



Home > Patents > PTAB > Decisions > Informative Opinions
> Alphabetical listing of informative decisions

Alphabetical listing of informative decisions

This is an alphabetical listing of informative decisions. For a list of precedential and informative decisions by topic, click [here](#).

- [A-C](#)
- [D-F](#)
- [G-I](#)
- [J-L](#)
- [M-O](#)
- [P-R](#)
- [S-U](#)
- [V-Z](#)

A-C

A

- [Abbott Diabetes Care, Inc. v. Patent of Dexcom, Inc.](#), No. 2011-003298 (May 3, 2011) [Inter partes reexamination - SNQ determination not appealable]
- [Ex parte Adams](#), 2007-0441 (March 14, 2007) [Reissue - 35 U.S.C. § 251 - changes to indefinite claims]
- [Adaptics Ltd. v. Perfect Co.](#), Case No. IPR2018-01596, Paper 20 (March 6, 2019) (designated: August 2, 2019) [AIA §§ 312(a)(3), 314(a) - requirements of petition - deny institution, failure to identify grounds with particularity]
- [Amgen, Inc. v. Human Genome Sciences, Inc.](#), Int. 105,613 (June 5, 2009) (Paper 79) [Interferences - jurisdiction - discretion to reach motions]
- [Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC. v. Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc.](#), Case No. IPR2014-00360, Paper 15 (June 27, 2014) [Bar due to patent owner's action, 35 U.S.C. § 315(b) - district court motion to amend complaint]
- [Anderson v. Eppstein](#), Int. 103,708 (May 11, 2001) (Paper 361) [Interferences - procedure - disqualification of counsel]
- [Ex parte Antor Media Corp.](#), 2010-007531 (October 21, 2012) [Anticipation - reference enablement]
- [AOL Inc v. Coho Licensing](#), Paper 12, IPR2014-00771 (March 24, 2015) [Expanded panels - dissent in original decision insufficient reason to expand]
- [Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.](#), IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 (May 13, 2020) [AIA § 314(a), deny institution – Fintiv factors weighed in favor of exercising discretion to deny institution]

- [Argentum Pharmaceuticals LLC v. Research Corporation Technologies, Inc.](#) (§ II.B), IPR2016-00204, Paper 19 (May 23, 2016) [AIA § 311(b) – discussing evidence related to determining whether an asserted reference qualifies as a printed publication]
- [Argentum Pharm. LLC v. Alcon Research, Ltd.](#), IPR2017-01053, Paper 27 (January 19, 2018) [AIA - factors for showing good cause to seal information]
- [Ariosa Diagnostics v. Isis Innovation Ltd.](#), Paper 55, IPR2012-00022 (August 7, 2013) [AIA - deposition testimony, 37 C.F.R. § 42.53 - guidelines]
- [Arris Group Inc. v. C-Cation Technologies LLC](#), Paper 10, IPR2015-00635 (May 1, 2015) [AIA - discovery, 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(5) - preclusion]
- [Ex parte Ashkenazi](#), 2005-2208 (October 20, 2005) [Anticipation - qualification as § 102(e) prior art]
- [Ashurst v. Brugger](#), Int. 105-482 (April 25, 2007) (Paper 44) [Interferences - additional discovery]

B

- [Bamberger v. Cheruvu](#), Int. 103, 844 (February 18, 1998) (Paper 409) [Interferences - motions - burdens of proof]
- [Barany v. McGall](#), Int. 105,351 (February 6, 2009) (Paper 59) [Interference - procedure - circumstances when appropriate to proceed to priority phase]
- [Ex parte Batteux](#), 2007-0622 (March 27, 2007) [Anticipation - intended treatment]
- [Ex parte Baxter International, Inc.](#), 2009-006493 (March 18, 2010) [Considering expert testimony]
- [Ex parte Bayer Cropscience, LP](#), 2011-005039 (May 16, 2011) [Anticipation - in preamble of method claim]
- [Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG](#), Paper 8, No. IPR2017-01587 (December 15, 2017) (designated: August 2, 2019) [AIA § 325(d) - delineating discretionary factors]
- [Ex parte Beineke](#), 2007-4215 (July 31, 2008) [Plant patents - 35 U.S.C. § 161 - “uncultivated state”]
- [Ex parte Beineke](#), 2007-3882 (July 30, 2008) [Plant patents - 35 U.S.C. § 161 - “uncultivated state”]
- [Ex parte Belinne](#), 2009-004693 (August 10, 2009) [Appellant’s response to rejection - burden to identify error]
- [Belkin International, Inc v. Optimumpath, LLC.](#), 2011-003697 (March 30, 2011) [Inter partes reexam - SNQ determination not appealable]
- [Ex parte Bobrowski](#), 2008-0580 (March 31, 2008) [35 U.S.C. § 112 - indefiniteness - In re Steele]
- [Ex parte Boer](#), 2009-010590 (May, 21, 2012) [Ex parte appeals - petitionable not appealable matters]
- [Bronstein v. Roser](#), Int. 104,727 (October 15, 2001) (Paper 29) [Interferences - cross-examination in a foreign country]
- [Bronstein v. Roser](#), Int. 104,727 (December 18, 2001) (Paper 54) [Interferences - procedure - motion to amend]
- [Bronstein v. Roser](#), Int. 104,727 (January 2, 2002) (Paper 55) [Interferences - analysis of whether interference-in-fact]

C

- [California Institute of Technology v. Enzo Life Sciences, Inc.](#), Int. 105,496, Paper 126 (October 29, 2010) [Interferences - publication of interference record]
- [Cambridge Mobile Telematics, Inc. v. Sfara, Inc.](#) (majority opinion), IPR2024-00952, Paper 12 (December 13, 2024) (designated: March 20, 2025) [AIA – denying institution where a petitioner argues for a means-plus-function construction in district court and a plain and ordinary meaning]

construction in a petition, but fails to explain the difference in claim construction positions or, alternatively, to provide a means-plus-function construction]

- [Chevron Oronite Co. LLC v. Infineum USA L.P.](#), Case IPR2018-00923, Paper 9 (November 7, 2018) (designated: April 5, 2019) [AIA § 314(a), insufficient number of proposed grounds/challenges to claims meet reasonable likelihood standard]
- [Ex parte Chuang](#), No. 2008-5143 (November 13, 2008) [Anticipation - cDNA]
- [Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC](#), Paper 12, No. IPR2014-00454 (August 29, 2014) [AIA - incorporation by reference, 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3) - incorporated evidence improper]
- [Colas Sols. Inc. v. Blacklidge Emulsions, Inc.](#), Case No. IPR2018-00242, Paper 9 (February 27, 2018) [AIA - bar due to petitioner's action, 35 U.S.C. § 315(a) - deny institution and joinder - prior declaratory judgment action]
- [CrowdStrike, Inc. v. GoSecure, Inc.](#), IPR2025-00068 & IPR2025-00070, Paper 25 (June 25, 2025) (designated: June 26, 2025) [AIA § 314(a) - vacating decisions granting institution of two parallel petitions where a petitioner offers distinct claim constructions in each petition, and remanding for the Board to institute at most one petition given the overlap in claims] (Director Review decision)
- [Cultec, Inc. v. Stormtech LLC.](#), Paper 7, No. IPR2017-00777 (August 22, 2017) [AIA - multiple proceedings, 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) - deny institution - examination]
- [Ex parte Curry](#), No. 2005-0509 (June 30, 2005) [Non-functional descriptive material - data in database]

D-F

D

- [Ex parte Daniels](#), No. 2008-0568 (May 20, 2009) (May 20, 2009) [evaluating sufficiency of affidavit]
- [Ex parte Dart](#), No. 2007-1325 (August 22, 2007) [Obviousness - analogous art, pertinent to same problem - rationales, predictable results]
- [DeBoer v. Gordon](#), Int. 105,004, Paper 18 (February 3, 2003) [Interferences - analysis of whether interference-in-fact]
- [Deeper, UAB v. Vexilar, Inc.](#), Case No. IPR2018-01310, Paper 7 (January 24, 2019) (designated: April 5, 2019) [AIA § 314(a), insufficient number of proposed grounds/challenges to claims meet reasonable likelihood standard]
- [Dionne v. Liotta](#), Int. 104,333, Paper 119 (October 31, 2001) [Obviousness – person of ordinary skill in the art, evidence in support]
- [Ex parte Ditzik](#), No. 2018-000087 (March 2, 2018) [Issue preclusion - precluded by prior district court adjudication]
- [Dung v. Buehler](#), Int. 105,893, Paper 121 (July 23, 2013) [Interferences - procedure - late introduction of evidence]

E

- [Eli Lilly & Co. v. Cameron](#), Int. 104,104, Paper 18 (October 31, 2001) [Interferences - procedure - request for adverse judgment]
- [Ellsworth v. Moore](#), No. Int. 104,528, Paper 54 (November 20, 2001) [Interferences - inventorship]

F

- [Ex parte Fautz](#), No. 2019-000106 (May 15, 2019) (designated July 1, 2019) [§ 101, statutory subject matter -applying 2019 revised guidance]
- [Ex parte Fletcher](#), No. 2009-007416 (January 26, 2010) [Ex parte appeals -official notice, failure to traverse]
- [Ex parte Frenk](#), No. 2009-005654 (June 19, 2009) [Claim construction -construing “substantially”]
- [Furman v. Cheng](#), Int. 104,523, Paper 58 (May 11, 2001) [Interferences -priority -procedure for showing]

G-I

G

- [Garmin Int'l Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs LLC](#), Case IPR2012-00001, Paper 26 (June 11, 2013) [AIA - discovery, 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(5), factors]
- [General Plastic Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha](#), Paper 19, No. IPR2016-01357 (September 6, 2017) [Expanded panels, reasons for expansion]
- [Genise v. Desautels](#), Int. 104,834 (May 12, 2003) Paper 66 [Interferences -written decision following bench ruling]
- [Gibson v. Sturman](#), Int. 105,016 (2002) Papers 42 & 43 [Interferences -procedure -extension of time]
- [Ex parte Givens](#), No. 2009-003414 (August 6, 2009) [Claim construction -construe in light of specification]
- [Glaxco Wellcome, Inc. v. Cabilly](#), Int. 104,532 (April 30, 2001) [Interferences -motions -prima facie case]
- [Ex parte Gleave](#), No. 2005-2447 (January 31, 2006) [35 U.S.C. § 112, written description -examiner burden]
- [Gregory v. Tsui](#), Int. 104,228 (January 4, 2002) Paper 100, aff'd mem., No. 02-1345 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (January 4, 2002) [Interferences -analysis of priority; § 102(g) abandon, suppress, or conceal]
- [Guthrie v. Espiau](#), Int. 105,393 (April 18, 2007) Paper 94 [Interferences –amending priority statement; derivation, raising in priority statement]

H

- [Han v. Livak](#), Int. 104,670 (2002) Paper 68 (March 26, 2002) [Interferences -jurisdiction -discretion to decide patentability issues]
- [Ex parte Hannun \(formerly Ex parte Linden\)](#), 2018-003323 (April 1, 2019) [applying 2019 revised guidance]
- [Ex parte Hansen](#), No. 2007-3424 (May 13, 2008) [Non-functional descriptive material -decal]
- [Herman v. Barnes](#), Int. 104,812 (April 10 2003) Paper 91 [Interferences -inventorship]
- [Ex parte Hicks](#), No. 2007-2715 (November 13, 2007) [35 U.S.C. § 112 -enablement -scope]
- [Hospira, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.](#), Case IPR2017-00739, Paper 16 (July 27, 2017) [AIA -35 U.S.C. § 325(d), deny institution -examination]
- [Hulu, LLC v. Piranha Media Distribution, LLC](#), IPR2024-01252 & IPR2024-01253, Paper 27 (April 17, 2025) (designated: May 7, 2025) [AIA § 314(a) –vacating decision granting institution when a district court has already found the challenged claims invalid under § 101] (Director Review decision)
- [Hulu, LLC v. Sound View Innovations, LLC](#), Case IPR2018-00582, Paper 34 (August 5, 2019) [no claims unpatentable –insufficient reason to combine references]

I

- [In-Depth Geophysical, Inc. v. ConocoPhillips Company](#) (§ I.E), Case IPR2019-00849, Paper 14 (September 6, 2019) [AIA § 311(b) –determining, for purposes of institution, Petitioner failed to make a sufficient showing that a reference qualifies as a printed publication]
- [Intellectual Concepts, LLC v. Zannier, Inc.](#), Int. 105,617, Paper 66 (September 19, 2008) [Interferences -evidence/discovery -admissibility]
- [Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Limited](#), Case IPR2013-00324, Paper 19 (November 21, 2013) [AIA -multiple proceedings, 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) -deny institution -prior petition]

J-L

J

- [Ex parte Janakiraman](#), No. 2008-0998 (May 6, 2009) [Ex parte appeals -new grounds of rejection, fairness]
- [Ex parte Jerg](#), No. 2011-000044 (April 17, 2012) [Ex parte appeals -double patenting -not reaching provisional double patenting]
- [Curt G. Joa, Inc. v. Fameccanica.data S.P.A.](#), Case IPR2016-00906, Paper 61 (June 20, 2017) [guidance on use of confidential information at hearing]
- [Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation, Inc.](#), Case IPR2018-00827, Paper 9 (October 16, 2018) [denying institution –insufficient reason to combine references]
- [Ex parte Jud](#), No. 2006-1061 (January 30, 2007) [Obviousness -person of ordinary skill in the art -evidence considered]

K

- [Karim v. Jobson](#), Int. 105,376, Paper 99 (February 28, 2007) [Interferences -jurisdiction -discretion to decide patentability issues]
- [Kaufman v. Talieh](#), Int. 105,233, Paper 23 (November 19, 2004) [Interferences -settlement -actions construed to be request for adverse judgment]
- [Kayak Software Corp. v. Int’l Bus. Mach. Corp.](#), CBM2016-00075, Paper 16 (December 15, 2016) (designated March 21, 2018) [AIA -multiple proceedings, 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) -deny institution -examination]
- [Khavari v. D.T.](#), Int. 104,696, Paper 21 (2001) [Interferences -motions -untimely and argumentative motions list]
- [Ex parte Kim](#), No. 2007-3980 (May 29, 2008) [35 U.S.C. § 112 –indefiniteness -lack of specification guidance]
- [Ex parte Kimizuka](#), No. 2018-001081 (May 15, 2019) (designated July 1, 2019) [35 U.S.C. § 101 –statutory subject matter -applying 2019 revised guidance]
- [Kokusai Electric Corporation v. ASM IP Holding B.V.](#), Case IPR2018-01151, Paper 38 (August 20, 2019) [granting joint motion to terminate, not deciding motion to amend]
- [Kopf-Sill v. Yager](#), Int. 104,718, Paper 81 (March 11, 2002) [Interferences -motions -untimely motions]
- [Ex parte Kraus](#), No. 2005-0841, Paper 52 (September 21, 2006) [Reissue -recapture]
- [Ex parte Kraus](#), No. 2005-0841, Paper 50 (February 22, 2006) [Reissue -recapture]
- [Kundu v. Ragunathan](#), Int. 104,843, Paper 51 (October 18, 2002) [Interferences -priority -§ 102(g) abandon, suppress, or conceal]

L

- [Lalonde v. Li](#), Int. 105,607, Paper 23 (March 19, 2008) [Interferences - motions - scope of motions list]
- [Ex parte Lazzara](#), No. 2007-0192 (November 13, 2007) [35 U.S.C. § 112, indefiniteness - term of degree]
- [LeVeen v. Edwards](#), Int. 104,290, Paper 348 (April 23, 2002) [Interferences - motions - striking improper brief]
- [LeVeen v. Edwards](#), Int. 104,290, Paper 351 (2002) [Interferences - motions - untimely arguments]
- Longi Green Energy Tech. Co., v. Hanwha Solutions Corp., Case IPR2019-01072, Paper 33 (August 18, 2020) [AIA, addressing remote hearings and demonstrative exhibits]
- [Luv N' Care, Ltd. v. McGinley](#), Case No. IPR2017-01216, Paper 13 (September 18, 2017) [AIA - bar due to patent owner's action, 35 U.S.C. § 315(b) - insufficient funds at filing]

M-O

M

- [Ex parte Maeda](#), No. 2008-006267 (July 22, 2009) [35 U.S.C. § 102 - inherency - proof properties are not inherent]
- [Ex parte Maeda](#), No. 2010-009814 (October 23, 2012) (designated October 15, 2019) [35 U.S.C. § 103 - rationales - design choice]
- [Ex parte Mathias](#), No. 2005-1851 (August 19, 2005) [Non-functional descriptive material - broadcast television content]
- [Ex parte May](#), No. 2006-1776 (April 30, 2007) [35 U.S.C. § 102 - qualification as § 102(e) prior art]
- [Ex parte McBrearty](#), No. 2007-1340 (July 27, 2007) [35 U.S.C. § 103 - rationales - finite solutions]
- [Ex parte McCann](#), No. 2008-0785 (May 29, 2008) [35 U.S.C. § 103 - secondary considerations - commercial success, long-felt need]
- [Medtronic, Inc. v. Nuvasive, Inc.](#), IPR2014-00487, Paper 8 (September 11, 2014) [AIA - Multiple proceedings, 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) - deny institution - prior petition]
- [Ex parte Moon](#), No. 2008-005829 (July 22, 2009) [Claim constructions - construe in light of Specification]
- [Motorola Mobility LLC v. Patent of Michael Arnouse](#), IPR2013-00010, Paper 20 (January 30, 2013) [AIA - bar due to patent owner's action, 35 U.S.C. § 315(b) - "served with a complaint"]

N

- [Nagaraj v. Rickerby](#), Int. 104,817, Paper 51 (December 5, 2002) [Interferences - evidence/discovery - motions in limine]
- [Noelle v. Armitage](#), Int. 104,724 Paper 89 (May 15, 2003) and Paper 92 (July 3, 2008) [Interferences - procedure - circumstances when appropriate to proceed to priority phase]
- [Noelle v. Armitage](#), Int. 104,724, Paper 33 (April 26, 2002) [Interferences - procedure - stay of interference]
- [Noelle v. Lederman](#), Int. 104,415, Paper 135 (October 19, 2001) [Interferences - interference-in-fact - one-way distinctiveness]

O

- [Ex parte Olson](#), No. 2017-006489 (March 25, 2019) (designated July 1, 2019) [35 U.S.C. § 101 - statutory subject matter - applying 2019 revised guidance]
- [Ondeyka v. Shelley](#), Int. 104,709, Paper 14 (July 24, 2001) [Interferences - jurisdiction - expired patent]

P-R

P

- [Panduit Corp. v. ADC Telecomms](#), No. 2011-003296 (February 24, 2012) [Inter partes reexam - jurisdiction]
- [Ex parte POD-NERS, L.L.C.](#), No. 2007-3938 (April 29, 2008) [35 U.S.C. § 112 -enablement, undue experimentation; indefiniteness, scope]
- [Ex parte Porro](#), No. 2008-0184 (March 11, 2008) [35 U.S.C. § 112 -written description -species-genus]
- [Perego v. Drehmel](#), Int. 105,467, Paper 63 (March 9, 2007) [Interferences -evidence/discovery -evidence submitted in response to objection]
- [Preputnick v. Provencher](#), Int. 104,693, Paper 60 (2002) [35 U.S.C. § 112 -written description -expert testimony]
- [Prism Pharma Co., Ltd. v. Choongwae Pharma Corp.](#), Case IPR2014-00315, Paper 14 (July 8, 2014) [35 U.S.C. § 325(d) -deny institution -prosecution activity]
- [PUMA North America, Inc. v. NIKE, Inc.](#), Case IPR2019-01042, Paper 10 (October 31, 2019) (designated: March 24, 2020) [AIA § 325(d) –denying institution based on prosecution activity]

Q

R

- [Rabbani v. Notomi](#), Int. 105,427, Paper 145 (January 25, 2008) [Interferences -motions -motion vs. reply]
- [Ex parte Righi](#), No. 2007-0590 (July 25, 2007) [Obviousness -rationales -known elements; fewer than all references]
- [Rodriguez Rilo v Benedict](#), Int. 105,684 (RT), Paper 17 (March 23, 2009) [Interferences -interference -in-fact -procedure for showing]
- [Rohr v. McNulty](#), Int. 104,804, Paper 39 (March 6, 2003) [Interferences -procedure -adding claims to interference]
- [Rohrman v. Alt](#), Paper 21 (June 27, 2001) [Interferences -procedure -adding claims to interference]
- [Rose v. Frazer](#), Int. 104,773, Paper 23 (December 17, 2001) [Interferences -procedure -correcting a preliminary statement]
- [Rose v. Frazer](#), Int. 104,773, Paper 73 (March 29, 2002) [Interferences -evidence/discovery -motions in limine]
- [Rowells v. Vichinsky](#), Int. 105,518, Paper 19 (March 6, 2007) [Derivation -corroborated communication of conception]
- [Ryan v. Young](#), Int. 105,504, Paper 116 (March 4, 2008) [Interferences -general motion practice]

S-U

S

- [Ex parte Sami Chemicals and Extracts, LTD.](#), 2007-3482 (February 2, 2009) [Ex parte -new grounds of rejection -claim construction]
- [Sanada v. Reynolds](#), Int. 105,029, Paper 21 (March 19, 2003) [35 U.S.C. § 112 -means-plus-function -functional claiming]

- [Sand Revolution II, LLC v. Continental Intermodal Group – Trucking LLC](#), IPR2019-01393, Paper 24 (June 16, 2020) [AIA § 314(a), instituting review – Fintiv factors weighed against exercising discretion to deny institution]
- [Sandoz Inc. v. AbbVie Biotechnology Ltd.](#) (§ III.C.1), IPR2018-00156, Paper 11 (June 5, 2018) [AIA § 311(b) – determining, for purposes of institution, Petitioner made a sufficient showing that a reference qualifies as a printed publication]
- [Sattler Tech Corp. v. Humancentric Ventures, LLC](#), Case PGR2019-00030, Paper 9 (July 26, 2019) [AIA § 321 - instituting review, design patent, alleged lack of ornamentality]
- [Sauer, Inc. v. Kanzaki Kokyukoki Mfg., Int.](#) 104,311, Paper 292 (2002) [Interferences - inventorship]
- [Ex parte Savescu](#), 2018-003174 (April 1, 2019) (designated July 1, 2019) [35 U.S.C. § 101 - statutory subject matter - applying 2019 revised guidance]
- [Schaenzer v. Knight](#), Int. 105,058, Paper 41 (October 29, 2003) [Interferences - settlement - relief sought as part of settlement]
- [Seabery North America Inc. v. Lincoln Global, Inc.](#) (§ II.A.i), Case IPR2016-00840, Paper 11 (October 6, 2016) [AIA § 311(b) – determining, for purposes of institution, Petitioner made a sufficient showing that a reference qualifies as a printed publication]
- [Sever v. Glickman](#), Int. 104,722, Paper 33 (November 6, 2001) [Interferences - fraud and inequitable conduct; derivation - conception]
- [Ex parte Shaw](#), 1997-3258 (December 19, 2005) [Issue preclusion - precluded by administrative adjudication]
- [Ex parte Shaw](#), 1997-3258 (May 21, 2004) [Issue preclusion - precluded by administrative adjudication]
- [Ex parte Smart](#), 2009-015036 (January 3, 2011)
- [Ex parte Smith](#), 2011-003337 (February 28, 2012) [Anticipation - picking and choosing; obviousness - secondary considerations - unexpected results]
- [Ex parte Smith](#), 2018-000064 (01 February 2019) (February 1, 2019) (designated: March 19, 2019) [35 U.S.C. § 101 - statutory subject matter - applying 2019 revised guidance]
- [Spalding v. Hartsell](#), 104,699, Paper 92 (2002) [Anticipation - printed publication; interferences - motions - incorporation of arguments by reference]
- [Ex parte Spangler](#), 2018-003800 (February 20, 2019) (designated October 15, 2019) [Obviousness - rationales - design choice]
- [Ex parte Srinivasan](#), No. 2007-0512 (May 1, 2007)
- [Stiller v. Heid](#), 105,044, Paper 38 (September 16, 2003) [Interferences - interference-in-fact - legal standard]
- [Strelchenko v. Campbell](#), Int. 104,809, Paper 26 (June 10, 2002) [Interferences - jurisdiction - § 135 time bar]
- [Strelchenko v. University of Massachusetts](#), Int. 104,808, Paper 88 (March 18, 2003) [Interferences - jurisdiction - § 135 time bar]
- [Sullivan v. Bingel](#), Int. 104,818, Paper 73 (2003) [Interferences - jurisdiction - discretion to decide patentability issues]

T

- [Ex parte Talkowski](#), 2012-002290 (May 24, 2013) [Obviousness - analogous art - two-step test]
- [Thomas v. Pippin](#), Int. 105,801, Paper 99 (April 24, 2013) [Interferences - procedure - request to convert application to SIR; ministerial actions during appeal]

- [Thomas v. Pippin](#), Int. 105,801, Paper 97 (March 6, 2013) [Interferences - procedure - request to convert application to SIR; ministerial actions during appeal]
- [Ex parte Thompson](#), 2011-011620 (March 21, 2014) [obviousness analysis includes considering objective indicia of non-obviousness]
- [TRW Automotive US LLC v. Magna Electronics, Inc.](#), Paper 18, IPR2014-00293 (June 27, 2014) [AIA - bar due to patent owner's action, 35 U.S.C. § 315(b) - district court motion to amend; real parties in interest, 35 U.S.C. §§ 312(a)(2), 322(a)(2) - "related" parties]
- [Tseng v. Doroodian-Shoja](#), Int. 104,482, Papers 85 & 91 (2001) [Interferences - analysis of whether interference-in-fact]
- [Ex parte Tullis](#), 2006-0210 (May 17, 2006) [Ex parte - double patenting - obvious-type double patenting]

U

- [Unified Patents, Inc. v. Berman](#), IPR2016-01571, Paper 10 (December 14, 2016) [AIA - 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) - deny institution, examination]
- [Unified Patents, Inc. v. PersonalWeb Techs., LLC](#), IPR2014-00702, Paper 13 (July 24, 2014) [AIA - 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) - deny institution, prior petition]
- [University of New Mexico v. Fordham University](#), Int. 104,761, Paper 47 (April 2, 2002) [Interferences - procedure - disqualification of counsel]
- [University of Washington v. Eli Lilly & Co.](#), Int. 104,733, Paper 45 (June 11, 2002) [Interferences - analysis of whether interference-in-fact]

V-Z

V

- [Ex parte Vegas Amusement, Inc.](#), 2012-001010 (Dec 9, 2011) [Claim construction - broadest reasonable interpretation]

W

- [Wang v. Kovesdi](#), Paper 75 (January 30, 2003) [Interferences - procedure - correcting a preliminary statement]
- [Ex parte Wellerdieck](#), 2007-1119 (May 4, 2007) [Reissue - 35 U.S.C. § 251 - term]
- [Wertz v. Rose](#), Int. 104,421, Paper 39 (March 28, 2003) [Interferences - arbitration]
- [Ex parte Whirlpool Corp.](#), 2013-008232 (October 30, 2013) [nexus, industry praise, commercial success, long-felt need, copying]
- [Wojciak v. Nishiyama](#), Int. 104,539, Paper 54 (February 23, 2001) [Interferences - evidence/discovery - cross-examination using an interpreter]
- [Wojciak v. Nishiyama](#), Int. 104,539, Paper 72 (June 4, 2001) [Interferences - evidence/discovery - hearsay]
- [Ex parte Wright](#), 2006-0003 (April 6, 2006) [commercial success, copying, long-felt need]

X

Y

- [Yurek v. Yamada](#), Paper 46 (2001) [Interferences -analysis of whether interference-in-fact]

Z

- [ZTE Corp. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.](#), IPR2013-00454, Paper 12 (September 25, 2013) [AIA – multiple proceedings, 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) -deny institution, prior petition; joinder, 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) - deny institution where joinder denied]

Most files are in portable document format (PDF), which requires the use of a pdf reader.

[Download Acrobat PDF Reader](#)

Was this page helpful?  

 Share this page  Print this page

[Additional information](#) about this page

Receive updates from the USPTO

Enter your email to subscribe or update your preferences

[Subscribe](#)

[About the USPTO](#) • [Search for patents](#) • [Search for trademarks](#)

[US Department of Commerce](#)
[Accessibility](#)
[Privacy Policy](#)
[Terms of Use](#)
[Financial and Performance Data](#)
[Vulnerability Disclosure Policy](#)
[Freedom of Information Act](#)
[Inspector General](#)
[NoFEAR Act](#)
[USA.gov](#)

Follow us

