



## **LegalMetric Federal Circuit Report**

### **Patent Cases**

**July 1995 through February 2017**

This report contains confidential and proprietary information of LegalMetric, Inc. Use of this information by anyone other than the purchaser or, if the purchaser is a law firm, the purchaser's client, or disclosure of this information to persons other than the purchaser or, if the purchaser is a law firm, the purchaser's client, without the consent of LegalMetric, Inc. is prohibited.


The information contained in this report is obtained from the official docket records of the federal courts. No attempt has been made to correct that data. For example, cases may be misclassified in the official docket records. In addition, cases are classified only by the primary cause of action. Cases having multiple causes of action are analyzed only under the primary cause of action identified on the official court docket.

LegalMetric, Inc. is not a law firm, does not provide legal advice, and is not engaged in the practice of law. No attorney-client relationship exists between LegalMetric, Inc. and any user of its products. LegalMetric provides statistical and analytical information to anyone who desires to purchase that information. Any purchaser of LegalMetric products who wants legal advice should hire an attorney.

## Introduction

This report covers the Federal Circuit patent cases for which there are written decisions (whether precedential or non-precedential) from July 1995 through February 2017. The decisions included are those available directly from the court's website and older decisions from the Georgetown University website.

In this report, the basic unit of analysis is the ruling. A single decided case may have a number of rulings. For example, the Federal Circuit in a single case may address a number of distinct claim construction issues. If the issues are treated separately in the Federal Circuit opinion, they are treated separately in this report. Similarly, a single case may have numerous distinct issues, such as attorney's fees, validity and infringement. For example, a single case may provide separate rulings that go into the calculation of some of the affirmance rates for the different issues illustrated. (An affirmance rate in this report is the number of rulings affirming the lower tribunal on the issue, divided by the total number of rulings on the issue, expressed as a percentage.)




## Overview

This report is divided into three main parts: (1) an analysis of the Federal Circuit rulings by legal issue; (2) an analysis by judge, and (3) the supporting data. The legal issues section includes sub-sections on attorney's fees, claim construction, damages, exceptional case, inequitable conduct, infringement, injunctions, and validity. Where the number of rulings is suitably large, the analysis includes figures broken out by judge and/or technology.

Affirmance rates and reversal rates are provided in the various sections. The court frequently vacates and remands without affirming or reversing, so the affirmance and reversal rates in general do not add up to 100%. The court is not consistent in its use of the term "reverse". For this reason, it is believed that the affirmance rates provide a more accurate measure of the likelihood of prevailing (and conversely, losing) on a particular issue on appeal.

### Affirmance and Reversal Rates, Various Issues



## PTO v. District Court Review


The chart below compares the affirmance rates for appeals from the district courts with those rates for appeals from various PTO proceedings from 2016 to date. Of particular interest, the affirmance rates for the district courts and for IPR proceedings are very similar where the patent(s) were found valid below, and where the patent(s) were found invalid below. The affirmance rate on claim construction decisions from district courts and IPR proceedings were similar to each other, but not as close as the overall validity appeal figures. The results for all such decisions are shown in the table below.

		Total				
		All Validity	Anticipation Affirmance Rate	Obviousness Affirmance Rate	Claim Construction Affirmance Rate	35 USC 101 Affirmance Rate
	<b>Invalid Below</b>	100.0				
<b>CBM</b>	<b>Claim Construction</b>	100.0				
	<b>Invalid Below</b>	81.8	100.0	100.0		100.0
	<b>Valid Below</b>	50.0		100.0		0.0
<b>District Court</b>	<b>Claim Construction</b>	74.7				
	<b>Invalid Below</b>	78.6	37.5	100.0		87.0
	<b>Valid Below</b>	78.9	45.5	85.7		100.0
<b>Ex Parte Reexam</b>	<b>Claim Construction</b>	50.0				
	<b>Invalid Below</b>	60.0	60.0	50.0		
<b>Examiner Appeal</b>	<b>Claim Construction</b>	100.0				
	<b>Invalid Below</b>	80.0	50.0	76.2		100.0
<b>Inter Partes Reexam</b>	<b>Claim Construction</b>	80.0				
	<b>Invalid Below</b>	90.5	90.9	91.3		
	<b>Valid Below</b>	71.4		66.7		
<b>Interference</b>	<b>Claim Construction</b>	75.0				
	<b>Invalid Below</b>	57.1		40.0		
	<b>Valid Below</b>	66.7				
<b>IPR</b>	<b>Claim Construction</b>	73.5				
	<b>Invalid Below</b>	80.9	72.0	76.7		
	<b>Valid Below</b>	72.0	62.5	78.6		

## Section I. Legal Issues

### A. Attorney's Fees

The number of attorney's fees rulings and the affirmance rates for those rulings for each year from 1995 are shown in the chart below.



	Affirmance Rate	No. of Rulings	Reversal Rate
<b>Total</b>	60.9	207	13.5
<b>1995</b>	50.0	2	0.0
<b>1996</b>	50.0	8	0.0
<b>1997</b>	100.0	5	0.0
<b>1998</b>	75.0	4	25.0
<b>1999</b>	80.0	5	0.0
<b>2000</b>	83.3	12	8.3
<b>2001</b>	88.9	9	0.0
<b>2002</b>	71.4	7	0.0
<b>2003</b>	25.0	8	62.5
<b>2004</b>	77.8	9	22.2
<b>2005</b>	50.0	18	22.2
<b>2006</b>	76.9	13	0.0
<b>2007</b>	57.1	7	14.3
<b>2008</b>	66.7	12	0.0
<b>2009</b>	55.6	9	22.2
<b>2010</b>	33.3	9	33.3

	<b>Affirmance Rate</b>	<b>No. of Rulings</b>	<b>Reversal Rate</b>
<b>2011</b>	40.0	5	40.0
<b>2012</b>	75.0	4	0.0
<b>2013</b>	41.7	12	16.7
<b>2014</b>	60.0	15	6.7
<b>2015</b>	38.9	18	22.2
<b>2016</b>	71.4	14	0.0
<b>2017</b>	100.0	2	0.0


**Awarded or Denied Below:** The number of decisions and affirmance rates as a function of whether attorney's fees were awarded or denied below are shown in the following table.

		<b>Total</b>		
		<b>Affirmance Rate</b>	<b>Number of Rulings</b>	<b>Reversal Rate</b>
<b>Total</b>		60.9	207	13.5
<b>Awarded/Granted Below</b>	<b>Total</b>	43.7	103	20.2
	<b>1995</b>	50.0	2	0.0
	<b>1996</b>	0.0	2	0.0
	<b>1997</b>	100.0	1	0.0
	<b>1998</b>	0.0	1	100.0
	<b>1999</b>	100.0	2	0.0
	<b>2000</b>	80.0	5	20.0
	<b>2001</b>	100.0	3	0.0
	<b>2002</b>	0.0	1	0.0
	<b>2003</b>	25.0	8	62.5
	<b>2004</b>	50.0	2	50.0
	<b>2005</b>	27.3	11	27.3
	<b>2006</b>	50.0	6	0.0
	<b>2007</b>	0.0	1	100.0
	<b>2008</b>	50.0	8	0.0
	<b>2009</b>	50.0	6	16.7
<b>2010</b>	14.3	7	42.9	
<b>2011</b>	50.0	4	50.0	
<b>2012</b>	66.7	3	0.0	
<b>2013</b>	37.5	8	12.5	


		<b>Total</b>		
		<b>Affirmance Rate</b>	<b>Number of Rulings</b>	<b>Reversal Rate</b>
<b>Awarded/Granted Below</b>	<b>2014</b>	70.0	10	0.0
	<b>2015</b>	16.7	6	33.3
	<b>2016</b>	0.0	4	0.0
	<b>2017</b>	100.0	2	0.0
<b>Not Awarded/Denied Below</b>	<b>Total</b>	79.6	98	6.2
	<b>1996</b>	60.0	5	0.0
	<b>1997</b>	100.0	4	0.0
	<b>1998</b>	100.0	3	0.0
	<b>1999</b>	66.7	3	0.0
	<b>2000</b>	85.7	7	0.0
	<b>2001</b>	83.3	6	0.0
	<b>2002</b>	83.3	6	0.0
	<b>2004</b>	85.7	7	14.3
	<b>2005</b>	85.7	7	14.3
	<b>2006</b>	100.0	7	0.0
	<b>2007</b>	100.0	4	0.0
	<b>2008</b>	100.0	3	0.0
	<b>2009</b>	66.7	3	33.3
	<b>2010</b>	100.0	2	0.0
	<b>2011</b>	0.0	1	0.0
	<b>2012</b>	100.0	1	0.0
	<b>2013</b>	50.0	4	25.0
	<b>2014</b>	33.3	3	0.0
	<b>2015</b>	50.0	12	16.7
<b>2016</b>	100.0	10	0.0	
<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>	50.0	6	16.7
	<b>1996</b>	100.0	1	0.0
	<b>2007</b>	0.0	2	0.0
	<b>2008</b>	100.0	1	0.0
	<b>2014</b>	50.0	2	50.0

The affirmance rates for the various judges on this issue are shown in the chart below, followed by the number of rulings for each judge. Note that a single ruling in a case typically has three judges associated with it.

## Attorney Fee Affirmance Rates, by Judge




## Attorney Fee Rulings, by Judge






The number of opinions on attorney's fees, by judge, is shown below.

### Number of Opinions on Attorney Fees



### Number of Dissents on Attorney Fees



## A. Attorney Fees

<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Case Name</u>	<u>Judges</u>	<u>Issue Type</u>	<u>Issue Subtype</u>	<u>Issue Outcome</u>	<u>Lower Decision Type</u>
95-1085	Unisplay v. American Electronic	Clevenger, Lourie, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
94-1450	Imazio v. Greenhouses	Lourie, Mayer, Rich	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
94-1109	National Presto v. West Bend	Lourie, Newman, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
93-1275	Exxon Chemical v. Lubrizol	Clevenger, Plager	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated	Order on Motion
93-1185	Baldwin Hardware v. Franksu Enterprise	Newman, Plager, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
93-1185	Baldwin Hardware v. Franksu Enterprise	Newman, Plager, Rader	Attorney's Fees	28usc1927	Affirmed	Order on Motion
93-1185	Baldwin Hardware v. Franksu Enterprise	Newman, Plager, Rader	Attorney's Fees	Appeal	NA	Order on Motion
94-1498	Jurgens v. CBK	Clevenger, Mayer	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
95-1058	Sensonics v. Aerosonic	Bennett, Bryson, Newman	Attorney's Fees	285	Remanded	Bench Trial
95-1292	Maxwell v. Baker, Inc.	Lourie, Schall, Skelton	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated	Order on Motion
95-1083	Seal-Flex, Inc. v. Athletic Track	Bryson, Newman, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
96-1308	Serrano v. Telular Corp.	Clevenger, Lourie, Mayer	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
96-1468	Laitram Corp. v. NEC Corporation	Lourie, Michel, Plager	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
96-1408	Motorola v. Interdigital	Archer, Plager, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
96-1508	B.Braun Med. Inc. v. Abbot Lab & NP Med	Clevenger, Michel, Plager	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
96-1416	Virginia v. Mac	Archer, Lourie, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
96-1255	Multiform v. Medzam	Clevenger, Newman, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
97-1076	Gentry v. Berkline	Friedman, Lourie, Rich	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
97-1512	Celeritas v. Rockwell	Lourie, Mayer, Michel	Attorney's Fees	285	Reversed	Order on Motion
97-1399	Hunter Douglas v. Harmonic Design	Bryson, Clevenger, Gajarsa	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion

97-1432	Seal-Flex v. Athletic Track & Court Construction	Bryson, Newman, Rader	Attorney's Fees	Discovery	Affirmed	Order on Motion
98-1076	Rodime PLC v. Seagate Technology	Friedman, Lourie, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
98-1448	Ohio Cellular Products v. Adams USA	Michel, Plager	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
98-1533	Odetics v. Storage Technology	Clevenger, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
98-1512	Brasseler v. Stryker	Clevenger, Lourie, Plager	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated	Order on Motion
97-1313	Seiko Epson v. Nu-Kote International	Bryson, Newman, Plager	Attorney's Fees	Sanction	Affirmed/Modified	Order on Motion
99-1316	Automated Business Companies v. NEC America	Bryson, Michel, Plager	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
98-1527	Speedplay v. Bebop	Bryson, Gajarsa, Skelton	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
98-1527	Speedplay v. Bebop	Bryson, Gajarsa, Skelton	Attorney's Fees	Discovery	Affirmed	Order on Motion
99-1224	Zodiac Pool Care v. Hoffinger Industries	Bryson, Gajarsa, Skelton	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
99-1466	Hoffman-La Roche v. Invamed	Friedman, Gajarsa, Mayer	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
99-1064	Embrex v. Service Engineering	Clevenger, Lourie, Rader	Attorney's Fees	Contract	Affirmed	Order on Motion
99-1064	Embrex v. Service Engineering	Clevenger, Lourie, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
99-1347	Tate Access Floors, Inc., et al. v. Maxcess Techno	Lourie, Michel, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
99-1581	Prima Tek II v. A-Roo	Clevenger, Gajarsa, Mayer	Attorney's Fees	285	Reversed	Order on Motion
99-1557	Ruiz v. A.B. Chance	Michel, Newman, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
99-1202	Stryker v. Davol	Mayer, Newman, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
99-1202	Stryker v. Davol	Mayer, Newman, Schall	Attorney's Fees	Contempt	Affirmed	Contempt Hearing
00-1053	Union Pacific Resources v. Chesapeake Energy	Lourie, Michel, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
00-1260	Biovail v. Andrx Pharmaceuticals	Clevenger, Gajarsa, Newman	Attorney's Fees	Appeal	NA	NA

99-1532	Mentor v. Medical Device Alliance	Lourie, Mayer, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
99-1523	Electro Scientific v. General Scanning	Michel, Rader, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
00-1526	Door-Master v. Yorktowne	Gajarsa, Linn, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
99-1569	Viskase v. American National Can	Lourie, Newman, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
00-1545	Schaefer Fan v. J&D Mfg.	Rader, Schall	Attorney's Fees	Contempt		Affirmed	Contempt Hearing
00-1194	Brasseler v. Stryker Sales	Clevenger, Gajarsa, Plager	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
00-1233	Superior Fireplace v. Majestic Products	Linn, Mayer	Attorney's Fees	285		Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
00-1468	APTIX Corp., et al. v. Quickturn Design Systems, I	Linn, Rader	Attorney's Fees	Litigation Misconduct		Affirmed	Order on Motion
00-1533	Vulcan Engineering v. Fata Aluminium	Lourie, Newman	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
01-1173	Pickholtz v. Rainbow Technologies	Dyk, Lourie, Mayer	Attorney's Fees	Discovery		Affirmed	Order on Motion
01-1173	Pickholtz v. Rainbow Technologies	Dyk, Lourie, Mayer	Attorney's Fees	Inherent Powers		Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
01-1217	Fantasy Sports Properties v. Sportsline.com	Friedman, Lourie, Newman	Attorney's Fees	Rule 11		Affirmed	Order on Motion
01-1268	Transclean v. Bridgewood Services	Clevenger, Lourie, Newman	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
01-1373	Vanguard Research, Inc. v. Peat, Inc.	Clevenger, Linn, Newman	Attorney's Fees	Vexatious Litigation		Vacated	Order on Motion
02-1001	Union Carbide Chemicals & Plastics Technology	Dyk, Prost	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
01-1449	Rambus v. Infineon Technologies	Bryson, Prost, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285		Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
02-1184	Waner v. Ford Motor Co.	Archer, Michel	Attorney's Fees	285		Reversed	Order on Motion
03-1012	Waymark Corporation, et al. v. Porta Systems Corpo	Dyk, Newman, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285		Reversed	Order on Motion
03-1012	Waymark Corporation, et al. v. Porta Systems Corpo	Dyk, Newman, Rader	Attorney's Fees	1927		Reversed	Order on Motion
02-1516	McNeil-PPC, Inc. v. L. Perrigo Company, et al.	Archer, Lourie, Michel	Attorney's Fees	285		Reversed	Order on Motion
03-1067	Forest Laboratories, Inc. et al. v. Tokyo Tanabe C	Dyk, Lourie, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285		Reversed	Order on Motion

02-1501	Phonometrics, Inc., et al. v. Economy Inns of Amer	Michel, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
02-1501	Phonometrics, Inc., v. Westin Hotel Co.	Michel, Rader	Attorney's Fees	1927	Affirmed	Order on Motion
02-1608	Golight, Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., et al.	Prost, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Bench Trial
03-1184	Q-Pharma, Inc. v. The Andrew Jergens Company	Archer, Clevenger, Lourie	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
03-1483	Inland Steel Company v. LTV Steel Company, et al.	Bryson, Gajarsa, Michel	Attorney's Fees	285	Reversed	Order on Motion
03-1083	Power Mosfet Technologies, L.L.C., et al v. Siemen	Gajarsa, Michel, Prost	Attorney's Fees	Rule 11	Affirmed	Order on Motion
03-1083	Power Mosfet Technologies, L.L.C., et al v. Siemen	Gajarsa, Michel, Prost	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
03-1534	Lighting World, Inc. v. Birchwood Lighting, Inc.	Bryson, Linn, Plager	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
03-1609	Juicy Whip, Inc. v. Orange Bang, Inc., et al.	Linn, Lourie, Newman	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
03-1519	Frank's Casing Crew & Rental Tools v. Weatherford	Dyk, Friedman, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
04-1215	Matthew Stephens, et al. v. Tech International, et	Mayer, Rader, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Reversed	Order on Motion
03-1379	Brooks Furniture Manufacturing v. Dutilier Int'l,	Dyk, Lourie, Newman	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated	Order on Motion
03-1562	Rosco v. Mirror Lite	Clevenger, Dyk, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Reversed	Order on Motion
04-1208	Junker v. Eddings	Bryson, Friedman, Newman	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
03-1541	Evident Corp., et al. v. Church & Dwight Co., et a	Linn, Lourie, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
04-1258	Bellehumeur v. Bonnett (doing business as J.B. Mar	Bryson, Linn, Michel	Attorney's Fees	285	Reversed	Order on Motion
03-1600	Mercexchange, L.L.C. v. eBay, Inc., et al.	Bryson, Clevenger, Michel	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
04-1364	Bowling v. Hasbro, Inc.	Gajarsa, Linn, Michel	Attorney's Fees	Appeal	NA	NA

04-1262	Imonex Services v. W.H. Munzprufer Dietmar Trenner	Archer, Bryson, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
03-1438	Designing Health v. Udo Erasmus	Clevenger, Lourie, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
03-1438	Designing Health v. Udo Erasmus	Clevenger, Lourie, Schall	Attorney's Fees	Appeal	NA	NA
04-1060	Frazier et al v. Roessel Cine Photo Tech et al	Dyk, Linn	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
04-1396	MEMC Electronic Materials v. Mitsubishi Materials	Dyk, Newman, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
04-1396	MEMC Electronic Materials v. Mitsubishi Materials	Dyk, Newman, Schall	Attorney's Fees	1927	Affirmed	Order on Motion
04-1596	Engineered Products, Co. v. Donalson Co., Inc.	Archer, Newman, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
04-1429	International Rectifier Corp. v. Samsung Electroni	Linn, Lourie, Prost	Attorney's Fees	Contempt	Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
04-1429	International Rectifier Corp. v. Samsung Electroni	Linn, Lourie, Prost	Attorney's Fees	Contempt	Reversed, Remanded	Order on Motion
05-1009	IPXL Holdings, L.L.C. v. Amazon.com, Inc.	Clevenger, Rader, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Reversed	Order on Motion
04-1571	IP Innovation, L.L.C. v. Ecollege.com, et al.	Dyk, Newman, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
05-1022	Perricone, M.D. v. Medicis Pharmaceutical Corp.	Bryson, Linn, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
04-1553	Fieldturf International, Inc., et al. v. Sprinturf	Dyk, Newman, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated	Order on Motion
03-1341	Ncube Corp. (now C-Cor, Inc.) v. Seachange Interna	Friedman, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
04-1609	Golden Blount, Inc. v. Robert H. Peterson, Co.	Linn, Lourie, Michel	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
05-1390	Forcillo v. Lemond Fitness, Inc., et al.	Bryson, Mayer, Michel	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
05-1224	M. Eagles Tool Warehouse v. Fisher Tooling Co.	Bryson, Lourie, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
05-1038	Kao Corporation, et al. v. Unilever United States,	Gajarsa, Mayer, Newman	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
05-1338	Exigent Technology, Inc. v. Atrana Solutions, Inc.	Dyk, Gajarsa, Prost	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion

05-1173	Sun Coast Merchandise Corp., et al. v. CCL Product	Linn, Michel, Prost	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
05-1173	Sun Coast Merchandise Corp., et al. v. CCL Product	Linn, Michel, Prost	Attorney's Fees	1927	Affirmed	Order on Motion
05-1173	Sun Coast Merchandise Corp., et al. v. CCL Product	Linn, Michel, Prost	Attorney's Fees	Inherent Powers	Affirmed	Order on Motion
05-1079	AGFA Corp. v. CREO Products, Inc., et al.	Lourie, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Bench Trial
05-1106	Serio-Us Industries, Inc. v. Plastic Recovery Tech	Lourie, Rader, Linn	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
05-1547	Highway Equipment Company, Inc. v. Feco, LTD, et a	Dyk, Linn, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Bench Trial
06-1222	Propat International Corp., et al. v. Rpost, Inc.,	Bryson, Mayer, Newman	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
06-1222	Propat International Corp., et al. v. Rpost, Inc.,	Bryson, Mayer, Newman	Attorney's Fees	1927	Affirmed	Order on Motion
05-1610	RFR Indus. v. Century Steps	Michel, Prost, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Reversed	Order on Motion
04-1621	In re Omeprazole Patent Litigation	Bryson, Newman, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
06-1490	Haberman v. Gerber Products Company	Gajarsa, Michel, Robinson*	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
06-1585	International Rectifier Corporation v. Samsung Ele	Gajarsa, Linn, Prost	Attorney's Fees	Contempt	Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
10-1247	OLD RELIABLE WHOLESALE, INC. V. CORNELL CORP.	Bryson, Mayer, Newman	Attorney's Fees	285	Reversed	Order on Motion
09-1308	EON-NET V. FLAGSTAR BANCORP	Lourie, Mayer, O'Malley	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
09-1251	LAZARE KAPLAN INTERNATIONAL, INC. V. PHOTOSCRIBE T	Friedman, Linn, Lourie	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated	Order on Motion
09-1102	ADVANCED MAGNETIC CLOSURES V. ROME FASTENER	Archer, Gajarsa, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion

09-1102	ADVANCED MAGNETIC CLOSURES V. ROME FASTENER	Archer, Gajarsa, Rader	Attorney's Fees	1927	Reversed	Order on Motion
09-1421	LEVITON MANUFACTURING CO., INC. V. UNIVERSAL SECUR	Michel, Moore, Prost	Attorney's Fees	Vexatious Litigation	Vacated	Order on Motion
10-1117	ILOR, LLC V. GOOGLE, INC.	Dyk, Linn, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285		Order on Motion
09-1147	ASPEX EYEWEAR INC. V. CLARITI EYEWEAR, INC.	Bryson, Newman, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
07-1169	Computer Docking Station Corp. v. Dell, Inc.	Michel, Plager, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
07-1104	Monsanto v. David	Bryson, Lourie, Moore	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Bench Trial
07-1133	Digeo v. Audible	Cote*, Michel, Moore	Attorney's Fees		Affirmed	Order on Motion
07-1353	Luma Corp. v. Striker Corp.	Lourie, Mayer, Schall	Attorney's Fees		Affirmed	Order on Motion
07-1299	Monsanto Co. v. Bayer Bioscience N.V.	Bryson, Gajarsa, Linn	Attorney's Fees		Affirmed	Order on Motion
07-1506	Taltech Ltd. v. Esquel Apparel, Inc.	Bryson, Gajarsa, Mayer	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
07-1424	Innovation Technologies v. Splash! Medical Devices	Friedman, Mayer, Moore	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
07-1344	Synthon IP v. Pfizer	Dyk, Mayer, Plager	Attorney's Fees		Affirmed	Order on Motion
07-1198	Nilssen v. Osram Sylvania	Lourie, Mayer	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
07-1399	Scanner Tech. Corp. v. Icos Vision Systems Corp. N	Clevenger, Gajarsa, Michel	Attorney's Fees		Reversed	Bench Trial
06-1275	Research Corp. Technologies Inc. v. Microsoft Corp	Friedman, Newman, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
07-1460	Brady Construction Innovations Inc. v. Perfect Wal	Michel, Moore, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
07-1272	800 Adept, Inc. v. Murex Securities, Ltd.	Dyk, Gajarsa, Plager	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
08-1047	Hildebrand v. Steck Manufacturing Co.	Mayer, Michel, Stearns*	Attorney's Fees		Affirmed	Order on Motion
07-1490	Minks v. Polaris Industries	Gajarsa, Newman, Plager	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
08-1090	Tavory v. NTP, Inc.	Bryson, Michel, Newman	Attorney's Fees	505	Affirmed	Order on Motion



07-1545	Qualcomm Inc. v. Broadcom Corp.	Lourie, Mayer, Prost	Attorney's Fees		Affirmed	Order on Motion
07-1269	Takeda Chemical Industries Ltd. v. Mylan Laborator	Bryson, Lourie, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
08-1144	E-Pass Technologies, Inc. v. 3Com Corp. [rule 36]	Bryson, Linn, Prost	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
08-1077	ICU Medical, Inc. v. Alaris Medical Systems, Inc.	Michel, Moore, Prost	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
08-1267	Revolution Eyewear, Inc. v. Aspex Eyewear, Inc.	Bryson, Michel, Posner*	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
08-1290	Air Turbine Tech., Inc. v. Atlas Copco AB	Prost, Schall	Attorney's Fees	Contract	Reversed	Order on Motion
08-1483	Heeling Sports Ltd. v. U.S. Furong International,	Bryson, Mayer, Plager	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
07-1487	Clearvalue, Inc. v. Pearl River Plymers, Inc.	Dyk, Newman, Schall	Attorney's Fees	Rule 37	Affirmed	Order on Motion
07-1487	Clearvalue, Inc. v. Pearl River Plymers, Inc.	Dyk, Newman, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Reversed	Order on Motion
08-1372	Dickson Industries, Inc. v. Patent Enforcement Tea	Mayer, Posner*, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
08-1240	Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.	Bryson, Linn, Newman	Attorney's Fees		Reversed	Order on Motion
09-1045	Wedgetail, Ltd. v. Huddleston Deluxe, Inc.	Dyk, Gajarsa, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
08-1530	In Re Electro-Mechanical Industries	Moore, Newman, Plager	Attorney's Fees		Modified	Bench Trial
09-1099	Seb S.A. v. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc.	Bryson, Linn, Rader	Attorneys Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
09-1058	MEDTRONIC NAVIGATION, INC. V. BRAINLAB MEDIZINISCH	Bryson, Lourie, Newman	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated	Order on Motion
09-1058	MEDTRONIC NAVIGATION, INC. V. BRAINLAB MEDIZINISCH	Bryson, Lourie, Newman	Attorney's Fees	1927	Reversed	Order on Motion
09-1058	MEDTRONIC NAVIGATION, INC. V. BRAINLAB MEDIZINISCH	Bryson, Lourie, Newman	Attorney's Fees	Inherent Powers	Reversed	Order on Motion

10-1247	OLD RELIABLE WHOLESALE, INC. V. CORNELL CORP.	Bryson, Mayer, Newman	Attorney's Fees	Litigation Misconduct	Reversed	Order on Motion
10-1285	MARCTEC, LLC. V. JOHNSON & JOHNSON	Newman, O'Malley, Prost	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
11-1165	HALL V BED BATH [OPINION]	Linn, Lourie, Newman	Attorney's Fees		Affirmed	Order on Motion
09-1564	SPECTRALYTICS, INC. V. CORDIS CORP.	Bryson, Clevenger, Newman	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated	Order on Motion
07-1469	BRADY CONSTRUCTION INNOVATIONS INC. V. CA. EXPANDE	Michel, Moore, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
12-1121	SPECTRALYTICS, INC. V. CORDIS CORP.	Clevenger, Moore, Newman	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
10-1285	MARCTEC, LLC. V. JOHNSON & JOHNSON	Newman, O'Malley, Prost	Attorney's Fees	Litigation Misconduct	Affirmed	Order on Motion
10-1409	POWELL V. THE HOME DEPOT U.S.A., INC.	Dyk, Linn, Prost	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
11-1329	MEYER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTIES LTD. V. BODUM, INC.	Dyk, Moore, O'Malley	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated	Order on Motion
12-1238	PHILLIP M. ADAMS & ASSOCIATES v. DELL COMPUTER COR	Moore, Prost, Wallach	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
12-1085	CHECKPOINT SYSTEMS, INC. v. ALL-TAG SECURITY S.A.	Lourie, Newman, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Reversed	Order on Motion
12-1285	BARON SERVICES, INC. v. MEDIA WEATHER INNOVATIONS	Dyk, Prost, Reyna	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated	Order on Motion
12-1461	PRECISION LINKS INC. v. USA PRODUCTS GROUP [JUDGME	Bryson, Dyk, Reyna	Attorney's Fees	Litigation Misconduct	Vacated	Order on Motion
8-1462	TAURUS IP v. DAIMLERCHRYSLER [OPINION]	Prost, Reyna, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
8-1462	TAURUS IP v. DAIMLERCHRYSLER [OPINION]	Prost, Reyna, Schall	Attorney's Fees	Contract	Affirmed	Order on Motion
12-1643	BUCKHORN INC. v. ORBIS CORPORATION [OPINION]	O'Malley, Rader, Reyna	Attorney's Fees	Contract	Reversed	Order on Motion

13-1193	KILOPASS TECHNOLOGY, INC. v. SIDENSE CORPORATION [	Lourie, O'Malley, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285		Vacated	Order on Motion
13-1390	RANDALL MAY INTERNATIONAL v. DEG MUSIC PRODUCTS [R	Lourie, Newman, Taranto	Attorney's Fees	Contract		Affirmed	Order on Motion
12-1504	THERASENSE, INC. v. BECTON, DICKINSON AND COMPANY	Dyk, Newman, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
13-1205	GABRIEL TECHNOLOGIES CORP. v. QUALCOMM INCORPORATE	Chen, Lourie, Mayer	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
13-1288	INNOVATIVE BIOMETRIC TECHNOLOG v. TOSHIBA AMERICA	Chen, Taranto, Wallach	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
12-1221	MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC. v. O2 MICRO INTERNA	Mayer, Prost, Reyna	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
13-1047	SYNTHES USA, LLC v. SPINAL KINETICS, INC. [OPINION	O'Malley, Prost, Taranto	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
12-1593	INTEGRATED TECHNOLOGY CORP. v. RUDOLPH TECHNOLOGIE	Clevenger, Moore, Rader	Attorney's Fees	285		Vacated	Order on Motion
11-1521	ICON HEALTH & FITNESS v. OCTANE FITNESS [OPINION F	Lourie, Mayer, Newman	Attorney's Fees	285		Vacated	Order on Motion
12-1085	CHECKPOINT SYSTEMS, INC. v. ALL-TAG SECURITY S.A.	Lourie, Newman, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285		Vacated	Order on Motion
11-1219	HIGHMARK, INC. v. ALLCARE HEALTH MANAGEMENT [OPINI	Dyk, Mayer, Newman	Attorney's Fees	285		Vacated	Order on Motion
13-1537	HOMELAND HOUSEWARES v. SORENSEN RESEARCH [OPINION]	Bryson, Chen, Lourie	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
13-1649	BIAX CORPORATION v. NVIDIA CORPORATION [OPINION]	Dyk, Lourie, Taranto	Attorney's Fees	285		Reversed	Order on Motion

14-1297	OPLUS TECHNOLOGIES, LTD. v. VIZIO, INC. [OPINION]	Moore, O'Malley, Prost	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated	Order on Motion
14-1453	LEE v. MIKE'S NOVELTIES, INC. [OPINION]	Dyk, Moore, Wallach	Attorney's Fees	Litigation Misconduct	Affirmed	Order on Motion
14-1712	SFA SYSTEMS, LLC v. NEWEGG INC. [OPINION]	Clevenger, Hughes, O'Malley	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
15-1163	SMALL v. IMPLANT DIRECT MFG. LLC [RULE 36 JUDGMENT]	Hughes, O'Malley, Wallach	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
14-1777	PRAGMATUS TELECOM LLC v. NEWEGG INC. [OPINION]	Bryson, Dyk, Prost	Attorney's Fees	285	Reversed	Order on Motion
13-1049	LEE v. MIKE'S NOVELTIES [OPINION]	Dyk, Moore, Wallach	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated, Remanded	Order on Motion
15-1103	SUMMIT DATA SYSTEMS LLC v. NETAPP INC. [OPINION]	Dyk, Hughes, Taranto	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
15-1252	TNS MEDIA RESEARCH, LLC v. TIVO RESEARCH AND ANALYTICS [OPINION]	Clevenger, Newman, O'Malley	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated	Order on Motion
12-1373	HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC. v. NOKIA CORPORATION [OPINION]	Newman, Prost, Wallach	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated	Order on Motion
14-1711	BUCKHORN INC. v. ORBIS CORPORATION [OPINION]	Dyk, Lourie, Plager	Attorney's Fees	Contract	Reversed	Order on Motion
14-1174	GAYMAR INDUSTRIES, INC. v. CINCINNATI SUB-ZERO PRO	Bryson, Dyk, Prost	Attorney's Fees	285	Reversed	Order on Motion
14-1405	SEALANT SYSTEMS INTERNATIONAL v. TEK GLOBAL, S.R.L.	Dyk, O'Malley, Wallach	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
14-1297	OPLUS TECHNOLOGIES, LTD. v. VIZIO, INC. [OPINION]	Moore, O'Malley, Prost	Attorney's Fees	1927	Vacated	Order on Motion
13-1668	STRYKER V. ZIMMER [REVISED OPINION]	Hughes, Newman, Prost	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated	Order on Motion

13-1649	BIAX CORPORATION v. NVIDIA CORPORATION [OPINION]	Dyk, Lourie, Taranto	Attorney's Fees	1927	Affirmed	Order on Motion
14-1263	AQUA SHIELD v. INTERPOOL POOL COVER TEAM [OPINION]	Chen, Taranto, Wallach	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated	Bench Trial
13-1332	LOOPS, LLC v. PHOENIX TRADING, INC. [OPINION]	Chen, Dyk, Taranto	Attorney's Fees	Discovery	Vacated	Order on Motion
13-1419	SSL SERVICES, LLC v. CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC. [OPINION]	Linn, Lourie, O'Malley	Attorney's Fees	285	Reversed	Order on Motion
13-1537	HOMELAND HOUSEWARES v. SORENSEN RESEARCH [OPINION]	Bryson, Chen, Lourie	Attorney's Fees	Amount	Affirmed	Order on Motion
13-1293	CARTNER v. ALAMO GROUP, INC. [OPINION]	Dyk,, Moore, Wallach	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
13-1293	CARTNER v. ALAMO GROUP, INC. [OPINION]	Dyk,, Moore, Wallach	Attorney's Fees	Amount	Affirmed	Order on Motion
16-1126	ANGIOSCORE, INC. v. TRIREME MEDICAL, LLC [OPINION]	Hughes, Plager, Reyna	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
16-1049	KASPERSKY LAB, INC. v. DEVICE SECURITY, LLC [RULE 36 JUDGMENT]	Newman, Prost, Taranto	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
15-2010	COMMONWEALTH LABORATORIES v. QUINTRON INSTRUMENT COMPANY [RULE 36 JUDGMENT]	Dyk, Newman, Wallach	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
15-1608	COMPUTER SOFTWARE PROTECTION v. ADOBE SYSTEMS INCORPORATED [RULE 36 JUDGMENT]	Chen, Schall, Taranto	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion
15-1642	MACROSOLVE, INC. v. GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES INS. [RULE 36 JUDGMENT]	Mayer, Prost, Reyna	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion

15-1598	SMARTMETRIC INC. v. MASTERCARD INTERNATIONAL INC. [RULE 36 JUDGMENT]	Newman, Prost, Stoll	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
15-1596	BARRON v. SCVNGR, INC. [RULE 36 JUDGMENT]	Dyk, Hughes, Mayer	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
15-1448	SITE UPDATE SOLUTIONS, LLC v. CBS CORP. [OPINION]	Dyk, Prost, Reyna	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
15-1324	ALPHA TECHNOLOGY U.S.A. CORP. v. MLSNA DAIRY SUPPLY, INC. [RULE 36 JUDGMENT]	Dyk, Moore, Stoll	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
15-2040	LARGE AUDIENCE DISPLAY SYSTEMS v. TENNMAN PRODUCTIONS, LLC [OPINION]	Linn, Moore, O'Malley	Attorney's Fees	285		Vacated	Order on Motion
15-1892	DRONE TECHNOLOGIES, INC. v. PARROT S.A. [OPINION]	Chen, Newman, Schall	Attorney's Fees	285		Vacated	Order on Motion
13-1668	STRYKER CORPORATION v. ZIMMER, INC. [OPINION 2016]	Hughes, Newman, Prost	Attorney's Fees	285		Vacated	Order on Motion
15-1801	VAPOR POINT LLC v. MOORHEAD [OPINION]	Chen, O'Malley, Stoll	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
15-1676	WALKER v. HEALTH INTERNATIONAL CORP. [OPINION]	Hughes, Reyna, Stoll	Attorney's Fees	28usc1927		Affirmed	Order on Motion
15-1500	MANKES v. VIVID SEATS LTD. [OPINION]	Chen, Schall, Taranto	Attorney's Fees	285		Affirmed	Order on Motion
15-1275	LUMEN VIEW TECHNOLOGY LLC v. FINDTHEBEST.COM, INC [OPINION]	Lourie, Moore, Wallach	Attorney's Fees	285			Order on Motion
15-1275	LUMEN VIEW TECHNOLOGY LLC v. FINDTHEBEST.COM, INC [OPINION]	Lourie, Moore, Wallach	Attorney's Fees	Amount		Vacated	Order on Motion

12-1575	UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH v. VARIAN MEDICAL SYSTEMS	Dyk, Lourie, O'Malley	Attorney's Fees		Vacated	Order on Motion
13-1205	GABRIEL TECHNOLOGIES CORP. v. QUALCOMM INCORPORATE	Chen, Lourie, Mayer	Attorney's Fees	Trade Secret	Affirmed	Order on Motion
14-1820	INTEGRATED TECHNOLOGY CORP. v. RUDOLPH TECHNOLOGIES, INC. [OPINION]	Moore, Prost, Wallach	Attorney's Fees	Amount	Vacated	Order on Motion
13-1665	ADJUSTACAM, LLC v. NEWEGG, INC. [OPINION]	Hughes, Newman, Plager	Attorney's Fees	285	Vacated	Order on Motion
15-1406	NATIONAL OILWELL VARCO, L.P. v. OMRON OILFIELD & MARINE, INC. [OPINION]	Chen, Hughes, Moore	Attorney's Fees	285	Affirmed	Order on Motion