

# AIPLA's Model Patent Jury Instructions

© 2008, American Intellectual Property Law Association

## Disclaimer

The Model Jury Instructions are provided as general assistance for the litigation of patent issues. While efforts have been and will be made to ensure that the Model Jury Instructions accurately reflect existing law, this work is not intended to replace the independent research necessary for formulating jury instructions that are best suited to particular facts and legal issues. AIPLA does not represent that the information contained in the Model Jury Instructions is accurate, complete, or current. The work could contain typographical errors or technical inaccuracies, and AIPLA reserves the right to add, change, or delete its contents or any part thereof without notice.

## Table of Contents

Introduction

### **Preliminary Jury Instructions**

I. The Nature of the Action and the Parties

A. United States Patents

B. Patent Litigation

II. Contentions of the Parties

III. Trial Procedure

Glossary of Patent Terms

Glossary of Technical Terms

### **Post-Trial Instructions**

1. Summary of Patent Issues

Claim Construction

2.0 Claim Construction – Generally

2.1 Claim Construction for the Case

2.2 Construction of Means-Plus-Function Claims for the Case Infringement

3.0 Infringement – Generally

3.1 Direct Infringement – Knowledge of Patent or Intent to Infringe is Immaterial

3.2 Direct Infringement – Literal Infringement

3.3 Inducing Patent Infringement

3.4 Contributory Infringement

3.5 Infringement of Means-Plus-Function Claims

3.6 Infringement of Dependent Claims

3.7 Infringement of Open Ended or “Comprising” Claims

3.8 Infringement by supply of all or a substantial portion of the components of a patented invention to another country (271(f)(1))

3.9 Infringement by supply of components especially made or adopted for use in the patented invention to another country (271(f)(2))

3.10 Infringement by Import, Sale, Offer for Sale or Use of Product Made Outside United States by Patented Process (infringement under 271(g))

3.11 Direct Infringement – Infringement Under The Doctrine Of Equivalents

3.12 Limitations on the Doctrine of Equivalents – Prior Art

3.13 Limitations on the Doctrine of Equivalents – Prosecution History Estoppel

3.14 Limitations on the Doctrine of Equivalents – Subject Matter Dedicated to the Public

4. Summary of Invalidity Defense

5. Prior Art Defined

Anticipation

6.0 Anticipation

- 6.1 Prior Public Knowledge
- 6.2 Prior Public Use
- 6.3 On Sale Bar
- 6.4 Experimental Use
- 6.5 Printed Publication
- 6.6 Prior Invention
- 6.7 Prior Patent
- 6.8 Prior U.S. Application
- Obviousness
  - 7.0 Obviousness
  - 7.1 Scope and Content of the Prior Art
  - 7.2 Differences Between the Claimed Invention and the Prior Art
  - 7.3 Level of Ordinary Skill
  - 7.4 Factors Indicating Nonobviousness
- 8. Enablement
- 9. Written Description Requirement
- 10. Best Mode
- Unenforceability (Inequitable Conduct)
  - 11.0 Inequitable Conduct - Generally
  - 11.1 Materiality
  - 11.2 Intent to Deceive or Mislead
  - 11.3 Balancing of Materiality and Intent
- Damages
  - 12.0 Damages – Generally
  - 12.1 Date Damages Begin
    - Alternate A [When the date of the notice of infringement is stipulated]
    - Alternate B [When the date of the notice of infringement is disputed]
    - Alternate C [When the date damages begin is the date the lawsuit was filed]
  - 12.2 Two Types of Damages – Lost Profits and Reasonable Royalty
  - 12.3 Lost Profits – “But-For” Test
  - 12.4 Lost Profits – Panduit Factors
  - 12.5 Lost Profits – Panduit Factors—Demand
  - 12.6 Lost Profits – Panduit Factors—Acceptable Non-Infringing Substitutes

- 12.7 Lost Profits – Panduit Factors—Capacity
- 12.8 Lost Profits – Panduit Factors—Amount of Profit Incremental Income Approach
- 12.9 Lost Profits – Market Share
- 12.10 Lost Profits – Price Erosion
- 12.11 Lost Profits – Cost Escalation
- 12.12 Lost Profits – Collateral Sales
- 12.13 Lost Profits – Doubts Resolved Against Infringer
- 12.14 Reasonable Royalty – Generally
- 12.15 Reasonable Royalty – Definition
- 12.16 Reasonable Royalty – Relevant Factors
- 12.17 Reasonable Royalty – Timing
- 13. Willful Infringement
- Acknowledgments

## Introduction

### 1. The 2007 Version

In the Winter of 2007, the Patent Litigation Committee of the American Intellectual Property Law Association undertook the task of updating the AIPLA Model Patent Jury Instructions (“Instructions”) to take into account changes to the law since the previous version of the Instructions were published. The Instructions were originally created in 1997 and were updated previously in 2005. A Subcommittee was formed to review recent case law and make any necessary changes to the Instructions. These changes included not only revising the Instructions to take into account recent case law, but to also revise the Instructions to make them simpler and more easily understandable to jurors. The current revision includes case law through December 31, 2007.

One of the fundamental goals of the Instructions is to provide a model set of jury instructions that would not be biased in

favor of either the patent owner or the accused infringer. The Instructions are not meant to address every conceivable issue that might arise in patent litigation, however. Instead, Instructions are provided on those issues that most typically arise in patent litigation and that have clear precedential support. Even so, it is incumbent upon the litigants to tailor these Instructions to the particular case and to simplify the tasks for the jury by not providing superfluous Instructions. Of course, it is also intended that these Instructions will be used in conjunction with other instructions dealing with non-patent issues such as credibility and that the trial court will further the jury's understanding of these Instructions by relating the legal principles in the Instructions to the particular factual contentions of the parties.

To further these goals and to enhance the litigants' ability to customize the Instructions to a particular case, the revised Instructions continue the use of bracketed terminology for certain consistent terms. This mechanism permits the litigants to use the find and replace feature of a word processing program to insert case specific facts. Examples of the consistent terms are:

[subject matter]  
[the patentee]  
[the Plaintiff]  
[the Defendant]  
[full patent number]  
[abbreviated patent number]  
[claims in dispute]  
[allegedly infringing product]  
[invention date]  
[U.S. filing date]  
[critical date]

[anticipating patent]  
[alleged analogous art]  
[alleged prior publication]  
[alleged device on sale]  
[infringement notice date]  
[lawsuit filing date]  
[beginning infringement date]  
[collateral products]  
[the Plaintiff's product]

In addition to these “find and replace” terms, brackets were also used to indicate where various terminology could be used to customize the Instructions to a particular case. For example, to take into account the differences between utility and method patents, there will be instructions that include “[product] [method]” and the like. Other examples include “[product][system],” “[importing][selling][offering for sale][using]” and “[method][process].”

The subcommittee at large substantially completed the revisions to the 2005 instructions in October 2007. Additional research was later done to update the case law through December 31, 2007 and the AIPLA Board of Directors approved the Instructions for publication in March 2008.

March 2008  
Scott J. Pivnick  
John Schneider  
Chairpersons, Model Jury Instructions  
Subcommittee  
Patent Litigation Committee  
American Intellectual Property Law  
Association

# Preliminary Jury Instructions

Members of the jury:

Now that you have been sworn, I have the following preliminary instructions for your guidance on the nature of the case and your role as jurors.

## I. The Nature of the Action and the Parties

This is a patent case. The patents involved in this case relate to [subject matter] technology. [BRIEFLY DESCRIBE TECHNOLOGY INVOLVED].

During the trial, the parties will offer testimony to familiarize you with this technology. For your convenience, the parties have also prepared a glossary of some of the technical terms to which they may refer during the trial, which will be distributed to you.

[The Plaintiff] is the owner of a patent, which is identified by the Patent Office number: [full patent number] (which may be called “the [abbreviated patent number] patent”); [IDENTIFY ADDITIONAL PATENTS]. This patent may also be referred to as “[the Plaintiff]’s patent.” [The Defendant] is the other party here.

### A. United States Patents

Patents are granted by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (sometimes called the “PTO”). A patent gives the owner the right to exclude others from making, using, offering to sell, or selling [[the patented invention] [a product made by the patented process]] within the United States or importing it into the United States. During the trial, the parties may offer testimony to familiarize you with how one obtains a patent from the PTO, but I will give you a general background here.

To obtain a patent, an application for a patent must be filed with the PTO. The application includes a specification, which must have a written description of the invention telling what the invention is, how it works, and how to make and use it so as to enable others skilled in the art to do so. The specification must also describe what the inventor believed at the time of filing to be the best way of making his or her invention. The specification concludes with one or more numbered sentences. These numbered sentences are called the claims of the patent. The purpose of the claims is to particularly point out what the applicant regards as the invention and to define the scope of the patent owner's exclusive rights.

An application for a patent is reviewed by a trained PTO examiner. The examiner reviews (or examines) 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 searches records available to the PTO for what is referred to as “prior art,” and he or she also reviews prior art submitted by the applicant. When the parties are done presenting evidence, I will give you specific instructions as to what constitutes prior art in this case. But generally it is technical information and knowledge that was known to the public either before the invention by the applicant or more than a year before the filing date of the patent application. The patent examiner considers, among other things, whether each claim defines an invention that is new, useful, and not obvious in view of this prior art.

Following the prior art search and examination of the application, the patent examiner advises the applicant in writing what the patent examiner has found and whether any claim is patentable (in other words, “allowed”). This writing from the patent examiner is called an “office action.” More often than not, the initial office action by the patent examiner rejects the claims. The applicant then responds to the office action and sometimes changes the claims or submits new claims. This process may go back and forth between the patent examiner and the applicant for several months or even years until the patent examiner is satisfied that the application and claims are patentable.

The collection of papers generated by the patent examiner and the applicant during this time of corresponding back and forth is called the “prosecution history.” You may also hear the “prosecution history” referred to as the “file history” or the “file wrapper.”

## **B. Patent Litigation**

Someone is said to be infringing on claims of a patent when they, without permission from the patent owner, import, make, use, offer to sell, or sell [[the patented invention] [a product made by the patented process]], as defined by the claims, within the United States before the term of the patent expires. A patent owner who believes someone is infringing on the exclusive rights of the patent may bring a lawsuit like this to stop the alleged infringing acts and recover damages, which generally is money paid by the infringer to the patent owner to compensate for the harm caused by the infringement. The patent owner must prove infringement of the claims of the patent. The patent owner must also prove the need for damages.

A granted patent is presumed to be valid. But that presumption of validity can be overcome if clear and convincing evidence is presented that proves the patent is invalid. One example of a way in which the presumption may be overcome is if the PTO has not considered, for whatever reason, invalidating prior art that is presented to you. A person sued for allegedly infringing a patent can deny infringement and also can defend by proving the asserted claims of the patent are invalid [and/or unenforceable, if the patent

owner unfairly procured the patent in some way. This will be discussed further below]. The accused infringer must prove invalidity [or unenforceability] by clear and convincing evidence. I will discuss more of this topic later.

I will now briefly explain the parties' basic contentions in more detail.

## **II. Contentions of the Parties**

[The Plaintiff] contends that [the Defendant] makes, uses, offers to sell, or sells a [[product] [method]] that infringes [claim(s) in dispute] of the [abbreviated patent number] patent. [The Plaintiff] must prove that [the Defendant] infringes the [abbreviated patent number] patent by a preponderance of the evidence. That means that [the Plaintiff] must show that it is more likely that [the Defendant]'s [allegedly infringing product] infringes than it does not infringe.

There are two ways in which a patent claim can be directly infringed.<sup>1</sup> First, a claim can be literally infringed. Second, a claim can be infringed under what is called the “doctrine of equivalents.” To determine literal infringement, you must compare the accused [[product] [method]] with each claim that [the Plaintiff] asserts is infringed. It will be my job to tell you what the language of the patent claims mean. You must follow my instructions as to the meaning of the patent claims.

A patent claim is literally infringed only if [the Defendant]'s [[product] [method]] includes each and every [[element] [method step]] in that patent claim. If [the Defendant]'s [[product] [method]] does not contain one or more [[elements] [method steps]] in that claim, [the Defendant] does not literally infringe that claim. You must determine literal infringement with respect to each patent claim individually.

Under the doctrine of equivalents, you may find that [the Defendant]'s [[product] [method]] infringes a claim of the [abbreviated patent number] patent even if not every [[element] [step]] of that claim is present in [the Defendant]'s [[product] [method]]. However, to do so, you must find that there is an equivalent [[component] [part] [method step]] in [the Defendant]'s [[product] [method]] for each [[element] [method step]] of the patent claim that is not literally present in [the Defendant]'s [[product] [method]]. [The Plaintiff] must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that [the Defendant]'s [[product] [method]] contains the equivalent of each element of the claimed invention that is not literally present in the [allegedly infringing product].

[The Defendant] denies that it is infringing the [abbreviated patent number] patent. [The Defendant] also contends that the [abbreviated patent

---

<sup>1</sup> This section and below should be modified in accordance with the patent owner's infringement contentions, e.g., where the doctrine of equivalents is not at issue.

number] patent is invalid [and/or unenforceable]. [INSERT BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICULAR INVALIDITY AND UNENFORCEABILITY DEFENSES BEING ASSERTED].

Invalidity is a defense to infringement. Therefore, even though the PTO examiner has allowed the claims of the [abbreviated patent number] patent, you, the jury, have the ultimate responsibility for deciding whether the claims of the [abbreviated patent number] patent are valid. [The Defendant] must prove invalidity by clear and convincing evidence. This is a higher standard than a preponderance of the evidence, but it does not require proof beyond a reasonable doubt. Clear and convincing evidence is evidence that shows it is highly probable that the claims are invalid.

### **III. Trial Procedure**

We are about to commence the opening statements in the case. Before we do that, I want to explain the procedures that we will be following during the trial and the format of the trial. This trial, like all jury trials, comes in six phases. We have completed the first phase, which was to select you as jurors. We are now about to begin the second phase, the opening statements. The opening statements of the lawyers are statements about what each side expects the evidence to show. The opening statements are not evidence for you to consider in your deliberations.

The evidence comes in the third phase, when the witnesses will take the witness stand and the documents will be offered and admitted into evidence. In the third phase, [the Plaintiff] goes first in calling witnesses to the witness stand. These witnesses will be questioned by [the Plaintiff]'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. After [the Plaintiff] has presented its witnesses, [the Defendant] will call its witnesses, who will also be examined and cross-examined. The parties may present the testimony of a witness by reading from their 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.

The evidence often is introduced piecemeal, so you need to keep an open mind as the evidence comes in. You are to wait until all the evidence comes in before you make any decisions. In other words, keep an open mind throughout the entire trial.

After we conclude the third phase, the lawyers again have an opportunity to talk to you in what is called "closing argument," which is the fourth phase. Again, what the lawyers say is not evidence. The closing arguments are not evidence for you to consider in your deliberations.

The fifth phase of the trial is when I read you the jury instructions. In that phase, I will instruct you on the law. I have already explained to you a little bit about the law. But in the fifth phase of the trial, I will explain the law in much more detail.

Finally, in the sixth phase of the trial it will be time for you to deliberate. You can then evaluate the evidence, discuss the evidence among yourselves and make a decision in the case. You are the judges of the facts, and I decide questions of law. I will explain the rules of law that apply to this case, and I will also explain the meaning of the patent claim language. You must follow my explanation of the law and the patent claim language even if you do not agree with me. Nothing I say or do during the course of the trial is intended to indicate what your verdict should be.

## **Glossary of Patent Terms**

**Application** – The initial papers filed by the applicant in the United States Patent and Trademark Office (also called the Patent Office or PTO).

**Claims** – The numbered sentences appearing at the end of the patent that define the invention. The words of the claims define the scope of the patent owner's exclusive rights during the life of the patent.

**File wrapper** – See “prosecution history” below.

**License** – Permission to use the patented invention(s), which may be granted by a patent owner (or a prior licensee) in exchange for a fee called a “royalty” or other compensation.

**Office action** – Communication from the patent examiner regarding the specification (see definition below) and/or the claims in the patent application.

**Ordinary skill in the art** – The level of experience, education, and/or training generally possessed by those individuals who work in the area of the invention at the time of the invention.

**Patent Examiners** – Personnel employed by the PTO in a specific technical area who review (examine) the patent application to determine (1) whether the claims of a patent application are patentable over the prior art considered by the examiner, and (2) whether the specification/application describes the invention with the required specificity.

**Prior art** – Knowledge that is available to the public either prior to the invention by the applicant or more than one year prior to the filing date of the application. [Insert additional types of prior art if applicable, e.g., nonpublic art.]

**Prosecution history** – The written record of proceedings between the applicant and the PTO, including the original patent application and later communications between the

PTO and applicant. The prosecution history may also be referred to as the “file history” or “file wrapper” of the patent during the course of this trial.

**References** – Any item of prior art used to determine patentability.

**Specification** – The information that appears in the patent and concludes with one or more claims. The specification includes the written text, the claims, and the drawings. In the specification, the inventor describes the invention, how it works, and how to make and use it. The specification must describe the invention in sufficient detail to enable others skilled in the art to practice the invention and must describe what the inventor believed at the time of filing to be the best way of making his or her invention.

[Others to be agreed upon between the parties]

## **Glossary of Technical Terms**

[To be agreed upon between the parties]

## **Post Trial Instructions<sup>2</sup>**

### **1. Summary of Patent Issues**

I will now summarize the issues that you must decide and for which I will provide instructions to guide your deliberations. You must decide the following [three] main issues:

1. Whether [the Plaintiff] has proved that [the Defendant] infringed Claim[s] [claims in dispute] of the [abbreviated patent number] patent.
2. Whether [the Defendant] has proved that Claim[s] [claims in dispute] of the [abbreviated patent number] patent are invalid.
3. What amount of damages, if any, [the Plaintiff] has proved.

[LIST ANY OTHER PATENT ISSUES]

### **Claim Construction**

#### **2.0 Claim Construction – Generally**

Before you decide whether [the Defendant] has infringed the claims of [the Plaintiff's] patent or whether [the Plaintiff's] patent is invalid, you will have to understand the patent claims. The patent claims are numbered sentences at the end of the patent.

---

<sup>2</sup> AIPLA drafted the model instructions assuming the litigated issues included in the instructions will be submitted to the jury. AIPLA is not suggesting that the parties have a right to a jury trial on all issues included in the instructions. The instructions used in your case should be tailored to the specific issues being litigated.

The patent claims involved here are [claims in dispute], beginning at column \_\_\_\_, line \_\_\_\_ of the patent, which is exhibit \_\_\_\_ in evidence. The claims are intended to define, in words, the boundaries of the invention. Only the claims of the patent can be infringed. Neither the written description, nor the drawings of a patent can be infringed. Each of the claims must be considered individually. You must use the same claim meaning for both your decision on infringement and your decision on invalidity.

35 U.S.C. § 112; *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc); *Catalina Lighting, Inc. v. Lamps Plus, Inc.*, 295 F.3d 1277, 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc), *aff'd*, 517 U.S. 370 (1996); *SmithKline Diagnostics, Inc. v. Helena Labs. Corp.*, 859 F.2d 878, 882 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

## 2.1 Claim Construction for the Case

It is my job as judge to provide to you the meaning of any claim language that must be interpreted. You must accept the meanings I give you and use them when you decide whether any claim of the patent has been infringed and whether any claim is invalid. I will now tell you the meanings of the following words and groups of words from the patent claims.

[READ STIPULATIONS AND COURT'S CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS]

You should give the rest of the words in the claims their ordinary meaning in the context of the patent specification and prosecution history.

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc); *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc) *aff'd*, 517 U.S. 370 (1996)

## 2.2 Construction of Means-Plus-Function Claims for the Case

The following clause used in claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ of the [abbreviated patent number] patent is in a special form called a [[“means-plus-function”] [“step-plus-function”]] clause: “\_\_\_\_\_”. This clause requires a special interpretation. Those words do not cover all [[means] [steps]] that perform the recited function of “\_\_\_\_\_”, but cover only the [[structure] [step]] described in the patent specification and drawings that performs the function of “\_\_\_\_\_” or an equivalent of that [[structure] [step]]. The court has found that the [[structure] [step]] in the patent specification that performs that function is: “\_\_\_\_\_.” You must use my interpretation of the means-plus-function [[element] [step]] in your deliberations regarding infringement and validity.

35 U.S.C. § 112; *Utah Med. Prods., Inc. v. Graphic Controls Corp.*, 350 F.3d 1376, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Carroll Touch, Inc. v. Electro Mech. Sys., Inc.*, 15 F.3d 1573, 1578 (Fed.

Cir. 1993); *Valmont Indus., Inc. v. Reinke Mfg. Co., Inc.*, 983 F.2d 1039, 1042 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

## **Infringement**

### **3.0 Infringement – Generally**

Questions \_\_\_\_\_ through \_\_\_\_\_ of the Verdict Form read as follows: [READ TEXT OF INFRINGEMENT VERDICT QUESTIONS].

I will now instruct you as to the rules you must follow when deciding whether [the Plaintiff] has proven that [the Defendant] infringed any of the claims of the [abbreviated patent number] patent.

Patent law gives the owner of a valid patent the right to exclude others from importing, making, using, offering to sell, or selling [[the patented invention] [a product made by a patented method]] within the United States during the term of the patent. Any person or business entity that has engaged in any of those acts without the patent owner's permission infringes the patent. Here, [the Plaintiff] alleges that [the Defendant]'s [allegedly infringing product] infringes claim[s] [claims in dispute] of [the Plaintiff]'s [abbreviated patent number] patent.

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

A patent may be infringed directly or indirectly. Direct infringement results if the accused [[product][method]] is covered by at least one claim of the patent. Indirect infringement results if the defendant induces another to infringe a patent or contributes to the infringement of a patent by another.

35 U.S.C. § 271; *Seal-Flex, Inc. v. Athletic Track & Court Constr.*, 172 F.3d 836, 842 (Fed. Cir. 1999). *Cybor Corp. v. FAS Techs., Inc.*, 138 F.3d 1448, 1454 (Fed.Cir.1998) (en banc); *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967, 976 (Fed.Cir.1995) (en banc), *aff'd*, 517 U.S. 370 (1996).

### **3.1 Direct Infringement – Knowledge of Patent or Intent to Infringe is Immaterial**

In this case, [the Plaintiff] asserts that [the Defendant] has directly infringed the patent. [The Defendant] would be liable for directly infringing [the Plaintiff]'s patent if you find that [the Plaintiff] has proven that it is more likely than not that [the Defendant] has made, used, offered to sell, or sold the invention defined in at least one claim of [the Plaintiff]'s patent.

Someone can directly infringe a patent without knowing that what they are doing is an infringement of the patent. They also may directly infringe a patent even though they believe in good faith that what they are doing is not an infringement of any patent.

35 U.S.C. § 271(a); *BMC Resources v. Paymentech, L.P.*, 498 F.3d 1373, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *DeMarini Sports, Inc. v. Worth, Inc.*, 239 F.3d 1314, 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Seal-Flex, Inc. v. Athletic Track & Court Constr.*, 172 F.3d 836, 842 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *SmithKline Diagnostics, Inc. v. Helena Labs. Corp.*, 859 F.2d 878, 889 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

### **3.2 Direct Infringement – Literal Infringement**

To determine literal infringement, you must compare the accused [[product] [method]] with each claim that [the Plaintiff] asserts is infringed, using my instructions as to the meaning of the patent claims.

A patent claim is literally infringed only if [the Defendant]'s [[product] [method]] includes each and every [[element] [method step]] in that patent claim. If [the Defendant]'s [[product] [method]] does not contain one or more [[elements] [method steps]] recited in a claim, [the Defendant] does not literally infringe that claim. If [the Plaintiff] alleges infringement of a method claim, and there are others apart from [the Defendant] that performed one or more method steps of the claim, there can be no infringement unless [the Plaintiff] has proven that [the Defendant] controlled or directed the activity of the others who performed the method steps.

You must determine literal infringement with respect to each patent claim individually.

The accused [[product] [method]] should be compared to the invention described in each patent claim it is alleged to infringe, not to the [the Plaintiff]'s preferred or commercial embodiment of the claimed invention. The same [[element] [method step]] of the accused [product] [method] may satisfy more than one element of a claim.

*BMC Resources v. Paymentech, L.P.*, 498 F.3d 1373, 1381-82 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *DeMarini Sports, Inc. v. Worth, Inc.*, 239 F.3d 1314, 1330-31 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Gen. Mills, Inc. v. Hunt-Wesson, Inc.*, 103 F.3d 978, 981 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Martin v. Barber*, 755 F.2d 1564, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Amstar Corp. v. Envirotech Corp.*, 730 F.2d 1476, 1481-82 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

### **3.3 Inducing Patent Infringement**

[The Plaintiff] asserts that [the Defendant] has actively induced another to infringe the patent. To show induced infringement, [the Plaintiff] must prove that it is more likely than not that someone has directly infringed the [abbreviated patent number] patent and that [the Defendant] has actively and knowingly aided and abetted that direct infringement. [The Plaintiff] must show that [the Defendant] actually intended to cause the acts that constitute direct infringement, that [the Defendant] knew of the patent, and that [the Defendant] knew or should have known that its actions would lead to actual

infringement. Intent to cause the acts that constitute direct infringement may be demonstrated by evidence of active steps taken to encourage direct infringement, such as advertising an infringing use or instructing how to engage in an infringing use. It is not necessary to show that [the Defendant] has directly infringed as long as you find that someone has directly infringed. If there is no direct infringement by anyone, there can be no induced infringement.

35 U.S.C. § 271(b); *DSU Medical Corp. v. JMS Co.*, 471 F.3d 1293, 1304-05 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (en banc) (quoting *Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios Inc. v. Gorkster, Ltd.*, 545 U.S. 913, 936 (2005)); *Metabolite Labs., Inc. v. Lab. Corp. of Am. Holdings*, 370 F.3d 1354, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Ferguson Beauregard/Logic Controls, Div. of Dover Res., Inc. v. Mega Sys., LLC*, 350 F.3d 1327, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Manville Sales Corp. v. Paramount Sys., Inc.*, 917 F.2d 544, 553 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb, Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1464, 1468-69 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

### **3.4 Contributory Infringement**

[The Plaintiff] asserts that [the Defendant] has contributed to another's infringement. To show contributory infringement, [the Plaintiff] must prove that it is more likely than not that there was contributory infringement.

It is not necessary to show that [the Defendant] has directly infringed as long as you find that someone has directly infringed. If there is no direct infringement by anyone, [the Defendant] cannot have contributed to the infringement of the patent. If you find someone has directly infringed the [abbreviated patent number] patent, then contributory infringement exists if:

- (1) [the Defendant] sold, offered for sale, or imported;
- (2) a material component of the patented invention that is not a staple article of commerce capable of substantial non-infringing use;
- (3) with knowledge that the component was especially made or adapted for use in an infringing [[product] [method]].

A “staple article of commerce capable of substantial non-infringing use” is something that has uses [[other than as a part or component of the patented product] [other than in the patented method]], and those other uses are not occasional, farfetched, impractical, experimental, or hypothetical.

35 U.S.C. § 271(c); *PharmaStem Therapeutics, Inc. v. ViaCell, Inc. et al.*, 491 F.3d 1342, 1356-58 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *Mentor H/S, Inc. v. Med. Device Alliance, Inc.*, 244 F.3d 1365, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb, Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1464, 1469 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *Preemption Devices, Inc. v. Minn. Mining & Mfg. Co.*, 803 F.2d 1170, 1174 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

### 3.5 Infringement of Means-Plus-Function Claims

The court has instructed you that claims \_\_\_\_\_ through \_\_\_\_\_ of the [abbreviated patent number] patent contain [[means-plus-function] [step-plus-function]] clauses. To show infringement, [the Plaintiff] must prove that it is more likely than not that the [[part of the Defendant's product] [step in the Defendant's method]] that performs the function of “\_\_\_\_\_” is identical to, or equivalent to, the [[structure] [step]] described in the specification for performing the identical function.

In deciding whether [the Plaintiff] has proven that [the Defendant]’s [[product] [method]] includes structure covered by a [[means-plus-function] [step-plus-function]] requirement, you must first decide whether the [[product] [method]] has any [[structure] [step]] 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 Defendant]’s accused [[product] [method]] performs the claimed function, you must next identify the [[structure] [step]] in [the Defendant]’s [accused product] that perform[s] this function. After identifying that [[structure] [step]], you must then determine whether [the Plaintiff] has shown that that [[structure] [step]] is either identical to, or equivalent to, any [[structure] [step]] disclosed in the patent specification for performing the function of “\_\_\_\_\_.” If they are the same or equivalent, the [[means-plus-function] [step-plus-function]] requirement is satisfied by that [[structure] [step]] of the [accused product]. If all the other requirements of the claim are satisfied by structures found in the [accused product], the [accused product] infringes the claim.

Whether the [[structure] [step]] of the accused product is equivalent to a [[structure] [step]] described in the patent specification is decided from the perspective of a person of ordinary skill in the art. If a person of ordinary skill in the art would consider the differences between the [[structure] [step]] found in [the Defendant]’s product and a [[structure] [step]] described in the patent specification to be insubstantial, the [[structures] [steps]] are equivalent.

35 U.S.C. § 112; *Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Med., Inc.*, 296 F.3d 1106, 1113-14 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Asyst Tech, Inc. v. Empak, Inc.*, 268 F.3d 1364, 1369-70 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Ishida Co. v. Taylor*, 221 F.3d 1310, 1316-17 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Odetics, Inc. v. Storage Tech. Corp.*, 185 F.3d 1259, 1266-68 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *Al-Site Corp. v. VSI Int’l, Inc.*, 174 F.3d 1308, 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *Seal-Flex, Inc. v. Athletic Track & Court Const.*, 172 F.3d 836, 843-44 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *Chiuminatta Concrete Concepts, Inc. v. Cardinal Indus., Inc.*, 145 F.3d 1303, 1307-09 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *Carroll Touch, Inc. v. Electro Mech. Sys., Inc.*, 15 F.3d 1573, 1578 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *Rite-Hite Corp. v. Kelley Co.*, 819 F.2d 1120, 1123-25 (Fed. Cir. 1987); *Texas Instruments, Inc. v. U.S. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 805 F.2d 1558, 1562 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

### 3.6 Infringement of Dependent Claims

There are two different types of claims in the patent. One type of claim is called an independent claim. The other type of claim is called a dependent claim.

An independent claim is a claim that does not refer to any other claim of the patent. An independent claim must be read separately from the other claims to determine the scope of the claim.

A dependent claim is a claim that refers to at least one other claim in the patent. A dependent claim incorporates all of the elements of the claim to which the dependent claim refers, as well as the elements recited in the dependent claim itself.

For example, [Independent Claim] is an independent claim and recites several elements. [Dependent Claim] is a dependent claim that refers to [Independent Claim] and includes an additional element. [IDENTIFY THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN [Independent Claim] AND [Dependent Claim]]. [Dependent Claim] requires each of the elements of [Independent Claim], as well as the additional elements identified in [Dependent Claim] itself.

To establish literal infringement of [Dependent Claim], [the Plaintiff] must show that it is more likely than not that the [the Defendant]'s [[product] [method]] includes each and every element of [Dependent Claim].

If you find that the [Independent Claim] from which [Dependent Claim] depends is not literally infringed, then you cannot find that [Dependent Claim] is literally infringed.

*Wolverine World Wide v. Nike Inc.*, 38 F.3d 1192, 1196-99 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (citing *Johnston v. IVAC Corp.*, 885 F.2d 1574, 1577-89 (Fed. Cir. 1989)); *Wilson Sporting Goods v. David Geoffrey & Assocs.*, 904 F.2d 677, 685-86 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *Wahpeton Canvas Co., Inc. v. Frontier, Inc.*, 870 F.2d 1546, 1552-53 nn.9&10 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *Shatterproof Glass Corp. v. Libbey-Owens Ford Co.*, 758 F.2d 613, 626 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

### 3.7 Infringement of Open Ended or “Comprising” Claims

The preamble to claim \_\_\_\_\_ uses the phrase [RECITE THE PREAMBLE “\_\_\_\_\_ comprising”]. The word “comprising” means “including the following but not excluding others.”

If you find that [the Defendant]'s [[product] [method]] includes all of the elements in claim \_\_\_\_\_, the fact that [the Defendant]'s [[product] [method]] might include additional [[components] [method steps]] would not avoid literal infringement of a claim that uses “comprising” language.

*Invitrogen Corp. v. Biocrest Mfg. LP*, 327 F.3d 1364, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *AFG Indus. v. Cardinal IG Co.*, 239 F.3d 1239, 1244-45 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Moleculon Research Corp. v. CBS, Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1261, 1271 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *AB Dick Co. v. Burroughs Corp.*, 713 F.2d 700, 703 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

### **3.8 Infringement by Supply of all or a Substantial Portion of the Components of a Patented Invention to Another Country (271(f)(1))**

[Plaintiff] asserts that [Defendant] infringed the [abbreviated patent number] patent by supplying [or causing to be supplied] all or a substantial portion of the components of the patented [product] [method] from the United States to another country and actively inducing [the assembly of those components into a product] [use of the components in a method] that would infringe the [abbreviated patent number] patent if they had been [assembled ][used] in the United States.

To show infringement under Section 271(f)(1), [the Plaintiff] must prove that it is more likely than not that (1) the [product] [method], as it was intended to be [assembled] [used] outside the United States, [included][would have included] all limitations of at least one of claims \_\_\_\_ of the [abbreviated patent number] patent, (2) [Defendant] supplied [or caused to be supplied] components from the United States that made up all or a substantial portion of the invention of any one of claims \_\_\_\_\_ of the [abbreviated patent number] patent, and (3) [Defendant] specifically intended to induce [the combination of the components into a product] [use of the components in a way] that would infringe the [abbreviated patent number] patent if the components had been combined in the United States.

35 U.S.C. § 271(f)(1); *Microsoft Corp. v. AT&T Corp.*, 127 S.Ct. 1746, 1757-58 (2007); *Minn. Mining & Mfg. Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1304-05 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

### **3.9 Infringement by Supply of Components Especially Made or Adapted for Use in the Patented Invention to Another Country (271(f)(2))**

[Plaintiff] asserts that [Defendant] infringed the [abbreviated patent number] patent by supplying [or causing to be supplied] [a component][components] of an invention covered by at least one claim of the [abbreviated patent number] patent from the United States to a foreign country, where the exported component[s] [was][were] especially made or especially adapted for use in an invention covered by the [abbreviated patent number] patent and [has][have] no substantial non-infringing use, and where [Defendant] knew the component[s] [was][were] especially made or adapted for use in the patented invention and intended for the component[s] to be combined in a way that would have infringed the [abbreviated patent number] patent if the combination had occurred in the United States.

To show infringement under Section 271(f)(2), [the Plaintiff] must prove that it is more likely than not that the (1) [Defendant] actually supplied the components from the

United States to a foreign country or caused them to be supplied from the United States to a foreign country, (2) [Defendant] knew or should have known that the components were especially made or adapted for use in a [product] [method] that infringes the [abbreviated patent number] patent, (3) those components have no substantial non-infringing use, and (4) [Defendant] intended for the components to be combined into that [product] [method]. It is not necessary for you to find that the components actually were combined into an infringing [product] [method], as long as you find that [Defendant] intended the components to be combined into a [product][method] that would have infringed the [abbreviated patent number] patent if they had been combined in the United States.

35 U.S.C. § 271(f)(2); *Microsoft Corp. v. AT&T Corp.*, 127 S.Ct. 1746 (2007); *Waymark Corp. v. Porta Systems Corp.*, 245 F.3d 1364, 1367-69 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Rotec Indus., Inc. v. Mitsubishi Corp.*, 215 F.3d 1246, 1257-58 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

### **3.10 Infringement by Import, Sale, Offer for Sale or Use of Product Made Outside United States by Patented Process (271(g))**

[Plaintiff] asserts that [Defendant] infringed the [abbreviated patent number] patent by [importing][selling][offering for sale][using] a product that was made outside the United States by a process covered by one or more claims of the [abbreviated patent number] patent.

To show infringement under Section 271(g), [the Plaintiff] must prove that it is more likely than not that the (1) [Defendant] [imported][sold][offered for sale][used] a product that was made outside the United States by a process that includes all steps of at least one claim of the [abbreviated patent number] patent, (2) the product was made between [issue date of patent] and [expiration date of patent][date of trial], (3) [Defendant] [imported][sold][offered for sale][used] the product between [issue date of patent] and [expiration date of patent][date of trial].

It is up to you to use your own judgment, based on the evidence presented at trial, to decide whether the product was “made by” the patented process. However, I am instructing you that you should find that the product was not “made by” by the patented process if you find that either (a) the product was materially changed by later processes, or (b) the product is only a trivial or non-essential part of another product.<sup>3</sup>

35 U.S.C. § 271(g); *Mycogen Plant Sci., Inc. v. Monsanto Co.*, 252 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Biotec Biologische Naturvenpackungen GmbH v. BioCorp., Inc.*, 249 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Eli Lilly & Co. v. American Cyanamid Co.*, 82 F.3d 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Bio-Technology Gen. Corp. v. Genentech, Inc.*, 80 F.3d 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

---

<sup>3</sup> In cases where the patentee is unable to determine the process by which the product at issue is made, and the prerequisites of 35 U.S.C. § 295 are satisfied, the presumption of Section 295 may also need to be included in this instruction, requiring the accused infringer to rebut a presumption that the product was made by the patented process.

### **3.11 Direct Infringement – Infringement Under the Doctrine of Equivalents**

If you decide that [the Defendant]’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]] can infringe 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 [[part] [step]] 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 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. 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. The same [[element] [method step]] of the accused [[product] [method]] may satisfy more than one element of a claim.

*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); *Johnson & Johnston Assoc. v. R.E. Service Co.*, 285 F.3d 1046, 1053-54 (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).

### **3.12 Limitations on the Doctrine of Equivalents – Prior Art**

You may not find that a component in [the Defendant]’s [[product] [method]] is equivalent to an element of the patent claim if by doing so the patent claim would cover [[products] [methods]] that were already in the prior art.

*Conroy v. Reebok Int’l, Ltd.*, 14 F.3d 1570, 1576-77 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *Wilson Sporting Goods Co. v. David Geoffrey & Assocs.*, 904 F.2d 677 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

### **3.13 Limitations on the Doctrine of Equivalents – Prosecution History Estoppel**

You are instructed that the doctrine of equivalents is limited by what is called “prosecution history estoppel.” As you have already heard, during prosecution of the patent, the patent applicant often makes arguments and amendments in an attempt to convince the PTO examiner to grant the patent. The party seeking to obtain a patent may amend his patent claims or submit arguments in order to define or narrow the meaning of the claims to obtain the patent. Once it has done so, it is not entitled to patent coverage under the doctrine of equivalents that would be so broad that it would cover the same feature that was used to distinguish the invention during the prosecution of the patent.

In this case, you are instructed that prosecution history estoppel applies and the doctrine of equivalents analysis cannot be applied to the following elements of the asserted claims:

[LIST ELEMENTS ON A CLAIM BY CLAIM BASIS]

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

[THE ABOVE INSTRUCTION ASSUMES PROSECUTION HISTORY ESTOPPEL APPLIES, THAT THE AMENDMENT WAS MADE FOR REASONS RELATED TO PATENTABILITY, AND THAT THE COURT HAS DETERMINED THAT THE PRESUMPTION OF SURRENDER OF EQUIVALENTS HAS NOT BEEN REBUTTED].

*Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.*, 535 U.S. 722 (2002); *Warner-Jenkinson Co. v. Hilton Davis Chem. Co.*, 520 U.S. 17, 30-34 (1997); *Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.*, 344 F.3d 1359, 1366-67 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (en banc).

### **3.14 Limitations on the Doctrine of Equivalents – Subject Matter Dedicated to the Public**

When a patent discloses subject matter but does not claim it, the patentee has dedicated that unclaimed subject matter to the public. If you find that [the patent] discloses, but does not claim, subject matter alleged to be equivalent to an element of the patent claim, then you cannot find that the [[component] [step]] alleged to be equivalent in [the Defendant's] [[product] [method]] is equivalent to that element of the patent claim. This is true even if the failure to claim the subject matter was wholly unintentional.

*Pfizer, Inc. v. Teva Pharms., USA, Inc.*, 429 F.3d 1364, 1378-79 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *Toro Co. v. White Consol. Indus., Inc.*, 383 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Johnson & Johnston Assocs. Inc. v. R.E. Serv. Co.*, 285 F.3d 1046, 1054-55 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (en banc).

#### **4. Summary of Invalidity Defense**

[The Defendant] contends that the asserted claim[s] of the patent[s]-in-suit are invalid. [The Defendant] must prove by clear and convincing evidence that each claim is invalid.

Claims of an issued patent may be found to be invalid. Thus, you must determine whether each of [the Plaintiff's] claims is invalid.

[The Defendant] contends that all of the asserted patent claims are invalid for the following reasons:

[Insert invalidity contentions]

I will now instruct you in more detail why [the Defendant] alleges that the asserted claim[s] of the [abbreviated patent numbers] is/are invalid.

#### **5. Prior Art Defined**

Prior art includes any of the following items received into evidence during trial:

1. any [product] [method] that was publicly known or used by others in the United States before the patented invention was made;
2. patents that issued more than one year before the filing date of the patent, or before the invention was made;
3. publications having a date more than one year before the filing date of the patent, or before the invention was made;
4. any [product] [method] that was in public use or on sale in the United States more than one year before the patent was filed;
5. any [product] [method] that was made by anyone before the named inventors created the patented [product] [method] where the [product] [method] was not abandoned, suppressed, or concealed.

[ADD ANY ADDITIONAL TYPES OF PRIOR ART]

In this case, [the Defendant] contends that the following items are prior art:  
[identify prior art by name]

35 U.S.C. § 102.

## Anticipation

### 6.0 Anticipation

A person cannot obtain a patent if someone else already has made an identical invention. Simply put, the invention must be new. An invention that is not new or novel is said to be “anticipated by the prior art.” Under the U.S. patent laws, an invention that is “anticipated” is not entitled to patent protection. To prove anticipation, [the Defendant] must prove with clear and convincing evidence that the claimed invention is not new.

In this case, [the Defendant] contends that the claims of the [abbreviated patent number] patent are anticipated. [DESCRIBE BRIEFLY EACH BASIS FOR THE DEFENDANT'S INVALIDITY DEFENSE, FOR EXAMPLE: “First, [the Defendant] contends that the invention of claims 1, 2, and 3 of the \_\_\_\_ patent was described in the July, 1983 article published by Jones in THE JOURNAL OF ENDOCRINOLOGY.”]

To anticipate a claim, each and every element in the claim must be present in a single item of prior art. You may not combine two or more items of prior art to prove anticipation. In determining whether every one of the elements of the claimed invention is found in the prior [[publication] [patent] [etc.]], you should take into account what a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood from his or her examination of the particular [[publication] [patent] [etc.]].

In determining whether the single item of prior art anticipates a patent claim, you should take into consideration not only what is expressly disclosed in the particular item of prior [[publication] [invention] [etc.]], but also what inherently resulted from its practice. This is called “inherency.” A party claiming inherency must prove it by clear and convincing evidence. To establish inherency, the evidence must make clear that the prior art either necessarily resulted in the missing descriptive matter and that it would be so recognized by a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the patent application was filed. It is not required, however, that the person of ordinary skill would have recognized the inherent disclosure. Thus, the prior use of the patented invention that was unrecognized and unappreciated can still be an invalidating anticipation.

You must keep these requirements in mind and apply them to each kind of anticipation you consider in this case. There are additional requirements that apply to the particular categories of anticipation that [the Defendant] contends apply in this case. I will now instruct you about those.

*Toro Co. v. Deere & Co.*, 355 F.3d 1313, 1320-1321 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharms., Inc.*, 339 F.3d 1373, 1377-1378 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *Atlas Powder Co. v. IRECO Inc.*, 190 F.3d 1342, 1346-1347 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *Glaverbel Societe Anonyme v. Northlake Mktg. & Supply, Inc.*, 45 F.3d 1550, 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *Minn. Mining & Mfg. Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Orthopaedics, Inc.*, 976 F.2d 1559, 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *Cont'l Can Co. USA v.*

*Monsanto Co.*, 948 F.2d 1264, 1267-1269 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Buildex, Inc. v. Kason Indus., Inc.*, 849 F.2d 1461, 1463 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

### **6.1 Prior Public Knowledge**

[The Defendant] contends that claim \_\_\_\_\_ of the [abbreviated patent number] patent was anticipated because the invention defined in that claim was publicly known by others in the United States before it was invented by the inventor(s).

[IF THERE IS A FACTUAL ISSUE TO BE RESOLVED BY THE JURY AS TO THE DATE OF INVENTION OF THE PATENT CLAIMS IN SUIT, THE JURY SHOULD BE INSTRUCTED HERE AS TO HOW THEY SHOULD DETERMINE THAT DATE OF INVENTION. OTHERWISE, THE COURT SHOULD INSTRUCT THE JURY AS FOLLOWS: “You are instructed that the invention defined by claim \_\_\_\_ of the [abbreviated patent number] patent was invented on [invention date].”]

A patent claim is invalid if the invention defined in that claim was publicly known by others in the United States before it was invented by [the patentee].

35 U.S.C. § 102(a); *Ecolochem, Inc. v. Southern Cal. Edison Co.*, 227 F.3d 1361, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Woodland Trust v. Flowertree Nursery*, 148 F.3d 1368, 1370 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

### **6.2 Prior Public Use**

[The Defendant] contends that claim \_\_\_\_\_ of the [abbreviated patent number] patent was anticipated because the invention defined in that claim [was publicly used by others in the United States before it was invented by [the patentee]] [was publicly used in the United States more than one year before [the patentee] filed his patent application on [effective filing date]].

[IF THERE IS A FACTUAL ISSUE TO BE RESOLVED BY THE JURY AS TO THE DATE OF INVENTION OF THE PATENT CLAIMS IN SUIT, THE JURY SHOULD BE INSTRUCTED HERE AS TO HOW THEY SHOULD DETERMINE THAT DATE OF INVENTION. OTHERWISE, THE COURT SHOULD INSTRUCT THE JURY AS FOLLOWS: “You are instructed that the invention defined by claim \_\_\_\_ of the [abbreviated patent number] patent was invented on [invention date].”]

A patent claim is invalid if the invention defined in that claim [was publicly used by a person other than [the patentee] in the United States before it was invented by [the patentee]] [was publicly used by anyone in the United States more than one year before the effective filing date of [the patentee's] patent application]. An invention is publicly used if it is used by the inventor or by a person who is not under any limitation, restriction, or obligation of secrecy to the inventor. The absence of affirmative steps to conceal is evidence of a public use. However, secret use by a third party is not public. If the public use was an experimental use performed in order to bring the invention to perfection or to determine if the invention was capable of performing its intended purpose then such a use does not invalidate the claim.

35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b); *SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.*, 365 F.3d 1306, 1316-20 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Netscape Commc'ns Corp. v. Konrad*, 295 F.3d 1315, 1320-23 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prods. Co.*, 840 F.2d 902, 906 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *Moleculon Research Corp. v. CBS, Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1261, 1265-67 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Kinzenbaw v. Deere & Co.*, 741 F.2d 383, 390-91 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *TP Lab., Inc. v. Prof'l Positioners, Inc.*, 724 F.2d 965, 970-72 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *WL Gore & Assocs., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1549-50 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Smith*, 714 F.2d 1127, 1134-37 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

### 6.3 On Sale Bar

[The Defendant] contends that claim \_\_\_\_\_ of the [abbreviated patent number] patent was anticipated because the invention defined in that claim was on sale in the United States more than one year before [the patentee] filed his U.S. patent application on [U.S. filing date].

A patent claim is invalid if an embodiment of the claimed invention was both (1) subject to commercial offer for sale in the United States; and (2) ready for patenting more than one year before the patent application date.

An invention was “on sale” if the claimed invention was embodied in the thing sold or commercially offered for sale. It is not required that a sale was actually made. The essential question is whether or not there was an attempt to obtain commercial benefit from the invention.

In order to be on sale, the invention must have been ready for patenting at the time of the alleged offer for sale is made.<sup>3</sup> An invention is ready for patenting either when it is reduced to practice or when the inventor has prepared drawings or other descriptions of the invention sufficient to allow a person of ordinary skill in the art to make or use the invention. The claimed invention is ready for patenting when there is reason to believe it would work for its intended purpose.

35 U.S.C. § 102; *Pfaff v. Wells Elecs.*, 525 U.S. 55, 67-68 (1998); *Allen Eng'g Corp. v. Bartell Indus., Inc.*, 299 F.3d 1336, 1352-55 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Linear Tech. Corp. v. Micrel, Inc.*, 275 F.3d 1040, 1047-54 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Group One, Ltd. v. Hallmark Cards, Inc.*, 254 F.3d 1041, 1045-49 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

---

<sup>3</sup> The instruction in this sentence was held to be erroneous in *August Technology Corp. v. Camtek, Ltd.*, Fed. Cir., No. 2010-1458, 8/22/2010. According to the Court, it is error to instruct a jury that, in order to be “on sale,” the patented device must also have been ready for patenting “at the time the alleged offer for sale is made.” Although the Supreme Court in *Pfaff v. Wells Elecs.*, 525 U.S. 55 (1998), said the invention must be ready for patenting prior to the critical date, Judge Kimberly Moore explained, *Pfaff* did not require the invention to be ready for patenting at the time of the offer. The Court pointed out that “there is no offer for sale until such time as the invention is conceived.”

## 6.4 Experimental Use

[The Plaintiff] contends that \_\_\_\_\_ should not be considered [[a prior public use of the invention] [placing the invention on sale]] because that [[use] [sale]] was experimental. The law recognizes that the inventor must be given the opportunity to develop the invention through experimentation. Certain activities are experimental if they are a legitimate effort to perfect the invention or to determine if the invention will work for its intended purpose. So long as the primary purpose is experimentation, it does not matter that the public used the invention or that the inventor incidentally derived profit from it. If you find that [the Defendant] has shown a [[prior public use] [prior sale]] by clear and convincing evidence, then the burden is on [the Plaintiff] to come forward with evidence showing that the purpose of [the prior public use] [prior sale]] was experimental.

Only experimentation by or under the control of the inventor of the patent [or his assignee] qualifies for this exception. Experimentation by [third party], for its own purposes, does not. The experimentation must relate to the features of the claimed invention, and it must be for the purpose of technological improvement, not commercial exploitation. If any commercial exploitation does occur, it must be merely incidental to the primary purpose of experimentation. A test done primarily for marketing, and only incidentally for technological improvement, is not an experimental use, but a public use.

*City of Elizabeth v. Am. Nicholson Pavement Co.*, 97 U.S. 126, 134-35 (1877); *Allen Eng'g Corp. v. Bartell Indus., Inc.*, 299 F.3d 1336, 1353-55 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *LaBounty Mfg., Inc. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n*, 958 F.2d 1066, 1071-72 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *Manville Sales Corp. v. Paramount Sys., Inc.*, 917 F.2d 544, 549-51 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *U.S. Envtl. Prods. Inc. v. Westall*, 911 F.2d 713, 716 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *In re Hamilton*, 882 F.2d 1576, 1580-83 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prods. Co.*, 840 F.2d 902, 906 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *Hycor Corp. v. Schlueter Co.*, 740 F.2d 1529, 1535-37 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *Pennwalt Corp. v. Akzona Inc.*, 740 F.2d 1573, 1580-81 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *TP Labs., Inc. v. Prof'l Positioners, Inc.*, 724 F.2d 965, 972-73 (Fed. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 826 (1984); *DL Auld Co. v. Chroma Graphics Corp.*, 714 F.2d 1144, 1149-50 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Smith*, 714 F.2d 1127, 1134-37 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Theis*, 610 F.2d 786, 792-93 (C.C.P.A. 1979).

## 6.5 Printed Publication

[The Defendant] contends that claim \_\_\_\_\_ of the [abbreviated patent number] patent was anticipated because the invention defined in that claim was described in a printed publication [more than one year before [[[the patentee] filed the U.S. patent application on [U.S. filing date]]] [[the patentee] invented the invention]].

A patent claim is invalid if the invention defined by that claim was described in a printed publication [[before it was invented by [the patentee]] [more than one year prior to the filing date of the U.S. application]].

A printed publication must be reasonably accessible to those members of the public who would be interested in its contents. It is not necessary that the printed publication be available to every member of the public. The information must, however, have been maintained in some form, such as [[printed pages] [typewritten pages] [magnetic tape] [microfilm] [photographs] [photocopies]]. An issued patent is a printed publication. A published patent application is a printed publication as of its publication date.

For a printed publication to anticipate a patent claim, it must, when read by a person of ordinary skill in the art, expressly or inherently disclose each element of the claimed invention to the reader. The disclosure must be complete enough to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to practice the invention without undue experimentation. In determining whether the disclosure is enabling, you should take into account what would have been within the knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the art [[one year before the application for the [abbreviated patent number] patent was filed] [at the time the invention of the [abbreviated patent number] patent was made]], and you may consider evidence that sheds light on the knowledge such a person would have had.

35 U.S.C. § 102; *In re Carol F. Klopfenstein*, 380 F.3d 1345, 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Glaverbel Societe Anonyme v. Northlake Mktg. & Supply, Inc.*, 45 F.3d 1550, 1554-55 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565, 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.*, 848 F.2d 1560, 1568-69 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n*, 808 F.2d 1471, 1479 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *In re Hall*, 781 F.2d 897, 898-899 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 533-34 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Studiengesellschaft Kohle mbH v. Dart Indus., Inc.*, 726 F.2d 724, 727 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *In re Wyer*, 655 F.2d 221, 227 (C.C.P.A. 1981); *In re Donohue*, 632 F.2d 123, 125-126 (C.C.P.A. 1980); *In re Samour*, 571 F.2d 559, 562 (C.C.P.A. 1978); *In re Coker*, 463 F.2d 1344, 1348 (C.C.P.A. 1972); *Deep Welding, Inc. v. Sciaky Bros., Inc.*, 417 F.2d 1227, 1235 (7th Cir. 1969); *In re Foster*, 343 F.2d 980, 984-985 (C.C.P.A. 1965).

## 6.6 Prior Invention<sup>4</sup>

[The Defendant] contends that claim \_\_\_\_\_ of the [abbreviated patent number] patent was anticipated because the invention defined in that claim was invented by another person, [third party], before [the patentee] invented his invention.

A patent claim is invalid if the invention defined by that claim was invented by another person in the United States before it was invented by the patentee[, and that other person did not abandon, suppress, or conceal the invention].

---

<sup>4</sup> In cases where priority of invention is an issue to be submitted to the jury, further instructions will be required. For example, the jury will need to consider not only the dates when the respective inventions were conceived, but also when the inventions were reduced to practice. An inventor who claims to be the first to conceive of a prior invention but was the last to reduce to practice must also show reasonable diligence from a time just before the other party entered the field until his own reduction to practice in order for the "prior invention" to anticipate the claimed invention in suit.

[The Defendant] must show by clear and convincing evidence *either* that before [the patentee] invented his invention, [third party] reduced to practice a [[product] [method]] that included all of the elements of claim \_\_\_\_ of the [abbreviated patent number] patent or that [third party] was first to conceive the invention and that he exercised reasonable diligence in later reducing the invention to practice. In addition, [the Defendant] must show that [third party]'s device was sufficiently developed that one skilled in the art would have recognized that it would work for its intended purpose.

[If the prior invention was abandoned, suppressed, or concealed, it does not anticipate the [abbreviated patent number] patent. However, it is not necessary that [the patentee] had knowledge of that prior invention.<sup>5</sup>

Generally, an invention was not abandoned, suppressed, or concealed if the invention was made public, sold, or offered for sale, or otherwise used for a commercial purpose. A period of delay does not constitute abandonment, suppression, or concealment if the prior inventor was engaged in reasonable efforts to bring the invention to market.]

35 U.S.C. § 102; *Rosco, Inc. v. Mirror Lite Co.*, 304 F.3d 1373, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Sci., Inc.*, 261 F.3d 1356, 1361-63 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Apotex USA, Inc. v. Merck & Co.*, 254 F.3d 1031, 1035-40 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 1436-37 (Fed. Cir.1988); *Kimberly-Clark Corp. v. Johnson & Johnson*, 745 F.2d 1437, 1444-46 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

## 6.7 Prior Patent

[The Defendant] contends that claim \_\_\_\_\_ of the [abbreviated patent number] patent was anticipated because the invention defined in that claim was patented by [third party] [[before it was invented by [the patentee]] [more than one year before [the patentee] filed his United States patent application on [U.S. filing date]]].

A patent claim is invalid if the invention defined by that claim was patented in the United States or a foreign country [[before it was invented by [the patentee]] [more than one year before [the patentee] filed his United States patent application]].

To show anticipation of the patented invention, [the Defendant] must show by clear and convincing evidence that before [critical date], [third party] patented an invention that included all of the elements of claim \_\_\_\_\_ of the [abbreviated patent number] patent.

35 U.S.C. § 102; *In re Monks*, 588 F.2d 308, 309 (C.C.P.A. 1978); *In re Fuge*, 272 F.2d 954, 956 (C.C.P.A. 1959); *In re Ekenstam*, 256 F.2d 321, 323-24 (C.C.P.A. 1958); *Bendix Corp. v. Balax, Inc.*, 421 F.2d 809, 811-12 (7th Cir. 1970).

---

<sup>5</sup> If abandonment, suppression or concealment are at issue in the case, these terms should be defined for the jury. See *Checkpoint Sys., Inc. v. United States Int'l Trade Comm'n*, 54 F.3d 756, 761-62 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *Dow Chem. Co. v. Astro-Valcour Inc.*, 267 F.3d 1334, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

## 6.8 Prior U.S. Application

[The Defendant] contends that claim \_\_\_\_\_ of the [abbreviated patent number] patent was anticipated because the invention defined in that claim was described in United States patent [anticipating patent number], and because the application for the [anticipating patent] was filed before [the patentee] made his invention.

A claim of the [abbreviated patent number] patent would be invalid if the invention defined by that claim was described in a United States patent issued on a patent application filed by another person before the invention was made by [the patentee].

To show anticipation of the patented invention, [the Defendant] must show by clear and convincing evidence that the application for the [anticipating patent number] patent described each and every element of claim \_\_\_\_\_ of the [abbreviated patent number] patent and that the specification, claims, and/or drawings of the application for the [anticipating patent number] patent was filed before the date of invention of the [abbreviated patent number] patent.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e); *Sun Studs, Inc. v. ATA Equip. Leasing, Inc.*, 872 F.2d 978, 983-84 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *In re Wertheim*, 646 F.2d 527, 536-37 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

## Obviousness

### 7.0 Obviousness

[The Defendant] contends that claim(s) [numbers] of the [abbreviated patent number] patent are invalid because the claimed invention(s) is “obvious.”

A claimed invention is invalid as “obvious” if it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of the claimed invention at the time the invention was made. Unlike anticipation, which allows consideration of only one item of prior art, obviousness may be shown by considering more than one item of prior art.

The following factors must be evaluated to determine whether [the Defendant] has established that the claimed inventions are obvious:

1. the scope and content of the prior art relied upon by [the Defendant];
2. the difference or differences, if any, between each claim of the [abbreviated patent number] patent that [the Defendant] contends is obvious and the prior art;
3. the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention of the [abbreviated patent number] patent was made; and

4. additional considerations, if any, that indicate that the invention was obvious or not obvious.

Each of these factors must be evaluated, although they may be analyzed in any order, and you must perform a separate analysis for each of the claims.

[The Defendant] must prove obviousness by clear and convincing evidence.

I will now explain each of the four factors in more detail.

*KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740-41 (2007); *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966); *Leapfrog Enters., Inc. v. Fisher-Price, Inc.*, 485 F.3d 1157, 1161-62 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.*, 234 F.3d 654, 662-63 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Arkies Lures, Inc. v. Gene Larew Tackle, Inc.*, 119 F.3d 953, 955 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Ryko Mfg. Co. v. Nu-Star, Inc.*, 950 F.2d 714, 716 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Nutrition 21 v. U.S.*, 930 F.2d 867, 871 n.2 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Newell Cos. v. Kenney Mfg. Co.*, 864 F.2d 757, 764 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co.*, 749 F.2d 707, 718-19 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *Orthopedic Equip. Co. v. All Orthopedic Appliances, Inc.*, 707 F.2d 1376, 1382-83 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 1538-40 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

### **7.1 Scope and Content of the Prior Art**

The prior art that you considered previously for anticipation purposes is also prior art for obviousness purposes. The prior art includes the following items received into evidence during the trial:

[LIST PRIOR ART STIPULATED TO BY THE PARTIES].

[IF PARTIES DISPUTE THE PRIOR ART, USE THE FOLLOWING]. You must determine what is the prior art that may be considered in determining whether the [abbreviated patent number] patent is obvious. A prior art reference may be considered if it discloses information designed to solve the same problem(s) faced by the inventor(s) or if the reference discloses information that has obvious uses beyond its main purpose that a person of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably examine to solve the same problem(s) faced by the inventor(s).

*KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1742 (2007); *Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.*, 234 F.3d 654, 664-65 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Wang Labs., Inc. v. Toshiba Corp.*, 993 F.2d 858, 864 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Clay*, 966 F.2d 656, 658-59 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Wood*, 599 F.2d 1032, 1036-37 (C.C.P.A. 1979).

[ADD INSTRUCTIONS ON PRIOR ART CONTENTIONS, E.G., PUBLICATION AND ON-SALE BAR]

### **7.2 Differences Between the Claimed Invention and the Prior Art**

You should analyze whether there are any relevant differences between the prior art and the claimed invention from the view of a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Your analysis must determine the impact, if any, of such differences on the obviousness or nonobviousness of the invention as a whole, and not merely some portion of it.

In analyzing the relevance of the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art, you do not need to look for precise teaching in the prior art directed to the subject matter of the claimed invention. You may take into account the inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have employed in reviewing the prior art at the time of the invention. For example, if the claimed invention combined elements known in the prior art and the combination yielded results that were predictable to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, then this evidence would make it more likely that the claim was obvious. On the other hand, if the combination of known elements yielded unexpected or unpredictable results, or if the prior art teaches away from combining the known elements, then this evidence would make it more likely that the claim that successfully combined those elements was not obvious.

Importantly, a claim is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of the elements was independently known in the prior art. Most, if not all, inventions rely on building blocks long since uncovered, and claimed discoveries almost of necessity will likely be combinations of what is already known. Therefore, you should consider whether a reason existed at the time of the invention that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the art in the relevant field to combine the known elements in the way the claimed invention does. The reason could come from the prior art, the background knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, the nature of the problem to be solved, market demand, or common sense.

If you find that a reason existed at the time of the invention to combine the elements of the prior art to arrive at the claimed invention, this evidence would make it more likely that the claimed invention was obvious.

Again, you must undertake this analysis separately for each claim that [the Defendant] contends is obvious.

*KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1742-43 (2007); *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966); *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 1536-37 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Medtronic, Inc., v. Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1563, 1567-68 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

### **7.3 Level of Ordinary Skill**

The determination of whether a claimed invention is obvious is based on the perspective of a person of ordinary skill in the [pertinent art field]. The person of ordinary skill is presumed to know all prior art that you have determined to be reasonably

relevant. The person of ordinary skill is also a person of ordinary creativity that can use common sense to solve problems.

[IF THE PARTIES HAVE AGREED TO THE LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART, THEN THE INSTRUCTION SHOULD INCLUDE: “[The Plaintiff] and [the Defendant] contend that the level of ordinary skill in the art is [insert proposal].”

[IF THE PARTIES HAVE NOT AGREED TO THE LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART, THEN THE INSTRUCTION SHOULD CONTINUE AS FOLLOWS].

When determining the level of ordinary skill in the art, you should consider all the evidence submitted by the parties, including evidence of:

- the level of education and experience of persons actively working in the field at the time of the invention, including the inventor;
- the types of problems encountered in the art at the time of the invention; and
- the sophistication of the technology in the art at the time of the invention, including the rapidity with which innovations were made in the art at the time of the invention.

*KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1742-43 (2007); *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966); *Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.*, 234 F.3d 654, 666-67 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Envtl Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co.*, 713 F.2d 693, 696-97 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

#### **7.4 Factors Indicating Nonobviousness**

Before deciding the issue of obviousness, you must also consider certain factors, which, if established, may indicate that the invention would not have been obvious. No factor alone is dispositive, and you must consider the obviousness or nonobviousness of the invention as a whole.

[USE ONLY THOSE INSTRUCTIONS THAT ARE APPROPRIATE.]

1. Were products covered by the claim commercially successful due to the merits of the claimed invention rather than due to advertising, promotion, salesmanship, or features of the product other than those found in the claim?
2. Was there long felt need for a solution to the problem facing the inventors, which was satisfied by the claimed invention?

3. Did others try, but fail, to solve the problem solved by the claimed invention?
4. Did others copy the claimed invention?
5. Did the claimed invention achieve unexpectedly superior results over the closest prior art?
6. Did others in the field, or [the Defendant] praise the claimed invention or express surprise at the making of the claimed invention?
7. Did others accept licenses under [abbreviated patent number] patent because of the merits of the claimed invention?

Answering any, or all, of these questions “yes” may suggest that the claim was not obvious.

*Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966); *United States v. Adams*, 383 U.S. 39, 52 (1966); *Perkin-Elmer Corp. v. Computervision Corp.*, 732 F.2d 888, 894-95 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *Envtl. Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co.*, 713 F.2d 693, 697 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *WL Gore & Assocs., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1555-56 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Stratoflex, Inc., v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 1538-39 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

## **8. Enablement**

The written description set forth in a patent must disclose sufficient information to enable or teach one skilled in the field of the invention to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention. This requirement is known as the enablement requirement. If a patent claim is not enabled, it is invalid.

A patent is enabling if its disclosure is sufficient to enable a person of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In considering whether the written description of a patent satisfies the enablement requirement, you must keep in mind that patents are written for persons of skill in the field of the invention. Thus, a patent need not expressly state information that skilled persons would be likely to know or could obtain. [The defendant] bears the burden of establishing lack of enablement by clear and convincing evidence.

[The defendant] contends that claim[s] \_\_\_\_ of the [abbreviated patent number] patent [is][are] invalid for lack of enablement. The fact that some experimentation may be required for a skilled person to practice the claimed invention does not mean that a patent's written description does not meet the enablement requirement. Factors that you may consider in determining whether the written description would require undue experimentation include: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary; (2) the amount of direction or guidance disclosed in the patent; (3) the presence or absence of working examples in the patent; (4) the nature of the invention; (5) the state of the prior art; (6) the

relative skill of those in the art; (7) the predictability of the art and (8) the breadth of the claims.

*Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.*, 481 F.3d 1371, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *AK Steel Corp. v. Sollac & Ugine*, 344 F.3d 1234, 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Durel Corp. v. Osram Sylvania Inc.*, 256 F.3d 1298, 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *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); *Nat'l Recovery Techs., Inc. v. Magnetic Separation Sys., Inc.*, 166 F.3d 1190, 1195-98 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Calgene, Inc.*, 188 F.3d 1362, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *Spectra-Physics, Inc. v. Coherent, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 1524, 1533 (Fed. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 954 (1987); *Hybritech Inc. v. Monolonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1384 (Fed. Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 480 U.S. 947 (1987); *Ralston Purina Co. v. Far-Mar Co.*, 772 F.2d 1570, 1573-74 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Lindmann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 1463 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *White Consolidated Indus., Inc. v. Vega Servo Control, Inc.*, 713 F.2d 788, 791 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

## 9. Written Description Requirement

A patent must contain a written description of the [product or process] claimed in the patent. The written description requirement helps to ensure that the patent applicant actually invented the claimed subject matter. To satisfy the written description requirement, the patent must describe each and every limitation of a patent claim, in sufficient detail, although the exact words found in the claim need not be used. The written description requirement is satisfied if a person of ordinary skill in the field reading the patent application as originally filed would recognize that the patent application described the invention as finally claimed in the patent. It is unnecessary to spell out every detail of the invention in the specification; only enough must be included to convince a person of skill in the art that the inventor possessed the full scope of the invention.

The [Defendant] contends that the claim[s] of the [abbreviated patent number] patent [is] [are] invalid for failure to satisfy the written description requirement. [The defendant] bears the burden of establishing lack of written description by clear and convincing evidence.

If you find that [the defendant] has proved that it is highly probable that the [abbreviated patent number] patent does not contain a written description of the invention covered by any of these claims, then you must find that the claim is invalid.

35 U.S.C. § 112; *Falko-Gunter Faulkner v. Inglis*, 448 F.3d 1357, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2006); *Kao Corp. v. Unilever U.S., Inc.*, 441 F.3d 963, 968 (Fed. Cir. 2006); *Monsanto Co. v. Scruggs*, 459 F.3d 1328, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006); *Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co., Inc.*, 358 F.3d 916, 922-928 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe Inc.*, 323 F.3d 956, 964 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (en banc); *Turbocare Div. of Demag Delaval*

*Turbomachinery Corp., v. General Elect. Co.*, 264 F.3d 1111, 1118 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Faulding Inc.*, 230 F.3d 1320, 1323-24 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Reiffin v. Microsoft Corp.*, 214 F.3d 1342, 1345-46 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Union Oil Co. of Cal. v. Atl. Richfield Co.*, 208 F.3d 989, 996-1001 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Gentry Gallery, Inc. v. Berklene Corp.*, 134 F.3d 1473, 1478-80 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 119 F.3d 1559, 1566-67 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Vas-Cath., Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1565-66 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re Ruschig*, 379 F. 2d 990, 995 (C.C.P.A. 1967).

## 10. Best Mode

The purpose of the best mode requirement is to ensure that the public obtains a full disclosure on how to practice the invention claimed in the patent. The inventor must disclose the best mode he or she knew at the time of filing for carrying out the invention as described in the claims. If an inventor knows of a best way or mode of making and using the claimed invention at the time the patent application was filed, then the written description must contain a description of that mode.

[The Defendant] has asserted that [the Plaintiff]'s patent is invalid for failure to satisfy the best mode requirement. [The Defendant] bears the burden of establishing failure to satisfy the best mode requirement by clear and convincing evidence.

To determine whether the inventor complied with the best mode requirements, two questions must be answered:

1. At the time the patent application was filed, did [the patentee] consider a particular mode for practicing his invention superior to all other modes?
2. If so, did [the patentee] adequately disclose the superior mode in the [abbreviated patent number] patent?

The first prong of the best mode inquiry focuses on the state of mind of the particular inventor and the knowledge he possessed at the time the application was filed. The first question is subjective.

For instance, a selection made for commercial expediency (such as the availability of certain materials, prior relationships with certain suppliers, and other routine manufacturing choices) may be the “best” decision in a manufacturing circumstance but may have been chosen by someone other than the inventor or may not be considered by the inventor to be the best mode of carrying out the invention. If the inventor contemplated a best mode before he filed the patent application and left it out of the application, an amendment after the filing will not cure an original omission of the best mode disclosure.

The one exception to the best mode requirement is that an inventor need not set forth “routine details” that would be apparent to one skilled in the art.

If the answer to the first question is “yes,” the second question of the analysis should be addressed. The second question, an objective inquiry, focuses on the scope of the patented invention and the level of skill in the field of the invention. The disclosure in the specification must be adequate to allow one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the best mode of the invention. Those skilled in the field of the invention should not have to look to the commercial embodiment in order to practice the best mode.

35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶1; *Liquid Dynamics Corp. v. Vaughan Co., Inc.*, 449 F.3d 1209, 1223 (Fed. Cir. 2006); *Bayer AG v. Schein Pharms., Inc.*, 301 F.3d 1306, 1314-1319 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Mentor H/S, Inc., v. Med. Device Alliance, Inc.*, 244 F.3d 1365, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Eli Lilly and Co. v. Barr Labs., Inc.*, 251 F.3d 955, 963 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *N. Telecom Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.*, 215 F.3d 1281, 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Applied Materials, Inc. v. Advanced Semiconductor Materials Am., Inc.*, 98 F.3d 1563, 1581 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *U.S. Gypsum Co. v. Nat’l Gypsum Co.*, 74 F.3d 1209, 1212 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Transco Prods. Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 558 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *Shearing v. Iolab Corp.*, 975 F.2d 1541, 1545-46 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *Wahl Instruments, Inc. v. Acvious, Inc.*, 950 F.2d 1575, 1581 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co., Ltd.*, 927 F.2d 1200, 1209-10 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Chemcast Corp. v. Arco Indus. Corp.*, 913 F.2d 923, 927-28 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *Spectra-Physics, Inc. v. Coherent, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 1524, 1535-36 (Fed. Cir. 1987); *DeGeorge v. Bernier*, 768 F.2d 1318, 1324-25 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Application of Gay*, 309 F.2d 769, 772 (C.C.P.A. 1962).

[THIS INSTRUCTION WILL NEED TO BE MODIFIED IF A DIVISIONAL OR CONTINUATION-IN-PART APPLICATION IS INVOLVED TO EXPLAIN THAT THE BEST MODE MUST BE DESCRIBED IN A DIVISIONAL OR CONTINUATION-IN-PART APPLICATION].

*Glaxo Inc. v. Novopharm Ltd.*, 52 F.3d 1043, 1049 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *Transco Prods. Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 558 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *Engel Indus., Inc. v. Lockformer Co.*, 946 F.2d 1528, 1531-32 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Dana Corp. v. IPC Ltd. Partnership*, 860 F.2d 415, 418-19 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Bundy*, 642 F.2d 430, 435 (C.C.P.A. 1981); *In re Sherwood*, 613 F.2d 809 (C.C.P.A. 1980); *In re Hay*, 534 F.2d 917 (C.C.P.A. 1976).

### **Unenforceability (Inequitable Conduct)**

[INTRODUCTORY NOTE: “Inequitable conduct is an equitable issue committed to the discretion of the trial court and reviewed by [the Federal Circuit] under an abuse of discretion standard.” *Flex-Rest, LLC v. Steelcase, Inc.*, 455 F.3d 1351, 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2006). That discretion includes the determination to seek an advisory determination on the factual predicates underlying inequitable conduct or on the issue as a whole. The court should consider whether to charge the jury in detail, to charge the jury solely on materiality, or to retain the issue solely for itself, and should consider using a verdict form that breaks out materiality, intent, and/or balancing.]

## 11.0 Inequitable Conduct – Generally

[The Defendant] contends that [the Plaintiff] may not enforce the [abbreviated patent number] patent against [the Defendant] because [the Plaintiff] engaged in inequitable conduct before the Patent and Trademark Office during prosecution of the [abbreviated patent number] patent.

Applicants for a patent have a duty to prosecute patent applications in the Patent and Trademark Office with candor, good faith, and honesty. This duty of candor and good faith extends to all inventors named on a patent application, all patent attorneys and patent agents involved in preparing and prosecuting the application, and every other person involved in a substantial way with the prosecution of the patent application. An intentional failure to meet this duty of candor and good faith is referred to as “inequitable conduct.”

[In this case, [the Defendant] asserts that [DESCRIBE BRIEFLY EACH BASIS FOR [THE DEFENDANT]'S UNENFORCEABILITY DEFENSE].]

[The Defendant] must prove inequitable conduct by clear and convincing evidence. To determine whether the [abbreviated patent number] patent was obtained through inequitable conduct, you must determine whether a person having this duty of candor and good faith withheld or misrepresented information, or submitted false information, that was material to the examination of the patent application, and that this individual or individuals acted with an intent to deceive or mislead the PTO.

*Cargill, Inc. v. Canbra Foods, Ltd.*, 476 F.3d 1359, 1363-64 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *eSpeed, Inc. v. BrokerTec USA, L.L.C.*, 480 F.3d 1129, 1135 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *Digital Control, Inc. v. Charles Mach. Works*, 437 F.3d 1309, 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2006); *Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Endo Pharm., Inc.*, 438 F.3d 1123, 1128 (Fed. Cir. 2006); *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Rhone-Poulenc Rorer, Inc.*, 326 F.3d 1226, 1233 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *GFI, Inc. v. Franklin Corp.*, 265 F.3d 1268, 1273 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Critikon, Inc. v. Becton Dickinson Vascular Access, Inc.*, 120 F.3d 1253, 1256 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

### 11.1 Materiality

[Defendant] contends that \_\_\_\_\_ was information known to a person with this duty of good faith and candor that was [withheld from] [or] [misrepresented to]] [or] [falsely submitted to] the Patent and Trademark Office during the prosecution of the [abbreviated patent number] patent. If you find that a person with this duty of good faith and candor [[withheld] [or] [misrepresented]] [or] [submitted false] information when applying for the [abbreviated patent number] patent, you must determine whether that information was material information.

Information is material if it establishes, either alone or in combination with other information that a claim of the patent application would more likely than not meet one of

the requirements for a patent.<sup>6</sup> Information is also material if it refutes or is inconsistent with the information provided to the Patent and Trademark Office or arguments made by the applicant to persuade the Patent and Trademark Office that the invention is entitled to patent protection. Information that is “cumulative” of, or adds little to, other information the examiner already had is not material.

37 C.F.R. § 1.56(b); *Cargill Inc. v. Canbra Foods, Ltd.*, 476 F.3d 1359, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc.*, 438 F.3d 1123, 1129 n. 6 (Fed. Cir. 2006); *Digital Control Inc. v. Charles Machine Works*, 437 F.3d 1309, 1314-16 (Fed. Cir. 2006); *Dayco Prods., Inc. v. Total Containment, Inc.*, 329 F.3d 1358, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *PerSeptive Biosystems, Inc. v. Pharmacia Biotech, Inc.*, 225 F.3d 1315, 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Baxter Int’l, Inc. v. McGaw, Inc.*, 149 F.3d 1321, 1327 n.3 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *Critikon, Inc. v. Becton Dickinson Vascular Access, Inc.*, 120 F.3d 1253, 1257 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

## 11.2 Intent to Deceive or Mislead

If you determine that material information was [withheld from] [or] [misrepresented to] [or] [falsely submitted to] the Patent and Trademark Office, you must next determine whether this was done with an intent to deceive or mislead the Patent and Trademark Office. Intent to deceive the Patent and Trademark Office may be found from direct evidence. Such direct evidence is rare, however, and as a result, the law allows deceptive intent to be inferred from the facts and surrounding circumstances.

[When a patentee has knowingly misrepresented a material fact or submitted false material information, and when the natural consequence of those intentional acts would be that to deceive the Patent and Trademark Office, an inference that the patentee intended to deceive may be appropriate.] [Simple negligence is insufficient for a holding of inequitable conduct.]

In determining whether or not there was intent to deceive or mislead the Patent and Trademark Office, you should consider the totality of the circumstances, including the nature of the conduct and evidence of the absence or presence of good faith.

*Cargill, Inc. v. Canbra Foods, Ltd.*, 476 F. 3d 1359, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *eSpeed, Inc. v. BrokerTec USA, L.L.C.*, 480 F.3d 1129, 1137-38 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Endo Pharm. Inc.*, 438 F. 3d 1123, 1133-34 (Fed. Cir. 2006); *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Rhone-Poulenc Rorer, Inc.*, 326 F.3d 1226, 1239-40 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *GFI, Inc. v. Franklin Corp.*, 265 F.3d 1268, 1274-75 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *PerSeptive Biosystems, Inc. v. Pharmacia Biotech, Inc.*, 225 F.3d 1315, 1319-20 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Semiconductor*

---

<sup>6</sup> The standard for determining materiality as articulated by the PTO rules changed on January 17, 1992 (effective March 16, 1992). Under the pre-1992 standard, information is material if there is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable patent examiner would consider it important in deciding whether or not to allow the application to issue as a patent. The Federal Circuit has held that information may be considered “material” under both the 1992 version of 37 CFR 1.56 as well as the pre-1992 standard. See, e.g., *Digital Control, Inc. v. Charles Mach. Works*, 437 F.3d 1309, 1314-16 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

*Energy Laboratory Co., Ltd. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.*, 204 F.3d 1368, 1374-76 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Critikon, Inc. v. Becton Dickinson Vascular Access, Inc.*, 120 F.3d 1253, 1256-57 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Molins PLC v. Textron, Inc.*, 48 F.3d 1172, 1180-82 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *LaBounty Mfg., Inc. v. United States Int'l Trade Comm'n*, 958 F.2d 1066, 1076 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

### **11.3 Balancing of Materiality and Intent**

If [the Defendant] has proven by clear and convincing evidence that information was [withheld] [or] [misrepresented] [or] [falsely submitted] by a person with the duty of good faith and candor, you must then balance the degree of materiality and the degree of intent to deceive or mislead the Patent and Trademark Office to determine whether or not the evidence is sufficient to establish clearly and convincingly that there was inequitable conduct committed in the prosecution of the [abbreviated patent number] patent. Where the materiality of the [withheld] [or] [misrepresented] [or] [false] information is high, the showing of intent needed to establish inequitable conduct is proportionally less. Likewise, when the showing of intent is high, the showing of materiality may be proportionally less.

*eSpeed, Inc. v. BrokerTec USA, L.L.C.*, 480 F.3d 1129, 1135 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *Cargill Inc. v. Canbra Foods, Ltd.*, 476 F. 3d 1359, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Endo Pharm. Inc.*, 438 F. 3d 1123, 1133-35 (Fed. Cir. 2006); *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Rhone-Poulenc Rorer, Inc.*, 326 F.3d 1226, 1239-41 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *GFI, Inc. v. Franklin Corp.*, 265 F.3d 1268, 1274-75 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *PerSeptive Biosystems, Inc. v. Pharmacia Biotech, Inc.*, 225 F.3d 1315, 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Baxter Int'l, Inc. v. McGaw, Inc.*, 149 F.3d 1321, 1330 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *Critikon, Inc. v. Becton Dickinson Vascular Access, Inc.*, 120 F.3d 1253, 1257 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Molins PLC v. Textron, Inc.*, 48 F.3d 1172, 1178 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

## **Damages**

### **12.0 Damages – Generally**

If you find that the accused [[device] [method]] infringes any of the claims of the [abbreviated patent number] patent, and that those claims are not invalid, you must determine the amount of damages to be awarded [the Plaintiff] for the infringement. On the other hand, if you find that each of the asserted patent claims is either invalid or is not infringed, then you need not address damages in your deliberations.

If you need to determine damages, the amount of those damages must be adequate to compensate [the Plaintiff] for the infringement. Your damage award should put [the Plaintiff] in approximately the financial position it would have been in had the infringement not occurred; but, in no event may the damage award be less than a reasonable royalty. You may not add anything to the amount of damages to punish the accused infringer or to set an example.

[The Plaintiff] must prove each element of its damages by a preponderance of the evidence.

The fact that I am instructing you as to the proper measure of damages should not be construed as intimating any view of the Court as to which party is entitled to prevail in this case. Instructions as to the measure of damages are given for your guidance in the event you find the evidence in favor of [the Plaintiff].

35 U.S.C. § 284 (2004); *Aro Mfg. Co. v. Convertible Top Replacement Co.*, 377 U.S. 476, 507 (1964); *Dow Chem. Co. v. Mee Indus., Inc.*, 341 F. 3d 1370, 1381-82 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Vulcan Eng'g Co. v. FATA Aluminum, Inc.*, 278 F.3d 1366, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prods. Co.*, 185 F.3d 1341, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *Maxwell v. J. Baker, Inc.*, 86 F.3d 1098, 1108-1109 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Hebert v. Lisle Corp.*, 99 F.3d 1109, 1119 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Rite-Hite Corp. v. Kelley Co.*, 56 F.3d 1538, 1544-45 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *Wang Labs., Inc. v. Toshiba Corp.*, 993 F.2d 858, 870 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *Fromson v. W. Litho Plate & Supply Co.*, 853 F.2d 1568, 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *overruled on other grounds by Knorr-Bremse Systeme Fuer Nutzfahrzeuge v. Dana Corp.*, 383 F.3d 1337, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Del Mar Avionics, Inc. v. Quinton Instrument Co.*, 836 F.2d 1320, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

### **12.1 Date Damages Begin**

#### ***(Alternate A)***

[WHEN THE DATE OF THE NOTICE OF INFRINGEMENT IS STIPULATED]:

The date that [the Plaintiff] first gave notice to [the Defendant] of its claim of patent infringement is the date at which patent damages begin to be calculated. That date has been agreed to by the parties to be [infringement notice date].

#### ***(Alternate B)***

[WHEN THE DATE OF THE NOTICE OF INFRINGEMENT IS DISPUTED – Product claims]:

The date that [the Plaintiff] first gave notice to [the Defendant] of its claim of patent infringement is the date at which patent damages begin to be calculated. That date is in dispute here, and it is up to you to determine what that date is. [The Plaintiff] must prove by a preponderance of the evidence the date it gave notice.

[The Plaintiff] can give notice in two ways. The first way is to give notice to the public in general. [The Plaintiff] can do this by placing the word “patent” or the abbreviation “PAT” with the number of the patent on substantially all the products it sold that included the patent invention. [Licensees of the [abbreviated patent number] patent who use the patented invention must also mark substantially all of their

products that include the patented invention with the patent number.] This type of notice is effective from the date [the Plaintiff] [and its licensees] began to mark substantially all of their products that use the patented invention with the patent number. If [the Plaintiff] [and its licensees] did not mark substantially all of their products that use the patented invention with the patent number, then [the Plaintiff] did not provide notice in this way.

A second way [the Plaintiff] can provide notice of its patent[s] is to communicate to [the Defendant] a specific charge that the [allegedly infringing product] infringed the [abbreviated patent number] patent. This type of notice is effective from the time it is given. If you find that [the Plaintiff], before filing this lawsuit, did not properly mark its products and did not notify [the Defendant] by communicating a specific charge that the [allegedly infringing product] infringed, then [the Plaintiff] can only recover damages for infringement that occurred after it sued [the Defendant] on [lawsuit filing date].

[IF THERE IS AN ISSUE OF FACT AS TO THE ADEQUACY OF THE PATENTEE’S MARKING, ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS WILL BE REQUIRED].

*(Alternate C)*

[WHEN THE DATE DAMAGES BEGIN IS THE DATE THE LAWSUIT WAS FILED]:

The date that damages begin to be calculated in this case is the date this lawsuit was filed, which is [date complaint was filed].

35 U.S.C. § 287(a); *Gart v. Logitech, Inc.*, 254 F.3d 1334, 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Lans v. Digital Equip. Corp.*, 252 F.3d 1320, 1327-28 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Crystal Semiconductor Corp. v. TriTech Microelecs. Int’l, Inc.*, 246 F.3d 1336, 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Amsted Indus., Inc. v. Buckeye Steel Castings Co.*, 24 F.3d 178, 184-87 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *Devices for Med., Inc. v. Boehl*, 822 F.2d 1062, 1066 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

## **12.2 Two Types of Damages – Lost Profits and Reasonable Royalty**

There are two types of damages for patent infringement. The first type of patent damages is lost profits. Briefly, lost profits damages compensate the patent owner for the additional profits that it would have made if the accused infringer had not infringed. You may hear this referred to as the “but for” test. The second type of patent damages is called reasonable royalty. Generally, the patent laws define a reasonable royalty as the reasonable amount that someone wanting to use the patented invention should expect to pay to the patent owner and the owner should expect to receive. A reasonable royalty is the minimum amount of damages that a patent owner may recover for infringement.

### **12.3 Lost Profits – “But-For” Test**

[The Plaintiff] is seeking its lost profits as its patent damages.

[The Plaintiff] must prove the amount of its lost profits. To recover lost profits for some or all of the infringing sales, [the Plaintiff] must show by a preponderance of evidence that, but for the infringement, [the Plaintiff] would have made profits. The lost profits may be profits that would have resulted from Plaintiff’s sales or a portion of them that [the Defendant] made of [allegedly infringing product]. Thus, part of your job is to determine what the customers who purchased the [allegedly infringing product] [from the Defendant] would have done if the [alleged] infringement had not occurred. The profits I have been referring to are the profits allegedly lost by [the Plaintiff], not the profits, if any, made by [the Defendant].

*Aro Mfg. Co. v. Convertible Top Replacement Co.*, 377 U.S. 476, 507 (1964); *Micro Chem. v. Lextron, Inc.*, 318 F.3d 1119, 1122-1125 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Ferguson Beauregard/Logic Controls v. Mega Sys., L.L.C.*, 350 F.3d 1327, 1345-46 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Ericsson, Inc. v. Harris Corp.*, 352 F.3d 1369, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Tate Access Floors, Inc. v. Maxcess Techs., Inc.*, 222 F.3d 958, 971 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prods. Co.*, 185 F.3d 1341, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *King Instruments Corp. v. Perego*, 65 F.3d 941, 952 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *Ryco, Inc. v. Ag-Bag Corp.*, 857 F.2d 1418, 1428 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *King Instrument Corp. v. Otari Corp.*, 767 F.2d 853, 863-64 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Paper Converting Mach. Co. v. Magna-Graphics Corp.* 745 F.2d 11, 21 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *Am. Hoist & Derrick Co. v. Sowa & Sons, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1350, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *Central Soya Co. v. Geo A Hormel & Co.*, 723 F.2d 1573, 1578-79 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

### **12.4 Lost Profits – Panduit Factors**

You may infer that [the Plaintiff] has proven its lost profits if you find that [the Plaintiff] has proven each of the following factors by a preponderance of the evidence:

1. the demand for the patented [[product] [method]],
2. absence of acceptable non-infringing substitutes,
3. that [the Plaintiff] had the manufacturing and marketing capacity to make the infringing sales [or a portion thereof] actually made by [the Defendant], and
4. the amount of profit that [the Plaintiff] would have made but for [the Defendant]’s sales.

I will now explain each of these factors.

*Tate Access Floors, Inc. v. Maxcess Techs., Inc.*, 222 F.3d 958, 971 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Gargoyles, Inc. v. United States*, 113 F.3d 1572, 1577-79 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Stryker Corp.*

*v. Intermedics Orthopedics, Inc.*, 96 F.3d 1409, 1417-18 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Rite-Hite Corp. v. Kelley Co.*, 56 F.3d 1538, 1545 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *State Indus., Inc. v. Mor-Flo Indus., Inc.*, 883 F.2d 1573, 1577 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *Yarway Corp. v. Eur-Control USA, Inc.*, 775 F.2d 268, 275 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Panduit Corp. v. Stahl Bros. Fibre Works, Inc.*, 575 F.2d 1152, 1156 (6th Cir. 1978).

### **12.5 Lost Profits – Panduit Factors – Demand**

Demand for the patented product can be proven by significant sales of [the Plaintiff]'s patented product. Demand for the patented product can also be proven by significant sales of [the Defendant's] product containing the patented features. However, if you find that [the Defendant] generated new or different markets by sales or marketing efforts because of features other than those claimed by [the Plaintiff], the sales of [the Defendant's] product cannot establish a demand for the patented product.

*BIC Leisure Prods., Inc. v. Windsurfing Int'l, Inc.*, 1 F.3d 1214, 1218-19 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *SmithKline Diagnostics, Inc. v. Helena Labs. Corp.*, 926 F.2d 1161, 1165 n.3 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Gyromat Corp. v. Champion Spark Plug Co.*, 735 F.2d 549, 552 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

### **12.6 Lost Profits – Panduit Factors – Acceptable Non-Infringing Substitutes**

In order to be an acceptable substitute, the product must have one or more of the advantages of the patented invention that were important to customers. If, however, the realities of the marketplace are that competitors other than [the Plaintiff] would likely have captured some or all of the sales made by the infringer, even despite a difference in the products, then [the Plaintiff] is not entitled to lost profits on those sales. An acceptable non-infringing substitute must be a product that does not infringe the patent. A product does not infringe a patent when it either (a) is sold based on a license under that patent or (b) does not include all the features required by the patent. An acceptable non-infringing substitute is available if, during the damages period, a competitor or [the Defendant] had all the necessary equipment, materials, know-how, and experience to design and manufacture the substitute and sell such substitute instead of its infringing sales at the time those infringing sales were made. If you determine that [the Defendant]'s customers would just as likely have purchased a non-infringing acceptable product, then [the Plaintiff] has not shown it lost that sale but for [Defendant]'s sales

In order to assess whether there is an absence of acceptable non-infringing substitutes, you must consider whether non-infringing substitutes existed that were acceptable to the *specific* purchasers of the infringing products, not “purchasers” generally. The test is whether purchasers of [the Defendant]'s product were motivated to make their purchase by features of [the Defendant]'s product that were attributable to the claimed invention. If so, non-infringing products without those features would not be “acceptable non-infringing substitutes,” even if they otherwise competed in the marketplace with the patented and [the Defendant]'s products.

*Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prods. Co.*, 185 F.3d 1341, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *Gargoyles, Inc. v. United States*, 113 F.3d 1572, 1577-1578 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Uniroyal, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp.*, 939 F.2d 1540, 1545-46 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Standard Havens Prods., Inc. v. Gencor Indus.*, 953 F.2d 1360, 1373 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Kaufman Co. v. Lantech, Inc.*, 926 F.2d 1136, 1142-43, 1143 n.17 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *SmithKline Diagnostics, Inc. v. Helena Lab. Corp.*, 926 F.2d 1161, 1166 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *TWM Mfg. Co. v. Dura Corp.*, 789 F.2d 895, 901-902 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

### **12.7 Lost Profits – Panduit Factors – Capacity**

[The Plaintiff] is only entitled to lost profits for sales it could have actually made. You should consider whether [the Plaintiff] has proven that it had the manufacturing capacity and the marketing capability to make the sales it says it lost. [The Plaintiff] must prove that it was more probable than not that it could have made, or could have had someone else make for it, the additional products it says it could have sold but for the infringement. [The Plaintiff] also must prove that it had the capability to market and sell the additional patented products.

*Gargoyles, Inc. v. United States*, 113 F.3d 1572, 1577-1578 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Fonar Corp. v. Gen. Elec. Co.*, 107 F.3d 1543, 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Kearns v. Chrysler Corp.*, 32 F.3d 1541, 1551 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *Datascope Corp. v. SMEC, Inc.*, 879 F.2d 820, 825 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *Gyromat Corp. v. Champion Spark Plug Co.*, 735 F.2d 549, 554 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

### **12.8 Lost Profits – Panduit Factors – Amount of Profit Incremental Income Approach**

[The Plaintiff] may calculate its lost profits on lost sales by computing the lost revenue for its patented product and subtracting from that figure the amount of additional costs or expenses that it would have incurred in making those lost sales, including but not limited to cost of goods, sales costs, packaging, shipping, etc. Certain fixed costs such as taxes, insurance, rent and administrative overhead may not vary with increases in production or scale. These are called fixed costs. Any costs, which do not vary with increased production or scale, should not be subtracted from the lost revenue when determining damages. Thus, in determining [the Plaintiff's] lost profits, you are not to subtract from its lost revenue the amount of any fixed costs. The amount of lost profits cannot be speculative but it need not be proved with unerring certainty.

*Sensonics, Inc. v. Aerosonic Corp.*, 81 F.3d 1566, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Oiness v. Walgreen Co.*, 88 F.3d 1025, 1030 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Beatrice Foods Co. v. New England Printing & Lithographing Co.*, 923 F.2d 1576, 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Kalman v. Berlyn Corp.*, 914 F.2d 1473, 1482-1483 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *State Indus., Inc. v. Mor-Flo Indus., Inc.*, 883 F.2d 1573, 1579-1580 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *Ryco, Inc. v. Ag-Bag Corp.*, 857 F.2d 1418, 1428 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *Del Mar Avionics, Inc. v. Quinton Instrument Co.*, 836 F.2d 1320, 1327 (Fed. Cir. 1987); *King Instrument Corp. v. Otari*, 767 F.2d 853, 863-864 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Gyromat Corp. v. Champion Spark Plug Co.*, 735 F.2d 549, 554-555

(Fed. Cir. 1984); *Paper Converting Mach. Co. v. Magna-Graphics Corp.*, 745 F.2d 11, 22 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *Bio-Rad Labs., Inc. v. Nicolet Inst. Corp.*, 739 F.2d 604 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *Lam, Inc. v. Johns-Manville Corp.*, 718 F.2d 1056, 1065 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

### **12.9 Lost Profits – Market Share**

It is not necessary for [the Plaintiff] to prove that [the Plaintiff] and [the Defendant] were the only two suppliers in the market for [the Plaintiff] to demonstrate entitlement to lost profits. If the realities of the marketplace are such that “acceptable non-infringing substitutes” were available from suppliers who would have made only some, but not all, of the sales that were made by [the Defendant], then [the Plaintiff] may be entitled to lost profits on a portion of the infringing sales. The burden is on [the Plaintiff], however, to show to a reasonable probability that it would have sold that portion if [the Defendant]'s product had never existed. By the same token, even if you find that [the Plaintiff] and [the Defendant] were the only two suppliers of products having the advantages of the patented product, it does not necessarily mean that [the Plaintiff] would have made all [the Defendant]'s sales. The burden is on [the Plaintiff] to show that its product competed in the same market with the [the Defendant]'s product and that it would have made those sales if the infringement had not occurred.

*Crystal Semiconductor Corp. v. Tritech Microelects. Int'l, Inc.*, 246 F.3d 1336, 1353-1357 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *BIC Leisure Prods., Inc. v. Windsurfing Int'l, Inc.*, 1 F.3d 1214 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *State Indus., Inc. v. Mor-Flo Indus., Inc.*, 883 F.2d 1573, 1577-78 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

### **12.10 Lost Profits – Price Erosion**

[The Plaintiff] is entitled to recover additional damages if it can show to a reasonable probability that, if there had been no infringement, [the Plaintiff] [[would have been able to charge higher prices for its patented products] [would not have had to lower its prices]]. In that case, you may also award as additional damages the amount represented by the difference between the amount of profits that [the Plaintiff] would have made by selling its product at the higher price and the amount of profits [the Plaintiff] actually made by selling its product at the lower price that [the Plaintiff] actually charged for its patented product. This type of damage is referred to as price erosion damage. If you find that [the Plaintiff] suffered price erosion damages, you may also use the higher price in determining [the Plaintiff]'s lost profits from sales lost because of the infringement. In calculating [the Plaintiff]'s total losses from price erosion, you must take into account any decrease in sales that might have occurred if [the Plaintiff] charged a higher price than it did. This is called price elasticity. In order to award lost profits based on price erosion, it is not required that [the Plaintiff] knew that the competing product infringed the patent, if [the Plaintiff] reduced its price to meet [the Defendant]'s competition.

*Ericsson, Inc. v. Harris Corp.*, 352 F.3d 1369, 1378-1379 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Vulcan Eng'g Co. v. FATA Aluminum, Inc.*, 278 F.3d 1366, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Minn. Mining &*

*Mfg. Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Orthopaedics, Inc.*, 976 F.2d 1559, 1578-1579 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *Amstar Corp. v. Envirotech Corp.*, 823 F.2d 1538, 1543 (Fed. Cir. 1987); *Lam, Inc. v. Johns-Manville Corp.*, 718 F.2d 1056, 1065 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

### **12.11 Lost Profits – Cost Escalation**

[The Plaintiff] can recover additional damages if it can show that it also lost profits because its costs – such as additional marketing costs – went up as a result of [the Defendant]'s actions. [The Plaintiff] must prove that it was more probable than not that its costs went up because of [the Defendant]'s actions, and not for some other reason.

*Fiskars, Inc. v. Hunt Mfg. Co.*, 221 F.3d 1318, 1324-1325 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Minco, Inc. v. Combustion Eng'g, Inc.*, 95 F.3d 1109, 1120 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Roton Barrier, Inc. v. Stanley Works*, 79 F.3d 1112, 1120 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

### **12.12 Lost Profits – Collateral Sales**

In this case, [the Plaintiff] contends that the patented product is ordinarily sold along with [collateral products]. To recover lost profits on sales of such collateral products, [the Plaintiff] must prove two things. First, that it is more likely than not that [the Plaintiff] 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. Damages for lost profits on lost collateral sales, if any, are calculated in the same manner as I just described for calculating lost profits on the patented product.

*Aro Mfg. Co. v. Convertible Top Replacement Co.*, 377 U.S. 476, 507 (1964); *Rite-Hite Corp. v. Kelley Co.*, 56 F.3d 1538, 1549-51 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *State Indus., Inc. v. Mor-Flo Indus., Inc.*, 883 F.2d 1573, 1580 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *Kori Corp. v. Wilco Marsh Buggies & Draglines, Inc.*, 761 F.2d 649, 656 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Paper Converting Mach. Co. v. Magna-Graphics Corp.*, 745 F.2d 11, 22-23 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

### **12.13 Lost Profits – Doubts Resolved Against Infringer**

All doubts resulting from [the Defendant]'s failure to keep proper records are to be resolved in favor of [the Plaintiff]. Any incorrectness or confusion in [the Defendant]'s records should be held against [the Defendant], not [the Plaintiff].

*Sensonics, Inc. v. Aerosonic Corp.*, 81 F.3d 1566, 1572-73 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Lam, Inc. v. Johns-Manville Corp.*, 718 F.2d 1056, 1065 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

### **12.14 Reasonable Royalty - Generally**

If you find that [the Plaintiff] has not proven its claim for lost profits, or if you find that [the Plaintiff] has proven its claim for lost profits for only a portion of the infringing sales, you must then determine what a reasonable royalty would be for that portion of [the Plaintiff]'s sales for which you have not awarded lost profit damages. The

patent law specifically provides that the amount of damages that [the Defendant] must pay [the Plaintiff] for infringing [the Plaintiff]'s patent may not be less than a reasonable royalty for the use that [the Defendant] made of [the Plaintiff]'s invention. A reasonable royalty is not necessarily the actual measure of damages, but is merely the floor below which damages should not fall. [The Plaintiff] is entitled to a reasonable royalty for all infringing sales for which it is not entitled to lost profits damages.

35 U.S.C. § 284; *Crystal Semiconductor Corp. v. Tritech Microelects. Int'l, Inc.*, 246 F.3d 1336, 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Fromson v. W. Litho Plate & Supply Co.*, 853 F.2d 1568, 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1998) *overruled on other grounds by Knorr-Bremse Systeme Fuer Nutzfahrzeuge v. Dana Corp.*, 383 F.3d 1337, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Minco, Inc. v. Combustion Eng'g, Inc.*, 95 F.3d 1109, 1119 (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); *State Indus., Inc. v. Mor-Flo Indus., Inc.*, 883 F.2d 1573, 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

### **12.15 Reasonable Royalty – Definition**

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. A reasonable royalty is the royalty that would have resulted from a hypothetical negotiation between the patent owner and a [[person] [company]] in the position of [the Defendant] taking place just before the infringement began. You should also assume that both parties to that negotiation understood the patent to be valid and infringed and were willing to enter into a license.

*Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.*, 79 F.3d 1572, 1579-81 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Maxwell v. J. Baker, Inc.*, 86 F.3d 1098, 1108-10 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Rite-Hite Corp. v. Kelley Co.*, 56 F.3d 1538, 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc); *State Indus., Inc. v. Mor-Flo Indus., Inc.*, 883 F.2d 1573, 1580 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. United States Plywood Corp.*, 318 F. Supp. 1116, 1121 (S.D.N.Y. 1970), *modified and aff'd sub nom.*, *Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. United States Plywood Champion Papers, Inc.*, 446 F.2d 295 (2d Cir. 1971).

### **12.16 Reasonable Royalty – Relevant Factors**

In determining the value of a reasonable royalty, you may consider evidence on any of the following factors:

1. Any royalties received by the licensor for the licensing of the patent-in-suit, proving or tending to prove an established royalty.
2. The rates paid by [the Defendant] to license other patents comparable to the [abbreviated patent number] patent.
3. The nature and scope of the license, as exclusive or non-exclusive, or as restricted or non-restricted in terms of its territory or with respect to whom the manufactured product may be sold.

4. The licensor's established policy and marketing program to maintain its right to exclude others from using the patented invention by not licensing others to use the invention, or by granting licenses under special conditions designed to preserve that exclusivity.
5. The commercial relationship between the licensor and the licensee, such as whether or not they are competitors in the same territory in the same line of business.
6. The effect of selling the patented product in promoting sales of other products of the licensee; the existing value of the invention to the licensor as a generator of sales of its non-patented items; and the extent of such collateral sales.
7. The duration of the [abbreviated patent number] patent and the term of the license.
8. The established profitability of the product made under the [abbreviated patent number] patent; its commercial success; and its current popularity.
9. The utility and advantages of the patented invention over the old modes or devices, if any that had been used for achieving similar results.
10. The nature of the patented invention; the character of the commercial embodiment of it as owned and produced by the licensor; and the benefits to those who have used the invention.
11. The extent to which [the Defendant] has made use of the invention; and any evidence that shows the value of that use.
12. The portion of the profit or of the selling price that may be customary in the particular business or in comparable businesses to allow for the use of the invention or analogous inventions.
13. The portion of the profit that arises from the patented invention itself as opposed to profit arising from unpatented features, such as the manufacturing process, business risks, or significant features or improvements added by the accused infringer.
14. The opinion testimony of qualified experts.
15. The amount that a licensor and a licensee (such as [the Defendant]) would have agreed upon (at the time the infringement began) if both sides had been reasonably and voluntarily trying to reach an agreement; that is, the amount which a prudent licensee—who desired, as a business proposition, to obtain a license to manufacture and sell a particular article embodying the patented invention—would have been willing to pay as a royalty and

yet be able to make a reasonable profit and which amount would have been acceptable by a patentee who was willing to grant a license.

16. Any other economic factor that a normally prudent business person would, under similar circumstances, take into consideration in negotiating the hypothetical license.

*Monsanto Co. v. McFarling*, 488 F.3d 973 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *Tec Air, Inc. v. Denso Mfg. Mich., Inc.*, 192 F.3d 1353, 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *Fonar Corp. v. Gen. Elec. Co.*, 107 F.3d 1543, 1552-53 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.*, 79 F.3d 1572, 1579-81 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Maxwell v. J. Baker, Inc.*, 86 F.3d 1098, 1108-10 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Rite-Hite Corp. v. Kelley Co.*, 56 F.3d 1538, 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc); *State Indus., Inc. v. Mor-Flo Indus., Inc.*, 883 F.2d 1573, 1580 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *TWM Mfg. Co. v. Dura Corp.*, 789 F.2d 895, 898-900 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Hanson v. Alpine Valley Ski Area, Inc.*, 718 F.2d 1075, 1079 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. United States Plywood Corp.*, 318 F. Supp. 1116 (S.D.N.Y. 1970), *modified and aff'd sub nom., Georgia Pacific Corp. v. United States Plywood Champion Papers, Inc.*, 446 F.2d 295 (2d Cir. 1971).

### **12.17 Reasonable Royalty – Timing**

Although the relevant date for the hypothetical reasonable royalty negotiation is just before the infringement began, you may consider in your determination of reasonable royalty damages any actual profits by [the Defendant] after that time and any commercial success of the patented invention in the form of sales of the patented or infringing products after that time. You may only consider this information, however, if it was foreseeable at the time that the infringement began.

*Trell v. Marlee Elecs. Corp.*, 912 F.2d 1443, 1446-48 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *State Indus., Inc. v. Mor-Flo Indus., Inc.*, 883 F.2d 1573, 1581 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *Fromson v. W. Litho Plate & Supply Co.*, 853 F.2d 1568, 1575-76 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *overruled on other grounds by Knorr-Bremse Systeme Fuer Nutzfahrzeuge v. Dana Corp.*, 383 F.3d 1337, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Studiengesellschaft Kohle, mbH v. Dart Indus., Inc.*, 862 F.2d 1564, 1571-72 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

### **13. Willful Infringement**

[The following instruction should be given only if the patent owner contends willful infringement]

If you find by a preponderance of the evidence that [the Defendant] infringed [the Plaintiff]'s patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, then you must further determine if this infringement was willful. Willfulness must be proven by clear and convincing evidence showing that:

1. [The Defendant] was aware of [the Plaintiff]'s patent,

2. [The Defendant] acted despite an objectively high likelihood that its actions infringed a valid patent, and

3. This objectively high likelihood of infringement was either known or so obvious that it should have been known to [the Defendant].

In making the determination as to willfulness, you must consider the totality of the circumstances. The totality of the circumstances comprises a number of factors, which include, but are not limited to whether [the Defendant] intentionally copied the claimed invention or a product covered by [the Plaintiff]'s patent, [whether [the Defendant] relied on competent legal advice<sup>7</sup>,] and whether [the Defendant] presented a substantial defense to infringement, including the defense that the patent is invalid [or unenforceable].

*In re Seagate Technology, LLC*, 497 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (en banc); *Knorr-Bremse Systeme Fuer Nutzfahrzeuge GmbH v. Dana Corp.*, 383 F.3d 1337, 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (en banc).

---

<sup>7</sup> This factor, “whether the Defendant relied on competent legal advice,” should only be included if the alleged infringer relies on a legal opinion as a defense to an allegation of willful infringement. “[I]t is inappropriate to draw an adverse inference that undisclosed legal advice for which attorney-client privilege is claimed was unfavorable . . . [and] it is [also] inappropriate to draw a similar adverse inference from failure to consult counsel.” *Knorr-Bremse Systeme Fuer Nutzfahrzeuge GmbH v. Dana Corp.*, 383 F.3d 1337, 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (en banc).

## Acknowledgments

The contributions of the following attorneys to the drafting and commenting on of these model jury instructions are gratefully acknowledged.

### The 1997 Version

Mark Abate  
Ken R. Adams  
Joseph Z. Allen  
Robert L. Baechtold  
Russell J. Barron  
Christopher R. Benson  
David J. Brezner  
Henry L. Brinks  
Jeffrey N. Costakos  
John F. Delaney  
Bradford J. Duft  
Donald R. Dunner  
Richard D. Fladung  
Floyd A. Gibson  
Eileen M. Herlihy

Roy E. Hofer  
Michael K. Kirschner  
Steven S. Korniczky  
William E. Lahey  
Bradley G. Lane  
Robert C. Laurenson  
Gary H. Levin  
Jeffrey I.D. Lewis  
Brent P. Lorimer  
Don W. Martens  
Alice O. Martin  
Clifton E. McCann  
Gaynell C. Methvin  
Frederick G. Michaud, Jr.  
Jeffrey D. Mills

John B. Pegram  
Michael F. Petock  
Peter H. Priest  
Jerrold B. Reilly  
Daniel M. Riess  
William C. Rooklidge  
Alan J. Ross  
John M. Skenyon  
Allan Sternstein  
Lawrence M. Sung  
Jennifer A. Tegfeldt  
David C. Wright

### The 2005 version

Kley Achterhof  
Stephanie Barbosa  
Kelli Deasy  
Denise DeFranco  
Barbara Fiacco  
Katherine Fick  
Mareesa Frederick  
Stephanie Harris  
Wendell Harris  
Andrew Lagatta  
Christy Lea  
Kalun Lee

Rashida MacMurray  
Steven Maslowski  
William McGeveran  
George Medlock  
Mary Beth Noonan  
Matthew Pearson  
Mark Schuman  
Steve Sheldon  
Sean Seymour  
John Skenyon  
Stephen Timmins  
Hema Viswanathan

Aaron Weiss  
Elizabeth Wright  
Jeremy Younkin

The 2007 version

Aaron Barlow  
Dave Bennett  
Elaine Hermann Blais  
Walter Bookhardt  
Scott Breedlove  
Patrick Coyne  
John Crossan  
Elizabeth Day  
Conor Farley  
John Hintz  
Scott Howard  
Kirby Lee  
Gregory Lyons

Joshua Masur  
Clifton McCann  
Tim Meece  
Heather Mewes  
Joe Miller  
Kenneth Mitchell  
John Moran  
Jeff Nichols  
Scott Pivnick  
Mirriam Quinn  
Amber Rovner  
Michael Sacksteder  
John Scheibeler

John Schneider  
Mark Schuman  
Jeff Sheldon  
John Skenyon  
Steve Swinton  
Tim Teter  
Kurt Van Thomme  
David Todd  
Michael Valek  
Alastair Warr  
Adam Wichman  
Daniel Winston  
Steven Zeller