LIMITATIONS ON THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS	21
3.6 CONTRIBUTORY INFRINGEMENT	22
3.7 INDUCING PATENT INFRINGEMENT	23
3.8 WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT.....	24
B.4.1 Validity.....	25
4.1a INVALIDITY—BURDEN OF PROOF.....	25
4.1b INVALIDITY—PERSPECTIVE OF ONE OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	26
B.4.2 Validity—Adequacy of Patent Specification	27
4.2a WRITTEN DESCRIPTION REQUIREMENT	27
4.2b ENABLEMENT	28
B.4.3 Validity—The Claims	29
4.3a1 ANTICIPATION	29
4.3a1a DETERMINING WHO IS THE FIRST INVENTOR	31
4.3a2 STATUTORY BARS	32

4.3a3	ANTICIPATION	34
4.3b	OBVIOUSNESS—(Alternative 1)	35
4.3b	OBVIOUSNESS—(Alternative 2)	37
4.3c	INVENTORSHIP	40
B.5.	Patent Damages	41
5.1	DAMAGES—BURDEN OF PROOF	41
5.2	LOST PROFITS—GENERALLY	42
5.3	LOST PROFITS—FACTORS TO CONSIDER	43
5.3a	LOST PROFITS—MARKET SHARE	44
5.3b	LOST PROFITS—NON-INFRINGEMENT SUBSTITUTE	45
5.4	LOST PROFITS—COLLATERAL SALES	46
5.5	LOST PROFITS—PRICE EROSION	47
5.6	REASONABLE ROYALTY—ENTITLEMENT	48
5.7	REASONABLE ROYALTY—DEFINITION	49
5.8	REASONABLE ROYALTY—MULTIPLE PATENTS	51
5.9	DATE OF COMMENCEMENT—PRODUCTS	52
5.10	REASONABLE ROYALTY—COMMITMENT TO LICENSE ON REASONABLE AND NONDISCRIMINATORY TERMS	53
5.11	CALCULATING DAMAGES IN CASES OF INDUCEMENT OR CONTRIBUTORY INFRINGEMENT	54
C.1.	Appendix	55
	GLOSSARY	55
C.2.	Appendix	58
	COMMENTS REGARDING USE OF SAMPLE VERDICT FORM	58
C.3.	Appendix	59
	SAMPLE VERDICT FORM	59

WHAT A PATENT IS AND HOW ONE IS OBTAINED

This case involves a dispute relating to a United States patent. Before summarizing the positions of the parties and the legal issues involved in the dispute, let me take a moment to explain what a patent is and how one is obtained.

Patents are granted by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (sometimes called “the PTO”). A valid United States patent gives the patent holder the right to prevent others from making, using, offering to sell, or selling the patented invention within the United States, or from importing it into the United States, during the term of the patent without the patent holder’s permission. A violation of the patent holder’s rights is called infringement. The patent holder may try to enforce a patent against persons believed to be infringers by means of a lawsuit filed in federal court.

To obtain a patent one must file an application with the PTO. The process of obtaining a patent is called patent prosecution. The PTO is an agency of the federal government and employs trained patent examiners who review applications for patents. The application includes what is called a “specification,” which must contain a written description of the claimed invention telling what the invention is, how it works, how to make it and how to use it so others skilled in the field will know how to make or use it. The specification concludes with one or more numbered sentences. These are the patent “claims.” When the patent is eventually granted by the PTO, the claims define the boundaries of its protection and give notice to the public of those boundaries.

After the applicant files the application, a PTO patent examiner reviews the patent application to determine whether the claims are patentable and whether the specification adequately describes the invention claimed. In examining a patent application, the patent examiner reviews information about the state of the technology at the time the application was filed. As part of that effort, the patent examiner searches for and reviews information that is publicly available, submitted by the applicant, or both. That information is called “prior art.” Prior art is defined by law, and I will give you at a later time specific instructions as to what constitutes prior art. [However, in general, prior art includes things that existed before the claimed invention, that were publicly known, or used in a publicly accessible way in this country, or that were patented or described in a publication in any country. The patent examiner considers, among other things, whether each claim defines an invention that is new, useful, and not obvious in view of the prior art.]¹ A patent lists the prior art that the examiner considered; this list is called the “cited references.”

¹The preceding two sentences are inapplicable to any post-AIA claims, i.e., to any claimed invention having an effective filing date on or after March 16, 2013.

After the prior art search and examination of the application, the patent examiner then informs the applicant in writing what the examiner has found and whether any claim is patentable, and thus will be “allowed.” This writing from the patent examiner is called an “office action.” If the examiner rejects the claims, the applicant has an opportunity to respond and sometimes changes the claims or submits new claims. This process, which takes place only between the examiner and the patent applicant, may go back and forth for some time until the examiner is satisfied that the application and claims meet the requirements for a patent. Sometimes, patents are issued after appeals with the PTO or to a court. The papers generated during this time of communicating back and forth between the patent examiner and the applicant make up what is called the “prosecution history.” All of this material becomes available to the public no later than the date when the patent issues.

The fact that the PTO grants a patent does not necessarily mean that any invention claimed in the patent, in fact, deserves the protection of a patent. For example, the PTO may not have had available to it all the information that will be presented to you. A person accused of infringement has the right to argue here in federal court that a claimed invention in the patent is invalid because it does not meet the requirements for a patent.

A.2. Preliminary Instructions

PATENT AT ISSUE

[The court should show the jury the patent at issue and point out the parts including the specification, drawings and claims including the claims at issue.]

A.3. Preliminary Instructions

SUMMARY OF CONTENTIONS

To help you follow the evidence, I will now give you a summary of the positions of the parties.

The parties in this case are [patent holder] and [alleged infringer]. The case involves United States Patent Number(s) [], obtained by [inventor] and transferred by [inventor] to [patent holder]. For convenience, the parties and I will often refer to this patent by the last three numbers of its patent number: the [last three numbers of the patent] patent.

[Patent holder] filed suit in this court seeking money damages from [alleged infringer] for allegedly infringing the [] patent by [making], [importing], [using], [selling], and [offering for sale] [products] [methods] that [patent holder] argues are covered by claims [] of the patent. [[Patent holder] also argues that [alleged infringer] has [actively induced infringement of these claims of the [] patent by others] [and] [contributed to the infringement of these claims of the [] patent by others].] The [products] [methods] that are alleged to infringe are [list of accused products or methods].

[Alleged infringer] denies that it has infringed claims [] of the [] patent. [Alleged infringer] also argues that those claims are invalid. [Add other defenses, if applicable]. Invalidity is a defense to infringement.

Your job will be to decide whether claims [] of the [] patent have been infringed and whether those claims are invalid. If you decide that any claim of the [] patent has been infringed and is not invalid, you will then need to decide any money damages to be awarded to [patent holder] to compensate it for the infringement. [You will also need to make a finding as to whether the infringement was willful. If you decide that any infringement was willful, that decision should not affect any damage award you give. I will take willfulness into account later.]

You may hear evidence that [alleged infringer] has its own patent(s) or that [alleged infringer] improved on the [] patent. While this evidence is relevant to some issues you will be asked to decide, a party can still infringe even if it has its own patents in the same area. You will be instructed after trial as to what, if any, relevance these facts have to the particular issues in this case. Meanwhile, please keep an open mind.

Before you decide whether [alleged infringer] has infringed the claim[s] of the patent or whether the claim[s] [is][are] invalid, you will need to understand the patent claims. As I mentioned, the patent claims are numbered sentences at the end of the patent that describe the boundaries of the patent's protection. It is my job as judge to explain to you the meaning of any language in the claim[s] that needs interpretation.

[The Court may wish to hand out its claim constructions (if the claims have been construed at this point) and the glossary at this time. If the claim constructions are handed out, the following instruction should be read:

I have already determined the meaning of certain terms of the claims of the [] patent. You have been given a document reflecting those meanings. For a claim term for which I have not provided a definition, you should apply the ordinary meaning. You are to apply my definitions of these terms throughout this case. However, my interpretation of the language of the claims should not be taken as an indication that I have a view regarding issues such as infringement and invalidity. Those issues are yours to decide. I will provide you with more detailed instructions on the meaning of the claims before you retire to deliberate your verdict.]

A.4. Preliminary Instructions

OVERVIEW OF APPLICABLE LAW

[The court may want to consider giving preliminary instructions on the patent law applicable to the specific issues in the case. This could help focus the jury on the facts relevant to the issues it will have to decide. If this is done, the instructions intended to be given after the close of evidence could be adapted and given as preliminary instructions. This, of course, would not negate the need to give complete instructions at the close of evidence.]

A.5. Preliminary Instructions

OUTLINE OF TRIAL

The trial will now begin. First, each side may make an opening statement. An opening statement is not evidence. It is simply an outline to help you understand what that party expects the evidence will show.

The presentation of evidence will then begin. Witnesses will take the witness stand and the documents will be offered and admitted into evidence. There are two standards of proof that you will apply to the evidence, depending on the issue you are deciding. On some issues, you must decide whether something is more likely true than not. On other issues you must use a higher standard and decide whether it is highly probable that something is true.

[Patent holder] will present its evidence on its contention that [some] [the] claims of the [] patent have been [and continue to be] infringed by [alleged infringer] [and that the infringement has been [and continues to be] willful.] These witnesses will be questioned by [Patent holder]’s counsel in what is called direct examination. After the direct examination of a witness is completed, the opposing side has an opportunity to cross-examine the witness. Finally [patent holder]’s counsel has the opportunity to question the witness one more time in what is called redirect examination. To prove infringement of any claim, [patent holder] must persuade you that it is more likely than not that [alleged infringer] has infringed that claim. [To persuade you that any infringement was willful, [patent holder] must prove that it is highly probable that the infringement was willful.]

After [Patent holder] has presented its witnesses, [alleged infringer] will call its witnesses, who will also be examined and subject to cross-examination and redirect. [Alleged infringer] will present its evidence that the claims of the [] patent are invalid. To prove invalidity of any claim, [alleged infringer] must persuade you that it is highly probable that the claim is invalid. In addition to presenting its evidence of invalidity, [alleged infringer] will put on evidence responding to [patent holder]’s infringement [and willfulness] contention[s].

[Patent holder] will then return and will put on evidence responding to [alleged infringer]’s contention that the claims of the [] patent are invalid. [Patent holder] will also have the option to put on what is referred to as “rebuttal” evidence to any evidence offered by [alleged infringer] of non-infringement [or lack of willfulness].

Finally, [alleged infringer] will have the option to put on “rebuttal” evidence to any evidence offered by [patent holder] on the validity of [some] [the] claims of the [] patent.

[During the presentation of the evidence, the attorneys will be allowed brief opportunities to explain what they believe the evidence has shown or what they believe upcoming evidence will show. Such comments are not evidence and are being allowed solely for the purpose of helping you understand the evidence.]

Because the evidence is introduced piecemeal, you need to keep an open mind as the evidence comes in and wait for all the evidence before you make any decisions. In other words, you should keep an open mind throughout the entire trial.

[The parties may present the testimony of a witness by reading from his or her deposition transcript or playing a videotape of the witness’s deposition testimony. A deposition is the sworn testimony of a witness taken before trial and is entitled to the same consideration as if the witness had testified at trial.]

After the evidence has been presented, [the attorneys will make closing arguments and I will give you final instructions on the law that applies to the case] [I will give you final instructions on the law that applies to the case and the attorneys will make closing arguments]. Closing arguments are not evidence. After the [closing arguments and instructions] [instructions and closing arguments], you will then decide the case.

B.1. Summary of Contentions

SUMMARY OF CONTENTIONS

I will first give you a summary of each side's contentions in this case. I will then tell you what each side must prove to win on each of its contentions. As I previously told you, [patent holder] seeks money damages from [alleged infringer] for allegedly infringing the [] patent by [making,] [importing,] [using,] [selling] and [offering for sale] [products] [methods] that [patent holder] argues are covered by claims [] of the patent. These are the asserted claims of the [] patent. [Patent holder] also argues that [alleged infringer] has [actively induced infringement of these claims of the [] patent by others] [contributed to the infringement of these claims of the [] patent by others]. The [products] [methods] that are alleged to infringe are [list of accused products or methods].

[Alleged infringer] denies that it has infringed the asserted claims of the patent and argues that, in addition, claims [] are invalid. [Add other defenses if applicable.]

Your job is to decide whether the asserted claims of the [] patent have been infringed and whether any of the asserted claims of the [] patent are invalid. If you decide that any claim of the patent has been infringed and is not invalid, you will then need to decide any money damages to be awarded to [patent holder] to compensate it for the infringement. [You will also need to make a finding as to whether the infringement was willful. If you decide that any infringement was willful, that decision should not affect any damage award you make. I will take willfulness into account later.]

B.2. Claim Construction

2.1 INTERPRETATION OF CLAIMS

Before you decide whether [alleged infringer] has infringed the claim[s] of the patent or whether the claim[s] [is][are] invalid, you will need to understand the patent claims. As I mentioned at the beginning of the case, the patent claims are numbered sentences at the end of the patent that describes the boundaries of the patent’s protection. It is my job as judge to explain to you the meaning of any language in the claim[s] that needs interpretation.

I have interpreted the meaning of some of the language in the patent claims involved in this case. You must accept those interpretations as correct. My interpretation of the language should not be taken as an indication that I have a view regarding the issues of infringement and invalidity. The decisions regarding infringement and invalidity are yours to make.

[Court gives its claim interpretation. This instruction must be coordinated with instruction 3.5 “Means-Plus-Function Claims—Literal Infringement” if the claims at issue include means-plus-function limitations.]

Authorities

Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc., 517 U.S. 370, 384-391 (1996); *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*, 182 F.3d 1298, 1304-13 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *Cybor Corp. v. FAS Techs.*, 138 F.3d 1448 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (*en banc*); *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967, 977 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (*en banc*).

B.3 Infringement

3.1 INFRINGEMENT—BURDEN OF PROOF

I will now instruct you on the rules you must follow in deciding whether [patent holder] has proven that [alleged infringer] has infringed one or more of the asserted claims of the [] patent. To prove infringement of any claim, [patent holder] must persuade you that it is more likely than not that [alleged infringer] has infringed that claim.

Authorities

Warner-Lambert Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc., 418 F.3d 1326, 1341 n.15 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *Seal-Flex, Inc. v. Athletic Track and Court Constr.*, 172 F.3d 836, 842 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *Morton Int'l, Inc. v. Cardinal Chem. Co.*, 5 F.3d 1464, 1468-69 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

B.3. Infringement

3.2 DIRECT INFRINGEMENT

A patent's claims define what is covered by the patent. A [product] [method] directly infringes a patent if it is covered by at least one claim of the patent.

Deciding whether a claim has been directly infringed is a two-step process. The first step is to decide the meaning of the patent claim. I have already made this decision, [and I will instruct you later as to the meaning of the asserted patent claims] [and I have already instructed you as to the meaning of the asserted patent claims]. The second step is to decide whether [alleged direct infringer] has [made,] [used,] [sold,] [offered for sale] or [imported] within the United States a [product] [method] covered by a claim of the [] patent.² If it has, it infringes. You, the jury, make this decision.

[With one exception,] you must consider each of the asserted claims of the patent individually, and decide whether [alleged direct infringer]'s [product] [method] infringes that claim. [The one exception to considering claims individually concerns dependent claims. A dependent claim includes all of the requirements of a particular independent claim, plus additional requirements of its own. As a result, if you find that an independent claim is not infringed, you must also find that its dependent claims are not infringed. On the other hand, if you find that an independent claim has been infringed, you must still separately decide whether the additional requirements of its dependent claims have also been infringed.]

[You have heard evidence about both [patent holder]'s commercial [[product] [method]] and [alleged infringer]'s accused [[product] [method]]. However, in deciding the issue of infringement you may not compare [alleged infringer]'s accused [[product] [method]] to [patent holder]'s commercial [[product] [method]]. Rather, you must compare the [alleged infringer]'s accused [[product] [method]] to the claims of the [] patent when making your decision regarding infringement.]³

Whether or not [alleged infringer] knew its [product][method] infringed or even knew of the patent does not matter in determining direct infringement.

There are two ways in which a patent claim may be directly infringed. A claim may be “literally” infringed, or it may be infringed under the “doctrine of equivalents.” The following instructions will provide more detail on these two types of direct infringement. [You should note, however, that what are called “means-plus-function” requirements in a claim are subject to different rules for deciding direct infringement. These separate rules apply to claims []. I will describe these separate rules shortly.]

² Consistent with the policy of these instructions not to propose instructions on issues that arise only rarely, we have not proposed instructions on international infringement under sections 35 U.S.C. 271(f) and (g). If those issues arise, the reference in this instruction to infringement “within the United States” should be modified accordingly. See *Microsoft Corp. v. AT&T Corp.*, 550 U.S. 437 (2007); *Bayer AG v. Housey Pharms. Inc.*, 340 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

³ This instruction is appropriate in cases where the plaintiff sells a commercial product and contends that such product practices at least one of the asserted patent claims.

Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 271; *Warner-Jenkinson Co., Inc. v. Hilton Davis Chem. Co.*, 520 U.S. 17 (1997); *Cross Med. Prods., Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.*, 424 F.3d 1293, 1310-11 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *DeMarini Sports, Inc. v. Worth, Inc.*, 239 F.3d 1314, 1330-34 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Seal-Flex, Inc. v. Athletic Track and Court Constr.*, 172 F.3d 836, 842 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *Carroll Touch, Inc. v. Electro Mech. Sys., Inc.*, 15 F.3d 1573, 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

B.3. Infringement

3.3 LITERAL INFRINGEMENT

To decide whether [alleged infringer]’s [product] [method] literally infringes a claim of the [] patent, you must compare that [product] [method] with the patent claim and determine whether every requirement of the claim is included in that [product] [method]. If so, [alleged infringer]’s [product] [method] literally infringes that claim. If, however, [alleged infringer]’s [product] [method] does not have every requirement in the patent claim, [alleged infringer]’s [product] [method] does not literally infringe that claim. You must decide literal infringement for each asserted claim separately.

[If the patent claim uses the term “comprising,” that patent claim is to be understood as an open claim. An open claim is infringed as long as every requirement in the claim is present in [alleged infringer]’s [product] [method]. The fact that [alleged infringer]’s [product] [method] also includes other [parts] [steps] will not avoid infringement, as long as it has every requirement in the patent claim.]

[If the patent claim uses the term “consisting of,” that patent claim is to be understood as a closed claim. To infringe a closed claim, [alleged infringer]’s [product] [method] must have every requirement in the claim and no other [parts] [steps].]

[If the patent claim uses the term “consisting essentially of,” that patent claim is to be understood as a partially closed claim. A partially closed claim is infringed as long as every requirement in the claim is present in [alleged infringer]’s [product] [method]. The fact that [alleged infringer]’s [product] [method] also includes other [parts] [steps] will not avoid infringement so long as those [parts] [steps] do not materially affect the basic and novel properties of the invention. If [accused infringer]’s [product] [method] includes other [parts] [steps] that do change those basic and novel properties, it does not infringe.⁴]

[If [alleged infringer]’s [product] [method] does not itself include every requirement in the patent claim, [alleged infringer] cannot be liable for infringement merely because other parties supplied the missing elements, unless [accused infringer] directed or controlled the acts by those parties.] [Alleged infringer] does not direct or control someone else’s action merely because [alleged infringer] entered into a business relationship with that person. Instead, [alleged infringer] must specifically instruct or cause that other person to perform each step in an infringing manner, so that every step is attributable to [alleged infringer] as controlling party.

[If one party controls and makes use of a system that contains all the requirements of the claim, that party may be an infringer even though the parts of the system do not all operate in the same place or at the same time.]⁵

⁴ Generally, only one of the three preceding paragraphs will be appropriate, depending on the transition used in the claim; the others should be omitted. In cases in which more than one claim is at issue, and the claims use different transitions, more than one paragraph will be used.

⁵ The final sentence of this instruction is appropriate in cases involving system claims, but not method claims. *Centillion Data Sys., LLC v. Qwest Comm’n Int’l*, 631 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011).

Authorities

MicroStrategy Inc. v. Business Objects, S.A., 429 F.3d 1344, 1352-53 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *Netword, LLC v. Centraal Corp.*, 242 F.3d 1347, 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Cole v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 102 F.3d 524, 532 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Cross Med. Prods. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek*, 424 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *BMC Res., Inc. v. Paymentech, L.P.*, 498 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

B.3. Infringement

3.3a JOINT, LITERAL INFRINGEMENT

Direct infringement occurs where all steps of a claimed method are performed by or are attributable to a single party. Where more than one party is involved in practicing the steps, you must determine whether the acts of one are attributable to the other such that a single party is responsible for the infringement. There are two situations where there may be direct infringement if no single party performs all of the steps of a claimed process but more than one party performs every step of the process: (1) the parties have formed a joint enterprise or (2) one party directs or controls another party's performance of the claim steps.

To prove that the alleged infringers have formed a joint enterprise, [Patent holder] must prove four elements:

- (1) there was an agreement, either express or implied, between [alleged infringer A] and [alleged infringer B];
- (2) they shared a common purpose;
- (3) each had a financial interest in that purpose; and
- (4) each had a right of control in the enterprise.

To prove that [alleged infringer A] directed or controlled the acts of [alleged infringer B, etc.], [Patent holder] must prove either (i) that [alleged infringer A] instructed [alleged infringer B] to perform the claim step(s) or (ii) [alleged infringer B] performed the claim step(s) to receive a benefit from [alleged infringer A] and that [alleged infringer A] established how or when the claim step(s) were performed.

Authorities

Limelight Networks, Inc. v. Akamai Technologies, Inc., 797 F.3d 1020, 1022-24 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (en banc).

B.3. Infringement

3.3b MEANS-PLUS-FUNCTION CLAIMS—LITERAL INFRINGEMENT⁶

I will now describe the separate rules that apply to “means-plus-function” requirements that are used in some claims. Claims [] in the [] patent contain “means-plus-function” requirements. A means-plus-function requirement only covers the specific [structure] disclosed in a patent specification for performing the claimed function and the equivalents of those specific [structure] that perform the claimed function. A means-plus-function requirement does not cover all possible structures that could be used to perform the claimed function.

As an example, the term “means for processing data” might be understood to encompass a variety of different ways of making a calculation, including not only a computer or calculator but a pencil and paper or even the human brain. But because the phrase is a means-plus-function requirement, we interpret that phrase not to cover every possible means for processing data, but instead to cover the actual means disclosed in the patent for processing data and other means that are equivalent to it.

For purposes of this trial, I have interpreted each means-plus-function requirement for you and identified the structure in the patent specification that corresponds to these means-plus-function requirements. Specifically, I have determined that:

[X. [] is the structure that perform[s] the [] function identified in the means-plus-function requirement of claim [].]

[X. [] is the structure that perform[s] the [] function identified in the means-plus-function requirement of claim [].]

In deciding if [patent holder] has proven that [alleged infringer]’s [product] includes structure covered by a means-plus-function requirement, you must first decide whether the [product] has any structure that performs the function I just described to you. If not, the claim containing that means-plus-function requirement is not infringed.

If you find that the [alleged infringer]’s [accused product] does have structure that performs the claimed function, you must then determine whether that structure is the same as or equivalent to the structure I have identified in the specification. If they are the same or equivalent, the means-plus-function requirement is satisfied by that structure of the [accused product]. If all the other requirements of the claim are satisfied, the [accused product] infringes the claim.

⁶ If a claim at issue is a method claim with a limitation written in “step-plus-function” format, this instruction should be modified accordingly, for example, substituting “acts” for “structure.”

In order to prove that [a structure] in the [accused product] is equivalent to the structure in the [] patent, the [patent holder] must show that a person of ordinary skill in the field would have considered that the differences between the structure described in the [] patent and the structure in the [accused product] are not substantial. The [patent holder] must also show that the structure was available on the date the [] patent was granted.⁷

Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 112(6); *Frank's Casing Crew & Rental Tools, Inc. v. Weatherford Intern., Inc.*, 389 F.3d 1370, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Odetics, Inc. v. Storage Tech. Corp.*, 185 F.3d 1259, 1266 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *Chiuminatta Concrete Concepts, Inc. v. Cardinal Indus., Inc.*, 145 F.3d 1303, 1307 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *Micro Chem., Inc. v. Great Plains Chem. Co., Inc.*, 103 F.3d 1538, 1547 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Valmont Indus., Inc. v. Reinke Mfg. Co., Inc.*, 983 F.2d 1039, 1042 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

⁷ There is an important difference between what can be an equivalent under § 112(6) and what can be an equivalent under the doctrine of equivalents. An equivalent structure or act under § 112(6) cannot embrace technology developed after the issuance of the patent because the literal meaning of a claim is fixed upon its issuance. *Chiuminatta Concrete Concepts, Inc. v. Cardinal Indus., Inc.*, 145 F.3d 1303, 1310 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *Al-Site Corp. v. VSI Int'l, Inc.*, 174 F.3d 1308, 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Although new matter cannot be added to a patent application after it has been filed, current Federal Circuit law nevertheless uses the patent issuance date, as opposed to the effective filing date, to distinguish what constitutes an “after arising equivalent.” An after arising equivalent infringes, if at all, under the doctrine of equivalents and could infringe under the doctrine of equivalents without infringing literally under § 112(6). Furthermore, under § 112(6) the accused device must perform the identical function as recited in the claim element while the doctrine of equivalents may be satisfied when the function performed by the accused device is only substantially the same. *Al-Site*, 174 F.3d. at 1320-21.

B.3. Infringement

3.4 INFRINGEMENT UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS

If you decide that [alleged infringer]’s [product] [method] does not literally infringe an asserted patent claim, you must then decide whether that [product] [method] infringes the asserted claim under what is called the “doctrine of equivalents.”

Under the doctrine of equivalents, the [product] [method] infringes an asserted patent claim if it includes [parts] [steps] that are identical or equivalent to the requirements of the claim. If the [product] [method] is missing an identical or equivalent [part] [step] to even one requirement of the asserted patent claim, the [product] [method] cannot infringe the claim under the doctrine of equivalents. Thus, in making your decision under the doctrine of equivalents, you must look at each individual requirement of the asserted patent claim and decide whether the [product] [method] has either an identical or equivalent [part] [step] to that individual claim requirement.

A [part] [step] of a [product] [method] is equivalent to a requirement of an asserted claim if a person of ordinary skill in the field would think that the differences between the [part] [step] and the requirement were not substantial as of the time of the alleged infringement.

Changes in technique or improvements made possible by technology developed after the patent application is filed may still be equivalent for the purposes of the doctrine of equivalents if it still meets the other requirements of the doctrine of equivalents set forth in this instruction.

[One way to decide whether any difference between a requirement of an asserted claim and a [part] [step] of the [product] [method] is not substantial is to consider whether, as of the time of the alleged infringement, the [part] [step] of the [product] [method] performed substantially the same function, in substantially the same way, to achieve substantially the same result as the requirement in the patent claim.]

[In deciding whether any difference between a claim requirement and the [product] [method] is not substantial, you may consider whether, at the time of the alleged infringement, persons of ordinary skill in the field would have known of the interchangeability of the [part] [step] with the claimed requirement. The known interchangeability between the claim requirement and the [part] [step] of the [product] [method] is not necessary to find infringement under the doctrine of equivalents. However, known interchangeability may support a conclusion that the difference between the [part] [step] in the [product] [method] and the claim requirement is not substantial. The fact that a [part] [step] of the [product] [method] performs the same function as the claim requirement is not, by itself, sufficient to show known interchangeability.]

[You may not use the doctrine of equivalents to find infringement if you find that [alleged infringer]'s [product] [method] is the same as what was in the prior art before the application for the [] patent or what would have been obvious to persons of ordinary skill in the field in light of what was in the prior art. A patent holder may not obtain, under the doctrine of equivalents, protection that it could not have lawfully obtained from the Patent and Trademark Office.]⁸

[You may not use the doctrine of equivalents to find infringement if you find that the subject matter alleged to be equivalent to a requirement of the patent claim was described in the [] patent but not covered by any of its claims. The subject matter described but not claimed must be specific enough that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that it was present in the patent.]

Authorities

Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 535 U.S. 722 (2002); *Warner-Jenkinson Co., Inc. v. Hilton Davis Chem. Co.*, 520 U.S. 17 (1997); *Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Prods. Co.*, 339 U.S. 605, 609 (1950); *Abraxis Bioscience, Inc. v. Mayne Pharma (USA) Inc.*, 467 F.3d 1370, 1379-82 (Fed. Cir. 2006); *Pfizer, Inc. v. Teva Pharms., USA, Inc.*, 429 F.3d 1364, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *Johnston & Johnston Assoc. v. R.E. Service Co.*, 285 F.3d 1046 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (*en banc*); *Multiform Desiccants, Inc. v. Medzam, Ltd.*, 133 F.3d 1473, 1480 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *Dolly, Inc. v. Spalding & Evenflo Cos.*, 16 F.3d 394, 397 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

⁸ If this instruction is applicable in a given case, then the court should instruct the jury that if [alleged infringer] has offered evidence sufficient to show that the accused [product] [method] is in the prior art, the burden shifts to the [patent holder] to prove that what it attempts to cover under the doctrine of equivalents is not in the prior art or would not have been obvious from the prior art. See *Fiskares, Inc. v. Hunt Mfg. Co.*, 221 F.3d 1318, 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Ultra-Tex Surfaces, Inc. v. Hill Bros. Chem. Co.*, 204 F.3d 1360, 1364-66 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Streamfeeder, LLC v. Sure-Feed Systems, Inc.*, 175 F.3d 974, 981-84 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

B.3. Infringement

3.4a MEANS-PLUS-FUNCTION CLAIMS—INFRINGEMENT UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS

[No model instruction is provided since an instruction on this subject is necessarily case specific. However, a means-plus-function requirement can be met under the doctrine of equivalents if the function is not the same but is equivalent (*see, e.g., WMS Gaming Inc. v. Int'l Game Tech.*, 184 F.3d 1339, 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999) or the corresponding structure in the accused product is later developed technology. *See Chiuminatta Concrete Concepts, Inc. v. Cardinal Indus., Inc.*, 145 F.3d 1303, 1310 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *Al-Site Corp. v. VSI Int'l, Inc.*, 174 F.3d 1308, 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1999).]

B.3. Infringement

3.5 LIMITATIONS ON THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS

Because [patent holder] made certain claim changes or statements during the patent application process for the [] patent, the doctrine of equivalents analysis cannot be applied to the following requirements of the asserted claims:

[List requirements on a claim-by-claim basis]

Unless each of these requirements is literally present within the [alleged infringer]'s [product] [method], there can be no infringement of the claim.

Authorities

Honeywell Int'l Inc. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp., 370 F.3d 1131 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (en banc);
Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd., 344 F.3d (Fed. Cir. 2003) (en banc).

B.3. Infringement

3.6 CONTRIBUTORY INFRINGEMENT

[Patent holder] [also] argues that [alleged infringer] has contributed to infringement by another. Contributory infringement may arise when someone supplies something that is used to infringe one or more of the patent claims. As with direct infringement, you must determine contributory infringement on a claim-by-claim basis.

In order for there to be contributory infringement by [alleged infringer], someone other than [alleged infringer] must directly infringe a claim of the [] patent; if there is no direct infringement by anyone, there can be no contributory infringement.

If you find someone has directly infringed the [] patent, then contributory infringement exists if:

[Alleged infringer] supplied an important component of the infringing part of the [product] or [method];

The component is not a common component suitable for non-infringing use; and

[Alleged infringer] supplied the component with the knowledge of the [] patent and knowledge that the component was especially made or adapted for use in an infringing manner.

A “common component suitable for non-infringing use” is a component that has uses [other than as a component of the patented product][other than in the patented method], and those other uses are not occasional, farfetched, impractical, experimental, or hypothetical.

Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 271(c); *PharmaStem Therapeutics, Inc. v. ViaCell, Inc. et. al.*, 491 F.3d 1342, 1356-58 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *Aro Mfg. Co. v. Convertible Top Replacement Co.*, 377 U.S. 476 (1964); *DSU Med. Corp. v. JMS Co.*, 471 F.3d 1293, 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2006); *Mentor H/S, Inc. v. Med. Device Alliance, Inc.*, 244 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb, Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1464, 1469 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *Preemption Devices, Inc. v. Minn. Mining & Mfr. Co.*, 803 F.2d 1170, 1174 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

B.3. Infringement

3.7 INDUCING PATENT INFRINGEMENT

[Patent holder] argues that [alleged infringer] has actively induced another to infringe the [] patent. In order for the [alleged infringer] to have induced infringement, [alleged infringer] must have induced another to directly infringe a claim of the [] patent; if there is no direct infringement by anyone, there can be no induced infringement. As with direct infringement, you must determine induced infringement on a claim-by-claim basis.

In order to be liable for inducing infringement, [alleged infringer]⁹ must:

- (1) have intentionally taken action that actually induced direct infringement;
- (2) have been aware of the [] patent; and
- (3) have known that the acts it was causing would infringe the patent.

The [alleged infringer] may be considered to have known that the acts it was causing would infringe the [] patent if it subjectively believed there was a high probability that the direct infringer's product or method was patented and nevertheless deliberately took steps to avoid learning that fact, in other words, willfully blinded itself to the infringing nature of the direct infringer's acts.

Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 271(b); *Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Systems, Inc.*, 135 S.Ct. 1920, 1928-31 (2015); *Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. et. al. v. SEB S.A.*, 131 S.Ct. 2060, 2070-71 (2011).

⁹ [Alleged Infringer] in this instance refers to the alleged inducer infringer, not the alleged direct infringer.

B.3. Infringement

3.8 WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT

In this case, [patent holder] argues that [alleged infringer] willfully infringed the [patent holder]'s patent.

To prove willful infringement, [patent holder] must persuade you that the [alleged infringer] infringed a valid [and enforceable] claim of the [patent holder]'s patent. The requirements for proving such infringement were discussed in my prior instructions.

In addition, to prove willful infringement of a claim, the [patent holder] must persuade you that it is more likely true than not true that [alleged infringer] intentionally ignored or recklessly disregarded that claim. You must base your decision on [alleged infringer's] knowledge and actions at the time of infringement. Evidence that the [patent holder] had knowledge of the patent at the time of infringement by itself is not sufficient to show willfulness. Rather, to show willfulness, you must find that the [accused infringer] engaged in additional conduct evidencing deliberate or reckless disregard of [patent holder's] patent rights.

In deciding whether [alleged infringer] willfully infringed, you should consider all of the facts surrounding the infringement including: whether [alleged infringer] intentionally copied [patent holder's] patented technology in developing the accused product [method]; whether [alleged infringer] knew, or should have known, that its conduct involved an unreasonable risk of infringement; and whether [alleged infringer] had a reasonable belief that at the time of infringement that its products did not infringe the asserted patent [or that the patent was invalid].

[Although there was no obligation on [alleged infringer] to have obtained an opinion of counsel, you may consider whether [alleged infringer] relied on a legal opinion that was well-supported and believable and that advised [alleged infringer:] (1) that the [product] [method] did not infringe [patent holder]'s patent or (2) that the patent was invalid [or unenforceable].¹⁰

Authorities:

35 U.S.C. § 284; *Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.*, 579 U.S. ___, 136 S. Ct. 1923 (2016); 35 U.S.C. § 298.

¹⁰ This bracketed language should only be included if the alleged infringer relies on advice of counsel. There is no affirmative obligation to obtain opinion of counsel. 35 U.S.C. § 298; *Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.*, 579 U.S. ___, 136 S.Ct. 1923, 1935 (2016); *In re Seagate Technology, LLC*, 497 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (en banc).

B.4.1 Validity

4.1a INVALIDITY—BURDEN OF PROOF

I will now instruct you on the rules you must follow in deciding whether [alleged infringer] has proven that claims [] of the [] patent are invalid. Before discussing the specific rules, I want to remind you about the standard of proof that applies to this defense. To prove invalidity of any patent claim, [alleged infringer] must persuade you that it is highly probable that the claim is invalid.

[During this case, the [alleged infringer] has submitted prior art that was not considered by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) during the prosecution of the [] patent. The [alleged infringer] contends that such prior art invalidates certain claims of the [] patent. In deciding the issue of invalidity, you may take into account the fact that the prior art was not considered by the PTO when it issued the [] patent. Prior art that differs from the prior art considered by the PTO may carry more weight than the prior art that was considered and may make the [alleged infringer's] burden of showing that it is highly probable that a patent claim is invalid easier to sustain.

Authorities

Microsoft Corp. v. i4i LTD Partnership, 131 S.Ct. 2238, 2242, 2251, __ U.S. __ (2011); *Buildex, Inc. v. Kason Indus., Inc.*, 849 F.2d 1461, 1463 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

B.4.1 Validity

4.1b INVALIDITY—PERSPECTIVE OF ONE OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART

The question of invalidity of a patent claim is determined from the perspective of a person of ordinary skill in the art in the field of the asserted invention as of [the effective filing date of the patent(s)]. In deciding the level of ordinary skill, you should consider all the evidence introduced at trial, including:

- (1) the levels of education and experience of persons working in the field;
- (2) the types of problems encountered in the field; and
- (3) the sophistication of the technology.

[Patent holder] contends that the level of ordinary skill in the field was []. [Alleged infringer] contends that the level of ordinary skill in the field was [].

Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 103; *KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 421 (2007); *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 3 (1966).

B.4.2 Validity—Adequacy of Patent Specification

4.2a WRITTEN DESCRIPTION REQUIREMENT

A patent claim is invalid if the patent does not contain an adequate written description of the claimed invention. The purpose of this written description requirement is to demonstrate that the inventor was in possession of the invention at the time the application for the patent was filed, even though the claims may have been changed or new claims added since that time. The written description requirement is satisfied if a person of ordinary skill in the field reading the original patent application at the time it was filed would have recognized that the patent application described the invention as claimed, even though the description may not use the exact words found in the claim. A requirement in a claim need not be specifically disclosed in the patent application as originally filed if a person of ordinary skill would understand that the missing requirement is necessarily implied in the patent application as originally filed.

Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 112(1) and (2); *In Re Skvorecz*, 580 F.3d 1262, 1269 (Fed. Cir. 2009); *Kao Corp. v. Unilever U.S., Inc.*, 441 F.3d 963, 968 (Fed. Cir. 2006); *Chiron Corp. v. Genentech, Inc.*, 363 F.3d 1247 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Faulding, Inc.*, 230 F.3d 1320, 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Lampi Corp. v. Am. Power Prods., Inc.*, 228 F.3d 1365, 1377-78 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Gentry Gallery, Inc. v. Berkline Corp.*, 134 F.3d 1473, 1478-80 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Alton*, 76 F.3d 1168, 1172 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *University of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.*, 358 F.3d 916, 926-928 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

B.4.2 Validity—Adequacy of Patent Specification

4.2b ENABLEMENT

A patent claim is invalid if the patent at the time it was originally filed did not contain a description of the claimed invention that is sufficiently full and clear to enable a person of ordinary skill in the field at the time to make and use the full scope of the invention. This is known as the “enablement” requirement.

The patent may be enabling even though it does not expressly state some information if a person of ordinary skill in the field could make and use the invention without having to do excessive experimentation. In determining whether excessive experimentation is required, you may consider the following factors:

- the scope of the claimed invention;
- the amount of guidance presented in the patent;
- the amount of experimentation necessary;
- the time and cost of any necessary experimentation;
- how routine any necessary experimentation is in the field of [identify field];
- whether the patent discloses specific working examples of the claimed invention;
- the nature and predictability of the field; and
- the level of ordinary skill in the field of [identify field].

The question of whether a patent is enabling is judged as of the date the original application for the patent was first filed.¹¹

Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 112(1); *Sitrick v. Dreamworks, LLC*, 516 F.3d 993, 999 (Fed. Cir. 2008); *Auto. Techs. Int’l, Inc. v. BMW of N. Am., Inc.*, 501 F.3d 1274, 1285 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *AK Steel Corp. v. Sollac & Ugine*, 344 F.3d 1234, 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Union Pac. Resources Co. v. Chesapeake Energy Corp.*, 236 F.3d 684, 690-92 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Ajinomoto Co. v. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.*, 228 F.3d 1338, 1345-46 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

¹¹ Where a claim is the result of a continuation-in-part application and the priority date is disputed, this language will need to be revised to reflect the concept of effective filing date.

B.4.3 Validity—The Claims

4.3a1 ANTICIPATION¹²

A patent claim is invalid if the claimed invention is not new. For the claim to be invalid because it is not new, all of its requirements must have existed in a single device or method that predates the claimed invention, or must have been described in a single previous publication or patent that predates the claimed invention. In patent law, these previous devices, methods, publications or patents are called “prior art references.” If a patent claim is not new we say it is “anticipated” by a prior art reference.

The description in the written reference does not have to be in the same words as the claim, but all of the requirements of the claim must be there, either stated or necessarily implied, so that someone of ordinary skill in the field of [identify field] looking at that one reference would be able to make and use the claimed invention.

[In determining whether a single item of prior art anticipates a patent claim, you may consider not only what is expressly disclosed in that item of prior art but also what is inherently present or disclosed in it or inherently results from its use. Prior art inherently anticipates a patent claim if the missing requirement or feature would necessarily be present in the prior art.]

Here is a list of the ways that [alleged infringer] can show that a patent claim was not new [use those that apply to this case]:

[– if the claimed invention was already publicly known or publicly used by others in the United States before [insert date of conception unless at issue];]

[– if the claimed invention was already patented or described in a printed publication anywhere in the world before [insert date of conception unless at issue]. [A reference is a “printed publication” if it is accessible to those interested in the field, even if it is difficult to find.];]

[– if the claimed invention was already made by someone else in the United States before [insert date of conception unless in issue], if that other person had not abandoned the invention or kept it secret;]

[– if the claimed invention was already described in another issued U.S. patent or published U.S. patent application that was based on a patent application filed before [insert date of the patent holder’s application filing date] [or] [insert date of conception unless at issue];]

[– if [named inventor] did not invent the claimed invention but instead learned of the claimed invention from someone else;]

[– if the [patent holder] and [alleged infringer] dispute who is a first inventor, the person who first conceived of the claimed invention and first reduced it to practice is the first inventor. If one person conceived of the claimed invention first, but reduced to practice second, that person is the first inventor only if that person (a) began to reduce the claimed invention to practice before the other party conceived of it and (b) continued to work diligently to reduce it to practice. [A claimed invention is “reduced to practice” when it

¹² This Section 4.3a1 is inapplicable to any post-AIA claims, i.e., to any claimed invention having an effective filing date on or after March 16, 2013.

has been tested sufficiently to show that it will work for its intended purpose or when it is fully described in a patent application filed with the PTO].]

Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (c), (e), (f) and (g); *Flex-Rest, LLC v. Steelcase, Inc.*, 455 F.3d 1351, 1358-60 (Fed. Cir. 2006); *Invitrogen Corp. v. Biocrest Mfg., L.P.*, 424 F.3d 1374, 1379-82 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *Apotex U.S.A., Inc. v. Merck & Co.*, 254 F.3d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Mycogen Plant Science, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.*, 243 F.3d 1316, 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co.*, 227 F.3d 1361, 1367-70 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Singh v. Brake*, 222 F.3d 1362, 1366-70 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Pannu v. Iolab Corp.*, 155 F.3d 1344, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *Gambro Lundia AB v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.*, 110 F.3d 1573, 1576-78 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Lamb-Weston, Inc. v. McCain Foods, Ltd.*, 78 F.3d 540, 545 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *In re Bartfeld*, 925 F.2d 1450 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Ralston Purina Co. v. Far-Mar-Co, Inc.*, 772 F.2d 1570, 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *American Stock Exch., LLC v. Mopies*, 250 F. Supp. 2d 323 (S.D.N.Y. 2003); *In re Wyer*, 655 F.2d 221, 226 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

4.3a1a DETERMINING WHO IS THE FIRST INVENTOR

[The [patent holder] and [alleged infringer] dispute who is the first inventor. [Since it is in dispute, you must determine a date of conception for the [claimed invention] [and/or] [prior invention].

The person who first conceived of the claimed invention and first reduced it to practice is the first inventor. Conception is the mental part of an inventive act and is proven when the invention is shown in its complete form by drawings, disclosure to another or other forms of evidence presented at trial. [A claimed invention is “reduced to practice” when it has been tested sufficiently to show that it will work for its intended purpose or when it is fully described in a patent application filed with the PTO].] If one person conceived of the claimed invention first, but reduced to practice second, that person is the first inventor only if that person (a) began to reduce the claimed invention to practice before the other party conceived of it and (b) continued to work diligently to reduce it to practice.]

4.3a2 STATUTORY BARS

(For Patents Having an Effective Filing Date Before March 16, 2013)¹³

A patent claim is invalid if the patent application was not filed within the time required by law. This is called a “statutory bar.” For a patent claim to be invalid by a statutory bar, all of its requirements must have been present in one prior art reference dated more than one year before the patent application was filed. Here is a list of ways [alleged infringer] can show that the patentee lost the right to patent the claim(s): [choose those that apply]

[– if the claimed invention was already patented or described in a printed publication anywhere in the world before [insert date that is one year before effective filing date of patent application]. [A reference is a “printed publication” if it is accessible to those interested in the field, even if it is difficult to find.];]

[– if the claimed invention was already being used in the United States before [insert date that is one year before application filing date] and that use was not primarily an experimental use (a) controlled by the inventor, and (b) to test whether the invention worked for its intended purpose;]

[– if the claimed invention was already being commercially used by the inventor in the United States before [insert the date that is one year before effective filing date of patent application];]

[– if a device or method using the claimed invention was sold or offered for sale in the United States, and that claimed invention was ready for patenting, before [insert date that is one year before application filing date]. [The claimed invention is not being [sold] [or] [offered for sale] if the [patent holder] shows that the [sale] [or] [offer for sale] was primarily experimental.] [The claimed invention is ready for patenting if it was actually built, or if the inventor had prepared drawings or other descriptions of the claimed invention that were sufficiently detailed to enable a person of ordinary skill in the field to make and use the invention based on them.];]

[– if the [patent holder] had already obtained a patent on the claimed invention in a foreign country before filing the original U.S. application, and the foreign application was filed at least one year before the U.S. application.]

For a claim to be invalid because of a statutory bar, all of the claimed requirements must have been either (1) disclosed in a single prior art reference, (2) implicitly disclosed in a reference to one skilled in the field, or (3) must have been present in the reference, whether or not that was understood at the time. The disclosure in a reference does not have to be in the same words as the claim, but all the requirements must be there, either described in enough detail or necessarily implied, to enable someone of ordinary skill in the field of [identify field] looking at the reference to make and use the claimed invention.

¹³ This Section 4.3a2 is inapplicable to any post-AIA claims, *i.e.*, to any claimed invention having an effective filing date on or after March 16, 2013.

Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and (d); *Pfaff v. Wells Elec. Inc.*, 525 U.S. 55 (1998); *Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharms.*, 339 F.2d 1273 (Fed Cir. 2003); *Helifix Ltd. v. Blok-Lok, Ltd.*, 208 F.3d 1339, 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Abbot Labs. v. Geneva Pharms., Inc.*, 182 F.3d 1315, 1318 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *Finnigan Corp. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n*, 180 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *J.A. LaPorte, Inc. v. Norfolk Dredging Co.*, 787 F.2d 1577, 1581 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *In re Hall*, 781 F.2d 897, 898-99 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *D.L. Auld Co. v. Chroma Graphics Corp.*, 714 F.2d 1144, 1150 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Metallizing Eng'g Co. v. Kenyon Bearing & Auto Parts Co.*, 153 F.2d 516 (2d Cir. 1946); *Invitrogen Corp. v. Biocrest Mfg., L.P.*, 424 F.3d 1374, 1382-83 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

B.4.3 Validity—The Claims

4.3a3 ANTICIPATION

(For Patents Having an Effective Filing Date on or After March 16, 2013)

This instruction is currently under review by the Patent Instructions and Rules Committee. A pattern instruction is forthcoming.

B.4.3 Validity—The Claims

4.3b OBVIOUSNESS¹⁴—(Alternative 1)

Not all innovations are patentable. A patent claim is invalid if the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the field [*for any patent that claims priority to an application filed before March 16, 2013: at the time the claimed invention was made*][*for any patent that claims priority to an application filed on or after March 16, 2013: as of the effective filing date of the claimed invention*]. The court, however, is charged with the responsibility of making the determination as to whether a patent claim was obvious based upon your determination of several factual questions.

First, you must decide the level of ordinary skill in the field that someone would have had [*for any patent that claims priority to an application filed before March 16, 2013: at the time the claimed invention was made*][*for any patent that claims priority to an application filed on or after March 16, 2013: as of the effective filing date of the claimed invention*]. In deciding the level of ordinary skill, you should consider all the evidence introduced at trial, including:

- (1) the levels of education and experience of persons working in the field;
- (2) the types of problems encountered in the field; and
- (3) the sophistication of the technology.

[Patent holder] contends that the level of ordinary skill in the field was []. [Alleged infringer] contends that the level of ordinary skill in the field was [].

Second, you must decide the scope and content of the prior art. [Patent holder] and [alleged infringer] disagree as to whether [identify prior art reference(s)] should be included in the prior art you use to decide the validity of claims [] of the [] patent. In order to be considered as prior art to the [] patent, these references must be reasonably related to the claimed invention of that patent. A reference is reasonably related if it is in the same field as the claimed invention or is from another field to which a person of ordinary skill in the field would look to solve a known problem.

Third, you must decide what difference, if any, existed between the claimed invention and the prior art.

Finally, you must determine which, if any, of the following factors have been established by the evidence:

¹⁴ This instruction provides the jury with an instruction on the underlying factual questions it must answer to enable the court to make the ultimate legal determination of the obviousness question. The court, not the jury, should make the legal conclusion on the obviousness question based on underlying factual determinations made by the jury. *KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 427 (2007) (“The ultimate judgment of obviousness is a legal determination.”); *see Dippin’ Dots, Inc. v. Mosey*, 476 F.3d 1337, 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2007). It is anticipated that these factual issues will be presented to the jury as specifically as possible. For example, if the only dispute between the parties is whether a particular reference is with the “scope and content” of the prior art, that is the only *Graham* factor that should be presented to the jury. As another example, if the only factual dispute between the parties on the “difference between the prior art and the claimed invention” is whether a prior art reference discloses a particular claim limitation, that is the only issue that should be presented to the jury on that *Graham* factor. The introductory comment to the sample verdict form discusses further the functions of the judge and jury in determining obviousness.

- [(1) commercial success of a product due to the merits of the claimed invention][;]
- [(2) a long felt need for the solution provided by the claimed invention][;]
- [(3) unsuccessful attempts by others to find the solution provided by the claimed invention][;]
- [(4) copying of the claimed invention by others][;]
- [(5) unexpected and superior results from the claimed invention][;]
- [(6) acceptance by others of the claimed invention as shown by praise from others in the field or from the licensing of the claimed invention][;]
- [(7) other evidence tending to show nonobviousness][;]
- [(8) independent invention of the claimed invention by others before or at about the same time as the named inventor thought of it[;] and][;]
- [(9) other evidence tending to show obviousness][.]

Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 103; *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966); *KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 407 (2007); *Circuit Check v. QXQ Inc.*, 795 F.3d 1331, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2015); *Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.*, 234 F.3d 654 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Arkie Lures, Inc. v. Gene Larew Tackle, Inc.*, 119 F.3d 953, 957 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Specialty Composites v. Cabot Corp.*, 845 F.2d 981, 991 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *Windsurfing Int'l, Inc. v. AMF, Inc.*, 782 F.2d 995, 1000 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Pentec, Inc. v. Graphic Controls Corp.*, 776 F.2d 309, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1985). *See Novo Nordisk A/S v. Becton Dickinson & Co.*, 304 F.3d 1216, 1219-20 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Wang Labs. v. Toshiba Corp.*, 993 F.2d 858, 864 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Apotex, Inc.*, 501 F.3d 1254, 1256 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. Philip Morris Inc.*, 229 F.3d 1120, 1125 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *SIBIA Neurosciences, Inc. v. Cadus Pharm. Corp.*, 225 F.3d 1349, 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Ryko Mfg. Co. v. Nu-Star, Inc.*, 950 F.2d 714, 718-19 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

B.4.3 Validity—The Claims

4.3b OBVIOUSNESS¹⁵—(Alternative 2)

Not all innovations are patentable. A patent claim is invalid if the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the field [*for any patent that claims priority to an application filed before March 16, 2013: at the time the claimed invention was made*] [*for any patent that claims priority to an application filed on or after March 16, 2013: as of the effective filing date of the claimed invention*] [as of [insert date]]. This means that even if all of the requirements of the claim cannot be found in a single prior art reference that would anticipate the claim or constitute a statutory bar to that claim, a person of ordinary skill in the field of [identify field] who knew about all this prior art would have come up with the claimed invention.

The ultimate conclusion of whether a claim is obvious should be based upon your determination of several factual decisions.

First, you must decide the level of ordinary skill in the field that someone would have had [*for any patent that claims priority to an application filed before March 16, 2013: at the time the claimed invention was made*] [*for any patent that claims priority to an application filed on or after March 16, 2013: as of the effective filing date of the claimed invention*]. In deciding the level of ordinary skill, you should consider all the evidence introduced at trial, including:

- (1) the levels of education and experience of persons working in the field;
- (2) the types of problems encountered in the field; and
- (3) the sophistication of the technology.

[Patent holder] contends that the level of ordinary skill in the field was []. [Alleged infringer] contends that the level of ordinary skill in the field was [].

Second, you must decide the scope and content of the prior art. [Patent holder] and [alleged infringer] disagree as to whether [identify prior art reference(s)] should be included in the prior art you use to decide the validity of claims [] of the [] patent. In order to be considered as prior art to the [] patent, these references must be reasonably related to the claimed invention of that patent. A reference is reasonably related if it is in the same field as the claimed invention or is from another field to which a person of ordinary skill in the field would look to solve a known problem.

Third, you must decide what difference, if any, existed between the claimed invention and the prior art.

Finally, you should consider any of the following factors that you find have been shown by the evidence:

- [(1) commercial success of a product due to the merits of the claimed invention][:]

¹⁵ This instruction provides the jury with an instruction on how to analyze the obviousness question and reach a conclusion on it in the event that the Court decides to allow the jury to render an advisory verdict on the ultimate question of obviousness. However, the court, not the jury, should make the legal conclusion on the obviousness question based on underlying factual determinations made by the jury. *KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 427(2007) (“The ultimate judgment of obviousness is a legal determination.”); *see Dippin’ Dots, Inc. v. Mosey*, 476 F.3d 1337, 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2007). The introductory comment to the sample verdict form discusses further the functions of the judge and jury in determining obviousness.

- [(2) a long felt need for the solution provided by the claimed invention][;]
- [(3) unsuccessful attempts by others to find the solution provided by the claimed invention][;]
- [(4) copying of the claimed invention by others][;]
- [(5) unexpected and superior results from the claimed invention][;]
- [(6) acceptance by others of the claimed invention as shown by praise from others in the field or from the licensing of the claimed invention][;]
- [(7) other evidence tending to show nonobviousness][;]
- [(8) independent invention of the claimed invention by others before or at about the same time as the named inventor thought of it[;] and][;]
- [(9) other evidence tending to show obviousness][.]

[The presence of any of the [list factors 1-7 as appropriate] may be considered by you as an indication that the claimed invention would not have been obvious [at the time the claimed invention was made] [as of the effective filing date of the claimed invention], and the presence of the [list factors 8-10 as appropriate] may be considered by you as an indication that the claimed invention would have been obvious at such time. Although you should consider any evidence of these factors, the relevance and importance of any of them to your decision on whether the claimed invention would have been obvious is up to you.]

A patent claim composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was independently known in the prior art. In evaluating whether such a claim would have been obvious, you may consider whether [the alleged infringer] has identified a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the field to combine the elements or concepts from the prior art in the same way as in the claimed invention. There is no single way to define the line between true inventiveness on the one hand (which is patentable) and the application of common sense and ordinary skill to solve a problem on the other hand (which is not patentable). For example, market forces or other design incentives may be what produced a change, rather than true inventiveness. You may consider whether an inventor would look to the prior art to help solve the particular problem at hand. You may consider whether the change was merely the predictable result of using prior art elements according to their known functions, or whether it was the result of true inventiveness. You may also consider whether there is some teaching or suggestion in the prior art to make the modification or combination of elements claimed in the patent. Also, you may consider whether the innovation applies a known technique that had been used to improve a similar device or method in a similar way. You may also consider whether the claimed invention would have been obvious to try, meaning that the claimed innovation was one of a relatively small number of possible approaches to the problem with a reasonable expectation of success by those skilled in the art. However, you must be careful not to determine obviousness using the benefit of hindsight; many true inventions might seem obvious after the fact. You should put yourself in the position of a person of ordinary skill in the field [at the time the claimed invention was made] [as of the effective filing date of the claimed invention] and you should not consider what is known today or what is learned from the teaching of the patent.

Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 103; *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966); *KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 407 (2007); *Circuit Check v. QXQ Inc.*, 795 F.3d 1331, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2015); *Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.*, 234 F.3d 654 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Arkie Lures, Inc. v. Gene Larew Tackle, Inc.*, 119 F.3d 953, 957 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Specialty Composites v. Cabot Corp.*, 845 F.2d 981, 991 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *Windsurfing Int'l, Inc. v. AMF, Inc.*, 782 F.2d 995, 1000 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Pentec, Inc. v. Graphic Controls Corp.*, 776 F.2d 309, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1985). *See* *Novo Nordisk A/S v. Becton Dickinson & Co.*, 304 F.3d 1216, 1219-20 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Wang Labs. v. Toshiba Corp.*, 993 F.2d 858, 864 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Apotex, Inc.*, 501 F.3d 1254, 1256 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. Philip Morris Inc.*, 229 F.3d 1120, 1125 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *SIBIA Neurosciences, Inc. v. Cadus Pharm. Corp.*, 225 F.3d 1349, 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Ryko Mfg. Co. v. Nu-Star, Inc.*, 950 F.2d 714, 718-19 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

B.4.3 Validity—The Claims

4.3c INVENTORSHIP

This instruction is currently under review by the Patent Instructions and Rules Committee. A pattern instruction is forthcoming.

B.5. Patent Damages

5.1 DAMAGES—BURDEN OF PROOF

I will instruct you about the measure of damages. By instructing you on damages, I am not suggesting which party should win on any issue. If you find that [alleged infringer] infringed any valid claim of the [] patent, you must then determine the amount of money damages to be awarded to [patent holder] to compensate it for the infringement.

The amount of those damages must be adequate to compensate [patent holder] for the infringement. A damages award should put the patent holder in approximately the financial position it would have been in had the infringement not occurred, but in no event may the damages award be less than a reasonable royalty. You should keep in mind that the damages you award are meant to compensate the patent holder and not to punish an infringer.

[Patent holder] has the burden to persuade you of the amount of its damages. You should award only those damages that [patent holder] more likely than not suffered. While [patent holder] is not required to prove its damages with mathematical precision, it must prove them with reasonable certainty. [Patent holder] is not entitled to damages that are remote or speculative.

Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 284; *Dow Chem. Co. v. Mee Indus., Inc.*, 341 F.3d 1370, 1381-82 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Grain Processing Corp. v. American Maize-Prod. Co.*, 185 F.3d 1341, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *Maxwell v. J. Baker, Inc.*, 86 F.3d 1098, 1108-09 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Rite-Hite Corp. v. Kelley Co.*, 56 F.3d 1538, 1544-45 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc); *Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.*, 580 F.3d 1301, 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2009); *Ericsson v. D-Link Sys., Inc.*, 773 F.3d 1201, 1230-32 (Fed. Cir. 2014).

B.5. Patent Damages

5.2 LOST PROFITS—GENERALLY

In this case, [patent holder] seeks to recover lost profits for some of [alleged infringer]’s sales of [infringing product], and a reasonable royalty on the rest of [alleged infringer]’s sales.

To recover lost profits for infringing sales, [patent holder] must show that but for the infringement there is a reasonable probability that it would have made sales that [alleged infringer] made of the infringing product. [Patent holder] must show the share of [alleged infringer]’s sales that it would have made if the infringing product had not been on the market.

Authorities

Aro Mfg. Co. v. Convertible Top Co., 377 U.S. 476, 502-07 (1964); *Beauregard v. Mega Sys., LLC*, 350 F.3d 1327, 1345-46 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Central Soya Co. v. George A. Hormel & Co.*, 723 F.2d 1573, 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Lam, Inc. v. Johns-Manville Corp.*, 718 F.2d 1056, 1065 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Versata Software, Inc. v. SAP America, Inc.*, 717 F.3d 1255, 1265 (Fed. Cir. 2013); *Presidio Components, Inc. v. American Technical Ceramics Corp.*, 702 F.3d 1351, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *Calico Brand, Inc. v. Ameritek Imps., Inc.*, 527 Fed. Appx. 987, 996 (Fed. Cir. 2013).

B.5. Patent Damages

5.3 LOST PROFITS—FACTORS TO CONSIDER

[Patent holder] is entitled to lost profits if it proves all of the following:

- (1) that there was a demand for the patented [product] [method] [product produced by the method];
- (2) that there were no acceptable non-infringing substitutes for the [product] [method] for which [patent holder] seeks lost profits, or, if there were, the number of sales made by [alleged infringer] that [patent holder] would have made despite the availability of any acceptable non-infringing substitutes;
- (3) that [patent holder] had the manufacturing and marketing capacity to make any infringing sales actually made by the infringer and for which [patent holder] seeks an award of lost profits; and
- (4) the amount of profit that [patent holder] would have made if [alleged infringer] had not infringed.

Authorities

Versata Software, Inc. v. SAP America, Inc., 717 F.3d 1255, 1264 (Fed. Cir. 2013); *Presidio Components, Inc. v. American Technical Ceramics Corp.*, 702 F.3d 1351, 1360-61 (Fed. Cir. 2012).

B.5. Patent Damages

5.3a LOST PROFITS—MARKET SHARE

One way [patent holder] may prove the number of sales it would have made if the infringement had not happened is to prove its share of the relevant market excluding infringing products. You may award [patent holder] a share of profits equal to that market share.

In deciding [patent holder]'s market share, you must decide which products are in [patent holder]'s market. Products are in the same market if they are sufficiently similar to compete against each other. Two products are sufficiently similar if one does not have a significantly higher price than or possess characteristics significantly different than the other.

Authorities

Micro Chem., Inc. v. Lextron, Inc., 318 F.3d 1119, 1124 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Crystal Semiconductor Corp. v. Tritech Microelectronics Int'l, Inc.*, 246 F.3d 1336, 1354-55 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *State Indus., Inc. v. Mor-Flo Indus., Inc.*, 883 F.2d 1573, 1580 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

B.5. Patent Damages

5.3b LOST PROFITS—NON-INFRINGEMENT SUBSTITUTE

An acceptable non-infringing substitute must include the advantages of the patented invention that were important to the actual buyers of the infringing product. A non-infringing substitute may be one that involved the modification of the infringing product to avoid infringement or the removal of the patented feature from the product altogether. To be an acceptable substitute, however, the substitute must have been available during the period when the infringing product was sold. A substitute may be considered available as a substitute even if it was not on sale during the infringement period, if, during that period, a competitor or [accused infringer] had all the necessary equipment, materials, know-how, and experience to design and manufacture a non-infringing substitute and sell it to its customers. If some of [patent holder]’s customers would have been just as likely to purchase a non-infringing acceptable product as to purchase the [patent holder]’s product, then [patent holder] has not shown that but for [alleged infringer]’s sales, it would have made the sales that [alleged infringer] made. Even if you find that [accused infringer’s] infringing sales and [patent holder’s] patented products were the only ones with the advantages of the patented invention, [patent holder] is nevertheless required to prove that it, in fact, would have made the [accused infringer]’s infringing sales.

Authorities

Presidio Components, Inc. v. Am. Tech. Ceramics Corp., 702 F.3d 1351, 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *Panduit Corp. v. Stahl Bros. Fibre Works*, 575 F.2d 1152, 1162 (6th Cir. 1978); *Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prods. Co.*, 185 F.3d 1341, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

B.5. Patent Damages

5.4 LOST PROFITS—COLLATERAL SALES

In this case, [patent holder] is seeking profits from sales of [x], which it contends it would have sold along with [y]. These products are called collateral products.

To recover lost profits on sales of such collateral products [patent holder] must prove two things. First, that it is more likely than not that [patent holder] would have sold the collateral products but for the infringement. Second, a collateral product and the patented product together must be analogous to components of a single assembly or parts of a complete machine, or they must constitute a functional unit.

Authorities

Rite-Hite Corp. v. Kelley Co., 56 F.3d 1538, 1550 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc); *State Indus., Inc. v. Mor-Flo Indus., Inc.*, 883 F.2d 1573, 1580 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *Panduit Corp. v. Stahl Bros. Fibre Works, Inc.*, 575 F.2d 1152, 1157-58 (6th Cir. 1978).

B.5. Patent Damages

5.5 LOST PROFITS—PRICE EROSION

[Patent holder] can recover additional damages if it can show to a reasonable probability that, if there had been no infringement, [patent holder] would have been able to charge higher prices for some of its products. In that case, you may also award as additional damages the amount represented by the difference between the amount of profits that [patent holder] would have made by selling its product at the higher price and the amount of profits [patent holder] actually made by selling its product at the lower price that [patent holder] charged for its product. This type of damage is referred to as price erosion damage.

If you find that [patent holder] suffered price erosion, you may also use the higher price in determining [patent holder]'s lost profits from sales lost because of the infringement. In calculating a patentee's total losses from price erosion, you must take into account any drop in sales that would have resulted from a higher price.

You may also award as damages the amount of any increase in costs of [patent holder], such as additional marketing costs, caused by competition from the infringing product.

Authorities

Ericsson, Inc. v. Harris Corp., 352 F.3d 1369, 1377-79 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Vulcan Eng'g Co. v. FATA Aluminum, Inc.*, 278 F.3d 1366, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Crystal Semiconductor Corp. v. Tritech Microelectronics Int'l, Inc.*, 246 F.3d 1336, 1357-58 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Minco, Inc. v. Combustion Eng'g, Inc.*, 95 F.3d 1109, 1120 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *BIC Leisure Prods., Inc. v. Windsurfing Int'l, Inc.*, 1 F.3d 1214, 1220 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *Kalman v. Berlyn Corp.*, 914 F.2d 1473, 1485 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *Wechsler v. Macke Int. Trade, Inc.*, 486 F. 3d 1286, 1293-94 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

B.5. Patent Damages

5.6 REASONABLE ROYALTY—ENTITLEMENT

If [patent holder] has not proved its claim for lost profits, or has proved its claim for lost profits for only a portion of the infringing sales, then [patent holder] should be awarded a reasonable royalty for all infringing sales for which it has not been awarded lost profits damages.

Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 284; *Crystal Semiconductor Corp. v. Tritech Microelectronics Int’l, Inc.*, 246 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Fromson v. Western Litho Plate & Supply Co.*, 853 F.2d 1568, 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (overruled on other grounds); *Minco, Inc. v. Combustion Eng’g, Inc.*, 95 F.3d 1109, 1119-20 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.*, 79 F.3d 1572, 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Rite-Hite Corp. v. Kelley Co.*, 56 F.3d 1538, 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc).

5.7 REASONABLE ROYALTY—DEFINITION

A royalty is a payment made to a patent holder in exchange for the right to make, use or sell the claimed invention. This right is called a “license.” A reasonable royalty is the payment for the license that would have resulted from a hypothetical negotiation between the patent holder and the alleged infringer taking place at the time when the infringing activity first began. In considering the nature of this negotiation, you must assume that both parties would have acted reasonably and would have entered into a license agreement. You must also assume that both parties believed the patent was valid and infringed. Your role is to determine what the result of that negotiation would have been. The test for damages is what royalty would have resulted from the hypothetical negotiation and not simply what either party would have preferred.

A royalty can be calculated in several different ways and it is for you to determine which way is the most appropriate based on the evidence you have heard. You should consider all the facts known and available to the parties at the time the infringement began. Some of the factors you may consider in making your determination are:

- (1) The value that the claimed invention contributes to [the accused product].
- (2) The value that factors other than the claimed invention contribute to [the accused product].
- (3) Comparable license agreements, such as those covering the use of the claimed invention or similar technology.

One way to calculate a royalty is to determine what is called an “ongoing royalty.” To calculate an ongoing royalty, you must first determine the “base,” that is, the product on which the alleged infringer is to pay. You then need to multiply the revenue the defendant obtained from that base by the “rate” or percentage that you find would have resulted from the hypothetical negotiation. For example, if the patent covers a nail, and the nail sells for \$1, and the licensee sold 200 nails, the base revenue would be \$200. If the rate you find would have resulted from the hypothetical negotiation is 1%, then the royalty would be \$2, or the rate of 0.01 times the base revenue of \$200. By contrast, if you find the rate to be 5%, the royalty would be \$10, or the rate of 0.05 times the base revenue of \$200. These numbers are only examples, and are not intended to suggest the appropriate royalty rate.

Instead of a percentage royalty, you may decide that the appropriate royalty that would have resulted from a hypothetical negotiation is a fixed number of dollars per unit sold. If you do, the royalty would be that fixed number of dollars times the number of units sold.

If the patent covers only part of the product that [alleged infringer] sells, then the base would normally be only that feature or component. For example, if you find that for a \$100 car, the patented feature is the tires which sell for \$5, the base revenue would be \$5.

[However, in a circumstance in which the patented feature is the reason customers buy the whole product, the base revenue may be the value of the whole product.]¹⁶

¹⁶ No model instruction is offered to cover the circumstances, if any, under which the entire market value can be considered by the jury in determining a reasonable royalty if the patented feature is not the reason for customer demand. A case-specific instruction will need to be drafted, if consideration of the entire market value is shown to be appropriate.

[In this case the [] patent covers only one component of the product that [alleged infringer] uses or sells. It is [patent holder]’s burden to demonstrate what value that component has added to the desirability of the product as a whole and to separate the value of the patented contribution from the value of other parts of the product that are not attributable to the patented invention.]

[In this case, [patent holder] [accused infringer] has introduced evidence of licenses between [licensees] and [licensors]. The royalty rate in one or more of those licenses may be considered if it helps to establish the value that is attributable to the patented invention as distinct from the value of other features of [alleged infringer’s] product.]¹⁷

The ultimate combination of royalty base and royalty rate must reflect the value attributable to the infringing features of the product, and no more. When the accused infringing products have both patented and unpatented features, measuring this value requires you to identify and award only the value of the patented features.

Another way to calculate a royalty is to determine a one-time lump sum payment that the alleged infringer would have paid at the time of the hypothetical negotiation for a license covering all sales of the licensed product, both past and future. This differs from payment of an ongoing royalty because, with an ongoing royalty, the licensee pays based on the revenue of actual licensed products it sells. When a one-time lump sum is paid, the alleged infringer pays a single price for a license covering both past and future infringing sales.

It is up to you, based on the evidence, to decide what type of royalty is appropriate in this case for the life of the patent.

Authorities

Garretson v. Clark, 111 U.S. 120 (1884); *Ericsson v. D-Link Sys., Inc.*, 773 F.3d 1201, 1226 (Fed. Cir. 2014); *VirnetX, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, 767 F.3d 1308, 1326-34 (Fed. Cir. 2014); *LaserDynamics, Inc. v. Quanta Computer, Inc.*, 694 F.3d 51, 67-68 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *Lucent v. Gateway*, 580 F.3d 1301, 1336-39 (Fed. Cir. 2009); *Golight, Inc., v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 355 F.3d 1327, 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Maxwell v. Baker, Inc.*, 86 F.3d 1098, 1108-10 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.*, 79 F.3d 1572, 1579-81 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Rite-Hite Corp. v. Kelley Co.*, 56 F.3d 1538, 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc); *Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. United States Plywood Corp.*, 318 F. Supp. 1116, 1120 (S.D.N.Y. 1970); *ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.*, 594 F.3d 860, 869 (Fed. Cir. 2010).

¹⁷ The court should apply the normal rules of admissibility of evidence. This instruction is intended to be used if one party introduces evidence of prior license agreements as support for a reasonable royalty and the patent covers only one component of the product.

B.5. Patent Damages

5.8 REASONABLE ROYALTY—MULTIPLE PATENTS

If you find that [alleged infringer] infringed more than one patent, even by a single infringing act, then you may award separate royalties to [patent holder] for each patent that was infringed. You also may consider the number of patent licenses that are needed for the allegedly infringing product and the effect on the hypothetical negotiation of having to pay a royalty for each of those licenses.

Authorities

Stickle v. Heublein, Inc., 716 F.2d 1550, 1561 n.8 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Integra Lifesciences I, Ltd. v. Merck KGaA*, 331 F.3d 860, 871 (Fed. Cir. 2003), *reversed on other ground*, *Merck KGaA v. Integra Lifesciences I, Ltd.*, 545 U.S. 193 (2005); *Verizon Servs. Corp. v. Vonage Holdings Corp.*, 503 F.3d 1295, 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

B.5. Patent Damages

5.9 DATE OF COMMENCEMENT—PRODUCTS¹⁸

Damages that [patent holder] may be awarded by you commence on the date that [alleged infringer] has both infringed and been notified of the [] patent: [use those that apply to this case]

[[Patent holder] and [alleged infringer] agree that date was [insert date];]

[Since [patent holder] sells a product that includes the claimed invention but has not marked that product with the patent number, you must determine the date that [alleged infringer] received actual written notice of the [] patent and the specific product alleged to infringe;]

[Since [patent holder] [marks the product] or [does not sell a product covered by the patent], then damages begin without the requirement for actual notice under the following circumstances:

If the [] patent was granted before the infringing activity began, damages should be calculated as of the date you determine that the infringement began; or

If the [] patent was granted after the infringing activity began as determined by you, damages should be calculated as of [date patent issued].]

Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 287; *Crystal Semiconductor Corp. v. Tritech Microelectronics Int'l, Inc.*, 246 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Nike Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores*, 138 F.3d 1437, 1443-44 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *Maxwell v. Baker, Inc.*, 86 F.3d 1098, 1111-12 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *American Med. Sys. v. Medical Eng'g Corp.*, 6 F.3d 1523, 1534 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *Devices for Med., Inc. v. Boehl*, 822 F.2d 1062, 1066 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

¹⁸ This instruction may be used when the claim is an apparatus or product claim and [alleged infringer] is a direct infringer. Different rules may apply if the claim is a method claim or [alleged infringer] is an inducer or contributory infringer.

B.5. Patent Damages

5.10 REASONABLE ROYALTY—COMMITMENT TO LICENSE ON REASONABLE AND NONDISCRIMINATORY TERMS

In this case, by participating in a standard-setting organization, [patent holder] has promised to license its patents to all willing licensees on reasonable and nondiscriminatory terms. [Insert details of promise here if more specific]. You must take that promise into account in determining the reasonable royalty.

When a technology is incorporated into an industry standard, it is typically chosen from among different options. Once a standard is adopted, the technology is not necessarily used by other companies because it is the best option; the technology is used because its use is necessary to comply with the standard. The royalty you award should reflect the value of [patent holder]’s technological contribution, not the value of its widespread adoption due to standardization. In other words, you may not consider the success of the standard itself in determining a reasonable royalty for the patent(s)-in-suit.

In addition, the value of the patented feature must be apportioned from the value of any unpatented features included in the standard.

Authorities

Ericsson v. D-Link Sys., Inc., 773 F.3d 1201, 1230-32 (Fed. Cir. 2014).

B.5. Patent Damages

5.11 CALCULATING DAMAGES IN CASES OF INDUCEMENT OR CONTRIBUTORY INFRINGEMENT

In order to recover damages for induced infringement, [patent holder] must either prove that the [accused product] necessarily infringes the [patent in suit] or prove acts of direct infringement by others that were induced by [accused infringer]. Because the amount of damages for induced infringement is limited by the number of instances of direct infringement, [patent holder] must further prove the number of direct acts of infringement of the [patent in suit], for example, by showing individual acts of direct infringement or by showing that a particular class of [products] [uses] directly infringes.

In order to recover damages for contributory infringement, [patent holder] must either prove that the [accused product] necessarily infringes the [patent in suit] or prove acts of direct infringement by others to which [accused infringer] made a substantial contribution. Because the amount of damages for contributory infringement is limited by the number of instances of direct infringement, [patent holder] must further prove the number of direct acts of infringement of the [patent in suit], for example, either by showing individual acts of direct infringement or by showing that a particular class of [products] [uses] directly infringes.

Authorities

Dynacore Holdings Corp. v. U.S. Philips Corp., 363 F.3d 1263 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Medical, Inc.*, 576 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2009).

GLOSSARY

Some of the terms in this glossary will be defined in more detail in the instructions you are given. The definitions in the instructions must be followed and must control your deliberations.

[Add any technical terms from the art involved that may be used during trial and have agreed-upon definitions and delete any of the following terms which may not be applicable in a particular case.]

Abstract: A brief summary of the technical disclosure in a patent to enable the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office and the public to determine quickly the nature and gist of the technical disclosure in the patent.

Amendment: A patent applicant's change to one or more claims or to the specification either in response to an office action taken by a Patent Examiner or independently by the patent applicant during the patent application examination process.

Anticipation: A situation in which a claimed invention describes an earlier invention and, therefore, is not considered new and is not entitled to be patented.

Assignment: A transfer of patent rights to another called an "assignee" who upon transfer becomes the owner of the rights assigned.

Claim: Each claim of a patent is a concise, formal definition of an invention and appears at the end of the specification in a separately numbered paragraph. In concept, a patent claim marks the boundaries of the patent in the same way that a legal description in a deed specifies the boundaries of land, i.e. similar to a land owner who can prevent others from trespassing on the bounded property, the inventor can prevent others from using what is claimed. Claims may be independent or dependent. An independent claim stands alone. A dependent claim does not stand alone and refers to one or more other claims. A dependent claim incorporates whatever the other referenced claim or claims say.

Conception: The complete mental part of the inventive act which must be capable of proof, as by drawings, disclosure to another, etc.

Continuation Application: A patent application filed during the examination process of an earlier application which has the same disclosure as the original application and does not include anything which would constitute new matter if inserted in the original application.

Continuation-In-Part (C-I-P) Application: A patent application filed during the application process of an earlier application which repeats some or all of the earlier application and adds matter not disclosed in the earlier application to support the addition of new patent claims.

Drawings: The drawings are visual representations of the claimed invention contained in a patent application and issued patent, and usually include several figures illustrating various aspects of the claimed invention.

Elements: The required parts of a device or the required steps of a method. A device or method infringes a patent if it contains each and every requirement of a patent claim.

Embodiment: A product or method that contains the claimed invention.

Enablement: A description of the invention that is sufficient to enable persons skilled in the field of the invention to make and use the invention. The specification of the patent must contain such an enabling description.

Examination: Procedure before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office whereby a Patent Examiner reviews the filed patent application to determine if the claimed invention is patentable.

Filing Date: Date a patent application, with all the required sections, has been submitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Infringement: Violation of a patent occurring when someone makes, uses or sells a patented invention, without permission of the patent holder, within the United States during the term of the patent. Infringement may be direct, by inducement, or contributory. Direct infringement is making, using or selling the patented invention without permission. Inducing infringement is intentionally causing another to directly infringe a patent. Contributory infringement is offering to sell or selling an item that is an important component of the invention, so that the buyer directly infringes the patent. To be a contributory infringer one must know that the part being offered or sold is designed specifically for infringing the patented invention and is not a common component suitable for non-infringing uses.

Limitation: A required part of an invention set forth in a patent claim. A limitation is a requirement of the invention. The word “limitation” is often used interchangeably with the word “requirement.”

Nonobviousness: One of the requirements for securing a patent. To be valid, the subject matter of the invention must not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention at the time of the earlier of the filing date of the patent application or the date of invention.

Office Action: A written communication from the Patent Examiner to the patent applicant in the course of the application examination process.

Patent: A patent is an exclusive right granted by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to an inventor to prevent others from making, using, offering to sell, or selling an invention within the United States, or from importing it into the United States, during the term of the patent. When the patent expires, the right to make, use or sell the invention is dedicated to the public. The patent has three parts, which are a specification, drawings and claims. The patent is granted after examination by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office of a patent application filed by the inventor which has these parts, and this examination is called the prosecution history.

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO): An administrative branch of the U.S. Department of Commerce that is charged with overseeing and implementing the federal laws of patents and trademarks. It is responsible for examining all patent applications and issuing all patents in the United States.

Prior Art: Previously known subject matter in the field of a claimed invention for which a patent is being sought. It includes issued patents, publications, and knowledge deemed to be publicly available such as trade skills, trade practices and the like.

Prosecution History: The prosecution history is the complete written record of the proceedings in the PTO from the initial application to the issued patent. The prosecution history includes the office actions taken by the PTO and the amendments to the patent application filed by the applicant during the examination process.

Reads On: A patent claim “reads on” a device or method when each required part (requirement) of the claim is found in the device or method.

Reduction to Practice: The invention is “reduced to practice” when it is sufficiently developed to show that it would work for its intended purpose.

Reexamination: A process in which a patent is reexamined by the PTO to determine whether one or more of the claims are patentable with respect to submitted prior art which may consist only of prior patents or printed publications. An “ex parte” reexamination is initiated by the patent holder or a third party, but does not include the further participation of any third party. An “inter partes” reexamination is initiated by a third party who continues to participate in the proceedings.

Requirement: A required part or step of an invention set forth in a patent claim. The word “requirement” is often used interchangeably with the word “limitation.”

Royalty: A royalty is a payment made to the owner of a patent by a non-owner in exchange for rights to make, use or sell the claimed invention.

Specification: The specification is a required part of a patent application and an issued patent. It is a written description of the invention and of the manner and process of making and using the claimed invention.

COMMENTS REGARDING USE OF SAMPLE VERDICT FORM

The following sample verdict form is provided for guidance in preparing an appropriate special verdict form tailored for your specific case. The sample is for a hypothetical case in which the patent holder alleges direct and indirect infringement of a single claim of one patent and seeks a combination of lost profits and a reasonable royalty for the allegedly infringing sales. The alleged infringer raises a number of invalidity defenses. No issue is raised, however, as to the conception date of the claimed invention. The issue of willfulness has not been bifurcated.

The form requires the jury to make specific findings on the bases for the affirmative defenses of “anticipation” and “statutory bars.”

The form also requires the jury to make factual determinations underlying a conclusion of “obviousness” or “nonobviousness.” It is expected that these issues will be presented to the jury as specifically as possible. For example, if the only dispute between the parties is whether a particular reference is within the “scope and content” of the prior art, that is the only question on that *Graham* factor that should be presented to the jury. As another example, if the only factual dispute between the parties on the “differences between the prior art and the claimed invention” is whether a prior art reference discloses a particular claim limitation, that is the only issue that should be presented to the jury on that *Graham* factor.

This form also provides two alternative section 11’s on obviousness. One asks the jury to only answer the underlying factual questions. The other permits the jury to give an advisory verdict on the ultimate question of obviousness. It must be remembered, however, that the ultimate question of obviousness is a question of law for the court. *KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 427 (2007) (“The ultimate judgment of obviousness is a legal determination.”); see *In re Adler*, 723 F.3d 1322, 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013). Both alternatives are designed to focus the parties and the court on the factual disputes on the obviousness question. For example, the form requires that each party specify exactly what it contends constitutes the scope and content of the prior art. Although trial courts have often permitted the jury to reach the final conclusion of obviousness without specifying its underlying factual determinations, such an approach is not recommended. The verdict form should require the jury’s finding on each factual issue so that the trial judge may make the final determination on the obviousness question. As Judge Michel pointed out in his dissent in *McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.*, 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001):

The issue presented in this appeal derives from the common, if unfortunate, practice of allowing the jury to render a general verdict on the ultimate legal conclusion of obviousness without requiring express findings on the underlying factual issues through a special verdict or special interrogatories under Fed. R. Civ. P. 49. Nevertheless, since the inception of our court, we have recognized that a court may submit this legal question to a jury and that doing so by general verdict rather than by Rule 49 is not ordinarily an abuse of discretion. We have emphasized, however, that there is no question that the judge must remain the ultimate arbiter on the question of obviousness.

Id. at 1358 (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). The fact that the verdict form allows the jury to give an advisory conclusion on obviousness should not be construed as suggesting that the court defer to the jury’s ultimate determination on obviousness. The law is clear that the ultimate question is a legal one for the court.

C.3. Appendix

SAMPLE VERDICT FORM

When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please follow the directions provided throughout the form. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in detail in the Jury Instructions. Please refer to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below.

We, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them under the instructions of this court as our verdict in this case.

FINDINGS ON INFRINGEMENT CLAIMS

(The questions regarding infringement should be answered regardless of your findings with respect to the validity or invalidity of the patent.)

A. Direct Infringement

1. Has Patent Holder proven that it is more likely than not that every requirement of claim 1 of its patent is included in Alleged Infringer's accused product?

Yes _____ No _____

If your answer to question 1 is "yes," go to question 3. If your answer to question 1 is "no," go to question 2.

B. Infringement Under the Doctrine of Equivalents

2. Has Patent Holder proven that it is more likely than not that the accused product includes parts that are identical or equivalent to every requirement of claim 1 of Patent Holder's patent? In other words, for any requirement that is not literally found in the Alleged Infringer's accused product, does the accused product have an equivalent part to that requirement?

Yes _____ No _____

C. Contributory Infringement

3. Has Patent Holder proven that it is more likely than not: (i) that Direct Infringer infringed claim 1 of Patent Holder's patent; (ii) that Alleged Infringer supplied an important component of the infringing part of the product; (iii) that the component was not a common component suitable for non-infringing use; and (iv) that Alleged Infringer supplied the component with knowledge of the patent and knowledge that the component was especially made or adapted for use in an infringing manner?

Yes _____ No _____

D. Inducing Infringement

4. Has Patent Holder proven that it is more likely than not: (i) that Direct Infringer infringed claim 1 of Patent Holder's patent; (ii) that Alleged Infringer took action that actually induced that infringement by Direct Infringer; and (iii) that Alleged Infringer was aware of the patent and believed that its actions would encourage infringement of a valid patent, or alternatively that it was willfully blind as to whether its actions would encourage infringement of the patent?

Yes _____ No _____

E. Willful Infringement

- 5b. Has the Patent Holder proven that it is more likely than not that the Alleged Infringer actually knew, intentionally ignored, or recklessly disregarded that its actions constituted infringement?

FINDINGS ON INVALIDITY DEFENSES

(The questions regarding invalidity should be answered regardless of your findings with respect to infringement.)

A. Written Description Requirement

6. Has Alleged Infringer proven that it is highly probable that the specification of the Patent Holder's patent does not contain an adequate written description of the claimed invention?

Yes _____ No _____

B. Enablement

7. Has Alleged Infringer proven that it is highly probable that the specification of the Patent Holder's patent does not contain a description of the claimed invention that is sufficiently full and clear to enable persons of ordinary skill in the field to make and use the invention?

Yes _____ No _____

C. Best Mode

8. Has Alleged Infringer proven that it is highly probable that the patent does not disclose what the inventor believed was the best way to carry out the claimed invention at the time the patent application was filed?

Yes _____ No _____

D. Anticipation

9. Has Alleged Infringer proven that it is highly probable that claim 1 of Patent Holder's patent was "anticipated," or, in other words, not new?

Yes _____ No _____

[If the answer is "yes," check any reason below that is applicable:

_____ The claimed invention was already publicly known or publicly used by others in the United States before the date of conception of the claimed invention.

- _____ The claimed invention was already patented or described in a printed publication anywhere in the world before the date of conception.
- _____ The claimed invention was already made by someone else in the United States before the date of conception and that other person had not abandoned the invention or kept it secret.
- _____ The claimed invention was already described in another issued U.S. patent or published U.S. patent application that was based on a patent application filed before the date of conception.
- _____ The named inventor did not invent the claimed invention but instead learned of the claimed invention from someone else.
- _____ The named inventor was not the first inventor of the claimed invention.]

E. Statutory Bar

10. Has Alleged Infringer proven that it is highly probable that claim 1 of Patent Holder's patent was not filed within the time required by law?

Yes _____ No _____

If the answer is "yes," check any reason below that is applicable:

- _____ The claimed invention was already patented or described in a printed publication anywhere in the world at least one year before the filing date of the patent application.
- _____ The claimed invention was already being openly used in the United States at least one year before the filing date of the patent application and that use was not primarily an experimental use to test whether the invention worked for its intended purpose which was controlled by the inventor.
- _____ A device or method using the claimed invention was sold or offered for sale in the United States and the claimed invention was ready for patenting at least one year before the filing date of the patent application and that offer or sale was not primarily for experimental purposes to test whether the invention worked for its intended purpose and which was controlled by the inventor.
- _____ Patent Holder had already obtained a patent on the claimed invention in a foreign country before the original U.S. application, and the foreign application was filed at least one year before the U.S. application.

F. Obviousness

[Alternative 1—Jury decides underlying factual issues only]

11. The ultimate legal conclusion on the obviousness question will be made by the court. However, in order for the court to do so, you must answer the following preliminary factual questions:
- a. What was the level of ordinary skill in the field that someone would have had at the time the claimed invention was made? (check the applicable answer)

_____ set forth Alleged Infringer's contention, e.g., an individual with at least 3 years of experience in both furniture design and manufacture]

_____ [set forth Patent Holder's contention, e.g., anyone who has worked in the field of furniture design or manufacture for at least two years]

_____ [other, specify: _____]

- b. What was the scope and content of the prior art at the time of the claimed invention? (check the applicable answer)

_____ [set forth what the Alleged Infringer has offered as the invalidating prior art, e.g., '123 patent on fixed sitting device with four legs, general knowledge in field of industrial design that a horizontal surface may be held parallel to the ground using three legs and common knowledge that a person can easily move an object weighing under 25 pounds]

_____ [set forth what the Patent Holder asserts was within the scope and content of the prior art, e.g., '123 patent on fixed sitting device with four legs]

_____ [other, specify: _____]

- c. What difference, if any, existed between the claimed invention and the prior art at the time of the claimed invention?

_____ [set forth the Alleged Infringer's contention as to the difference, e.g., no difference between scope of invention and what is known in prior art]

_____ [set forth the Patent Holder's contention as to the difference, e.g., only 3 legs on a sitting device and portability]

_____ [other, specify: _____]

- d. Which of the following factors has been established by the evidence with respect to the claimed invention: (check those that apply)[verdict form should list only those factors for which a *prima facie* showing has been made]:

_____ commercial success of a product due to the merits of the claimed invention

_____ a long felt need for the solution that is provided by the claimed invention

_____ unsuccessful attempts by others to find the solution that is provided by the claimed invention

_____ copying of the claimed invention by others

_____ unexpected and superior results from the claimed invention

_____ acceptance by others of the claimed invention as shown by praise from others in the field or from the licensing of the claimed invention

_____ independent invention of the claimed invention by others before or at about the same time as the named inventor thought of it

_____ [other, factor(s) indicating obviousness or nonobviousness—describe the factor(s): _____]

11. The ultimate conclusion that must be reached on the obviousness question is whether Alleged Infringer has proven that it is highly probable that the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the field at the time the patent application was filed. In order to properly reach a conclusion the following preliminary questions must be answered:

- a. What was the level of ordinary skill in the field that someone would have had at the time the claimed invention was made? (check the applicable answer)

_____ [set forth Alleged Infringer's contention, e.g., an individual with at least 3 years of experience in both furniture design and manufacture]

_____ [set forth Patent Holder's contention, e.g., anyone who has worked in the field of furniture design or manufacture for at least two years]

_____ [other, specify: _____]

- b. Was [disputed reference] within the scope and content of the prior art at the time of the claimed invention? (check only if reference was within the scope and content of the prior art)

_____ [set forth the prior art reference [alleged infringer] has offered as prior art that the [patent holder] disputes as being in the scope and content of the prior art. If there is more than one reference in dispute, each disputed reference should be listed separately.]

- c. What difference, if any, existed between the claimed invention and the prior art at the time of the claimed invention?

_____ [set forth the Alleged Infringer's contention as to the difference, e.g., no difference between scope of invention and what is known in prior art]

_____ [set forth the Patent Holder's contention as to the difference, e.g., only 3 legs on a sitting device and portability]

_____ [other, specify: _____]

- d. Which of the following factors has been established by the evidence with respect to the claimed invention: (check those that apply)[verdict form should list only those factors for which a *prima facie* showing has been made]

_____ commercial success of a product due to the merits of the claimed invention

_____ a long felt need for the solution that is provided by the claimed invention

_____ unsuccessful attempts by others to find the solution that is provided by the claimed invention

_____ copying of the claimed invention by others

_____ unexpected and superior results from the claimed invention

_____ acceptance by others of the claimed invention as shown by praise from others in the field or from the licensing of the claimed invention

_____ independent invention of the claimed invention by others before or at about the same time as the named inventor thought of it

_____ [other factor(s) indicating obviousness or nonobviousness—describe the factor(s):
_____]

After consideration of the answers to the preliminary questions above, do you find that the Alleged Infringer has proven that it is highly probable that the claim of Patent Holder's patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the field at the time the patent application was filed?

Yes _____ No _____

G. Inventorship

12. Has Alleged Infringer proven that it is highly probable that Patent Holder's patent fails to meet the requirement to name all actual inventors and only the actual inventors?

Yes _____ No _____

FINDINGS ON DAMAGES (IF APPLICABLE)

If you answered question 1, 2, 3 or 4 "yes" and questions 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 "no," proceed to answer the remaining questions. If you did not so answer, do not answer the remaining questions and proceed to check and sign the verdict form.

13. What lost profits, if any, did Patent Holder show it more likely than not suffered as a result of sales that it would with reasonable probability have made but for Alleged Infringer's infringement?

\$ _____

14. For those infringing sales for which Patent Holder has not proved its entitlement to lost profits, what has it proved it is entitled to as a reasonable royalty:

- a) on-going royalty payment of (1) \$ [per unit sold] or _____ % of \$ _____ in total sales; or
- b) one-time payment of \$ _____ for the life of the patent.

You have now reached the end of the verdict form and should review it to ensure it accurately reflects your unanimous determinations. The Presiding Juror should then sign and date the verdict form in the spaces below and notify the Courtroom Deputy that you have reached a verdict. The Presiding Juror should retain possession of the verdict form and bring it when the jury is brought back into the courtroom.

Date:

By: _____
Presiding Juror