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Overview

• Study methodology

• Study results

• New precedential opinion: *General Plastic*

• New informative decisions on 35 U.S.C. §325(d)

• Case studies

• Board case management
Multiple Petition Study Methodology
Methodology

• Comprehensive review of all IPR, PGR, and CBM petitions filed on or before 6/30/2017

• Covers 7,168 petitions and their associated:
  • 4,376 patents;
  • 1,633 patent owners; and
  • 1,423 petitioners

• Relied upon metadata from a PTAB database that identified parties, filings, and milestones

• Additional data was gathered manually to identify claim information (e.g., challenged, instituted) and to determine if the petitioner was a defendant in an associated district court litigation
Methodology (cont.)

• Counting the numbers of petitions and identifying the parties tells only part of the story

• Further identifies the context of a petition, i.e., how the petition relates to other petitions challenging the same patent by examining:
  o Who came first?
  o How long after?
  o Same party?

• Considers a “net” challenge to the patent
  o Example 1:
    o Petition 1: Challenges claims 1-10
    o Petition 2: Challenges claims 11-20
    o Net challenge is to claims 1-20

  o Example 2:
    o Petition 1: Settled
    o Petition 2: Denied institution
    o Petition 3: Some claims unpatentable
    o Net result is some claims unpatentable
Multiple Petition Study Results
Multiple Petition Study Questions

• **Question 1**: Do IPRs represent a significant proportion of the U.S. patent litigation landscape?

• **Question 2**: How many petitioners challenge patents?

• **Question 3**: How many petitions are filed against each patent?

• **Question 4**: Do petitioners often “wait and see” what the Patent Owner says in its Preliminary Response or the Board says in a decision on institution?

• **Question 5**: Who are the petitioners filing petitions after the Board issues a decision on institution?

• **Question 6**: How often have petitioners been able to use the Board’s institution decision to inform another petition?

• **Question 7**: What is the institution rate counting by patent versus counting by petition?

• **Question 8**: What is the ultimate outcome by patent versus the ultimate outcome by petition?
**Question 1**: Where does the PTAB fit into the U.S. patent litigation landscape?
Approximately 85% of IPRs in Fiscal Year 2017 have a co-pending district court case.

Less than a fifth of district court cases involve patents that are challenged in an IPR.

Data sourced from Lex Machina PTAB Report 2017
Question 2: How many petitioners file challenges against each patent?
## Multiple Petition Study

### Petitioners Per Patent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Petitioners vs. Patent</th>
<th>No. of Patents</th>
<th>% Patents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3711</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4376</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

84.8% of Patents are Challenged by a Single Petitioner

**Data Through 6/30/17**
Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding
Question 3: How many petitions are filed against each patent?
### Multiple Petition Study

**Petitions Per Patent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Petitions per Patent</th>
<th>Patents</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2932</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or more</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4376</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NUMBER OF PETITIONS PER PATENT**

- 87.2% of Patents Challenged at PTAB by 1 or 2 Petitions
- 67.0% of Patents Challenged at PTAB

Data Through 6/30/17
Question 4: If more than one petition is filed against a patent, when are the additional petitions filed?
When Petitions Are Filed

Before POPR

PO Preliminary Response

Decision on Petition

PO Response & Motion to Amend Claims

Petitioner Reply to PO Response & Opposition to Amendment

PO Reply to Opposition to Amendment

Oral Hearing

Final Written Decision

3 months

No more than 3 months

3 months

3 months

1 month

Hearing Set on Request

“POPR”

“DI”

“FWD”

Before DI

After DI
Multiple Petition Study  
*When Petitions are Filed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing of Petition</th>
<th>No. of Petitions</th>
<th>% of Petitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Petition Filed</td>
<td>2932</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Petitions Filed On or Near Same Day</td>
<td>2685</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Petitions Filed After POPR, But Before DI</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Petitions Filed After DI</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7168</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**When Petitions are Filed**

- Single Petition vs. Patent: 41%
- Multiple Petition Filed On or Near Same Day: 38%
- Multiple Petition Filed after POPR: 5%
- Multiple Petition Filed After DI: 16%

79% of Petitions are filed without the benefit of seeing a POPR or DI.
16% of petitions are filed after a decision on institution. 

**Question 5**: Who are the petitioners filing these petitions?
Multiple Petition Study

Who are post-DI Petitioners?

• 16% of all petitions are filed after a DI
• A random sample of the 1054 petitions filed after DI as of 3/1/17* was taken
• The sample included 169 petitions, and the results were found to be statistically significant, such that we can use the sample (169 petitions) as an estimate of the whole (1054 petitions).

9-10% of petitions filed by:
• Defendant-Petitioner; or
• Same or Different Petitioner
  • Filing due to a change in litigation; or
  • Seeking to join existing trial as a party

6-7% of petitions filed by:
• Non-Defendant Petitioner; or
• Same Petitioner
  • Filing not due to change in litigation; and
  • Not seeking party joinder

*Random sample taken on 3/1/17 using data through 2/28/17
**Question 6:** How often do individual Petitioners file additional rounds of petitions after receiving a decision on institution?

- A “round” is all petitions filed before receiving a DI on one of those petitions
Multiple Petition Study  
*Rounds of Petitions*

- 95% of petitions are filed in a given petitioner’s first round
- A “round” is all petitions filed before receiving a DI on one of those petitions

### Rounds of Petitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rounds of Petitions</th>
<th>No. of Petitions</th>
<th>% of Petitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Round of Petitions</td>
<td>6481</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Round of Petitions</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third or Fourth Round of Petitions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6857</strong></td>
<td><strong>95%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Through 6/30/17

*Not included are 311 Petitions filed where a request to join as a party to another proceeding was granted*
Question 7: What is the institution rate counting by patent versus counting by petition?
Multiple Petition Study

Institution Rate

- **Institution rate as measured by patent** is only slightly higher than the institution rate as measured by petition.

- **“By patent”** accounts for whether any one petition against particular patent is instituted:
  - Example against Patent A:
    - Petition 1 instituted
    - Petition 2 not instituted
    - Net result = 100% institution rate

- **“By petition”** accounts for whether a particular petition was instituted; publicly reported monthly:
  - Example against Patent A
    - Petition 1 instituted
    - Petition 2 not instituted
    - Net result = 50% institution rate

Data Through 6/30/17
**Question 8**: What is the ultimate outcome by patent versus the ultimate outcome by petition?
These figures reflect the latest status of each petition. The outcomes of decisions on institution responsive to requests for rehearing are incorporated. Once joined to a base case, a petition remains in the Joined category regardless of subsequent outcomes.
Multiple Petition Study

Ultimate Outcome

• 69% of all petitions result in a patent being unchanged; 58% of patents are unchanged at the end of one or more AIA proceedings

• “By patent” accounts for whether any one petition against particular patent results in any unpatenable claims

• “By petition” accounts for whether a particular petition results in any unpatentable claims

Data Through 6/30/17
Multiple Petition Study Highlights

- **Studied**: 7168 petitions addressing 4376 patents

- **Who**: 84.8% of patents are challenged by a single petitioner

- **What**: 87% of patents are challenged by 1 or 2 petitions

- **Where**: 85% of IPRs have a co-pending district court case

- **When**:
  - 79% of petitions are filed before any Patent Owner Response or a Decision on Institution
  - 95% of petitions are filed in a given petitioner’s first round

- **Why**: Often a petitioner could not have filed a petition earlier or may be prompted to file later because of the litigation circumstances

- **How**:
  - Institution rate by patent (FY17: 70%) is only slightly higher than by petition (FY17: 64%)
  - 58% of patents challenged at the PTAB are unchanged
Multiple Petition Study Next Steps

• Slides available on the USPTO PTAB website

• Data under continued review and future installments of study results anticipated
New Precedential Opinion: General Plastic Industrial Co. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha
IPRs: 2016-01357, 2016-01358, 2016-01359, 2016-01360, 2016-01361
Timeline for General Plastic

First Set of Petitions Filed

Institution Denied on Merits

Second Set of Petitions Filed
## Multiple Petition Study

*When Petitions are Filed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing of Petition</th>
<th>No. of Petitions</th>
<th>% of Petitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Petition Filed</td>
<td>2932</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Petitions Filed On or Near Same Day</td>
<td>2685</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Petitions Filed After POPR, But Before DI</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple Petitions Filed After DI</strong></td>
<td><strong>1170</strong></td>
<td><strong>16%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7168</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Through 6/30/17**

### WHEN PETITIONS ARE FILED

- Single Petition vs. Patent
- Multiple Petition Filed On or Near Same Day
- Multiple Petition Filed after POPR
- Multiple Petition Filed After DI

- General Plastic: 41%
- Multiple Petition Filed On or Near Same Day: 38%
- Multiple Petition Filed After POPR, But Before DI: 5%
- Multiple Petition Filed After DI: 16%
Factors Considered

1. whether the same petitioner previously filed a petition directed to the same claims of the same patent;

2. whether at the time of filing of the first petition the petitioner knew or should have known of the prior art asserted in the second petition;

3. whether at the time of filing of the second petition the petitioner already received the patent owner’s preliminary response to the first petition or received the Board’s decision on whether to institute review in the first petition;

4. length of time that elapsed between the time the petitioner learned of the prior art asserted in the second petition and the filing of the second petition;

5. whether the petitioner provides adequate explanation for the time elapsed between the filings of multiple petitions directed to the same claims of the same patent;

6. finite resources of the Board; and

7. requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11) to issue a final determination not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director notices institution of review.
New Informative Decisions Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d)
Informative Decisions

- IPR2016-01571 - Unified Patents, Inc. v. Berman
- IPR2017-00739 - Hospira, Inc. v. Genentech
- IPR2017-00777 - Cultec, Inc. v. Stormtech LLC
Multiple Petition Case Studies
Case Studies

- Approximately 1% of patents are challenged by 7 or more petitions

- PTAB investigated the “extreme outliers” (aka, the last third of this 1%) to determine what commonalities, if any, exist
Extreme Outliers

• Very unusual:
  o Almost 90% of patents face 1 or 2 petitions
  o 16 patents out of 4376 challenged patents (appx. third of 1%) have faced more than 10 petitions

• Driven by extreme conditions:
  o Large numbers of claims;
  o Large numbers of defendants; and/or
  o Large numbers of joinders
Extreme Outlier #1: Largest Family

- 125 petitions filed against 10 patents totaling more than 370 claims
  - (per patent: 23, 21, 19, 16, 15, 11, 10, 4, 4, 2)
- All petitions filed by defendants
  - District Court required a petition for a stay
- 65 petitions were merely requesting joinder to other petition – effectively a copy
- Each claim faced only 1 ground total
- No follow up petitions
- All claims found unpatentable after PTAB trial
- Federal Circuit Rule 36 opinions affirming all appealed cases
Extreme Outlier #2: Most Petitions

- 26 petitions filed against a single patent having 306 claims
- Petitions filed by 3 different petitioners
  - District court litigation filed in waves
  - 2 petitioners were current defendants; 1 was prior defendant
  - 13 petitions (includes 5 requests for joinder)
    - Two petitioners
    - Each petitioner filed all of their petitions on same day
    - All settled prior to DI
- 13 petitions
  - One petitioner
  - Petitions filed to address over 200 claims
Multiple Petition Case Management
How Judges Coordinate Multiple Petitions

• Generally, utilize the same panel on all cases, with one judge taking “point” on interlocutory matters

• Coordinate briefing among petitioners – e.g., have one petitioner take “point”
  • Require meet and confer

• Coordinate oral hearing schedules
  • Option of waiving oral hearings or limiting scope to reduce overlap

• Stagger major due dates to allow attorneys more time to prepare briefs
## Upcoming Boardside Chats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 7, 2017</td>
<td>Presenting Prior Art and Proving a Document is a Printed Publication in an Appeal or AIA Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1, 2018</td>
<td>Design Patent Appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 5, 2018</td>
<td>AIA Motion Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7, 2018</td>
<td>Motions to Exclude and Motions to Strike in AIA Trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 4, 2018</td>
<td>Motions to Seal, Protective Orders, and Confidential Information in AIA Trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 6, 2018</td>
<td>Hearsay and Authentication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 7, 2019</td>
<td>Supplemental Information vs. Supplemental Evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>