Course Description

This course provides an in-depth examination of the U.S. International Trade Commission and its adjudication of patent litigation disputes under Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930. The course will focus on all aspects of litigation at the ITC, from the institution of an investigation under Section 337 through the Commission’s review of an Administrative Law Judge’s decision, as well as key Federal Circuit decisions involving the ITC. Students will not only learn the unique procedures of the ITC, but will also be exposed to policy considerations and the practical application of U.S. patent law in ITC investigations. Patent Law I is a prerequisite for this course.

Grading

This course is a writing course. There will be 3 short written assignments over the course of the semester, due at dates indicated in the syllabus or provided in class. Your final grade for the course will be based on the written assignments, each worth 33%, and may be adjusted one increment up or down (e.g. B to B- or A- to A) based on class participation.

Classes 1 and 2: Introduction

- Current 19 U.S.C. § 1337
- Kinick v. ITC, 362 F.3d 1359, 1359-1363 (Fed. Cir. 2004)
- Amgen v. ITC, 902 F.3d 1532 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (all)
- In re Certain Wireless Devices with 3G Capabilities & Components Thereof, Inv. No. 337-TA-800, Order Nos. 4 (Ground Rules) (all) and 18 (Procedural Schedule) (all)
Class 2: The Complaint


- *In re Certain Wireless Devices with 3G Capabilities & Components Thereof*, Inv. No. 337-TA-800, Complaint (July 26, 2011) (SKIM complaint and exhibits)

- 28 U.S.C. § 1659 (district court stay)

- 19 C.F.R. § 210.19 (third-party intervention)

- *In re Certain Garage Door Operators Incl. Components Thereof*, Inv. No. 337-TA-459, Order No. 7 (all) (Nov. 20, 2001)

Class 3: Discovery

- *In re Certain Wireless Devices with 3G Capabilities & Components Thereof*, Inv. No. 337-TA-800, Order Nos. 1 (PO) (all) and 7 (Source code amendment) (all)


- *In re Certain Wind and Solar-Powered Light Posts and Street Lamps*, Inv. No. 337-TA-736, Order No. 9 (all) (April 13, 2011) (subpoena enforcement)
Class 4: Practical Discovery Skills and Depositions

- Deposition Fact Pattern for practicum, which shall be distributed in Class 3

Classes 5 and 6: Domestic Industry

- Economic Prong
  - *Motiva v. ITC*, Slip Op. 2012-1252 (all) (May 13, 2013) (affirming that filing date of complaint is relevant date for determining economic prong and finding litigation costs not sufficient on facts)

- Technical Prong
  - *In re Certain Semiconductor Chips with Minimized Chip Package Size & Prods. Containing Same*, Inv. No. 337-TA-432, Order No. 13 ID (all) (Jan. 24, 2001) (DI claim can be different from infringement claim)

DISTRIBUTE DI SUMMARY DETERMINATION FACT PATTERN AT CLASS 6

Classes 7 and 8: Summary Determination, Importation, Infringement

- Summary Determination
• In re Certain Elect. Devices, Including Wireless Comm’n Devices, Portable Music & Data Processing Devices, & Tablet Computers, Inv. No. 337-TA-794, Order No. 85 (all) (June 1, 2012) (also used for Importation) (outlining SD standards of proof)

• Importation

• In re Certain Elect. Devices, Including Wireless Comm’n Devices, Portable Music & Data Processing Devices, & Tablet Computers, Inv. No. 337-TA-794, Order No. 85 (all) (June 1, 2012) (also used for Summary Determination) (denying MSD of importation because infringement not shown)

• In re Certain Electronic Devices with Image Processing Sys., Components Thereof, & Associated Software, Inv. No. 337-TA-724, Comm’n Op., at*1-20 (Dec. 21, 2011) (also used for Method Claims) (purpose of importation requirement and interplay with jurisdiction)

• Amgen v. ITC, 902 F.3d 1532 (all) (Fed. Cir. 1990)

• Infringement


• Global Tech Appliances, Inc. v. S.E.B. SA, 131 S. Ct. 458 (all) (2011)

DOMESTIC INDUSTRY SUMMARY DETERMINATION DUE – CLASS 8

Classes 9 and 10: Remedy and Bonding


• In re Certain Personal Data and Mobile Comm’ns Devices & Related Software, Inv. No. 337-TA-710, Additional Views of Comm’ner Pinkert on Remedy and the Public Interest (all) (Dec. 29, 2011) (same as above)
• Kyocera v. ITC, 545 F.3d 1340 (all) (Fed. Cir. 2008) (holding LEO cannot apply to downstream products)

• Spansion, Inc. v. ITC, 629 F.3d 1331 (all) (Fed. Cir. 2010) (balancing benefit of protecting IPR against PI factors)


• Class 11: Pre-Hearing MILS and other Hearing Issues

• DISTRIBUTE MILS FACT PATTERNS

Class 12: Guest Speaker

Class 13: Enforcement

• Funai Elect. Co. v. CBP, 645 F. Supp. 2d 1351 (all) (CIT 2009)

• Hyundai Elecs. Indst. Co. v. ITC, 899 F.2d 1204 (all) (Fed. Cir. 1990) (certification requirements)

• Vastfame Camera, Ltd. v. ITC, 386 F.3d 1108 (all) (Fed. Cir. 2004) (non-parties affected by GEO)


Class 14: Contingent Make-up Day/Overflow Day

• MILS DEADLINE AND DISCUSSION