Patent Litigation

IP litigation is the firm's largest practice area, and more than 80% of our IP cases involve patents. This deep expertise has made Quinn Emanuel the preeminent law firm in the world for patent litigation. We represent many of the world's leading technology companies, both as plaintiffs and defendants, in their most important matters. Our clients trust us to win, and we do.

The firm has been recognized for its work in patent litigation globally including in the United States. Some of the firm's recent accolades in the patent litigation field include:

- *The Legal 500 UK 2025*: Recognized as a "Firm to Watch" in the UK for Intellectual Property: Patents (contentious and non-contentious)
- The firm has been ranked the No. 1 patent challenger, with a 94% win rate from 2022 to 2024, and the No. 2 patentee firm in the U.S. district courts by the *Docket Navigator*.
- *Chambers Global 2023*: Band 1 for patent litigation in Germany, USA
- The firm has been ranked Tier 1 in the USA and Tier 2 in Germany for Patent Contentious by *Managing IP* in the *IP STARS* 2022 guide.
- The firm has been ranked Tier 1 for patent Litigation (Full Coverage) and Tier 2 for patent litigation (ITC) by *Legal 500 United States 2022.*
- The firm has been ranked Band 1 for patent litigation (nationwide) by *Chambers USA 2022*.
- The firm has been ranked Tier 1 in both National and Metropolitan rankings (Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, San Francisco) for patent litigation by *Best Lawyers* "Best Law Firms (2023 Edition)".
- Several Quinn Emanuel attorneys have been selected for patent litigation as part of the inaugural 2023 *Lawdragon 500 Leading Litigators in America* guide, which spotlights the most elite courtroom advocates in the nation.
- The firm has been ranked in 8 jurisdictions with 21 individual attorneys recognized for 2022 by *IAM Patent 1000: The World's Leading Patent Professionals.*

Patent disputes are often fought on multiple fronts, with numerous litigations proceeding simultaneously in different venues, and thus we are frequently called upon to litigate patent disputes in venues around the world. We have the leading patent litigation practice in Germany, which is the second most important venue (after the U.S.) for patent disputes globally. Recently, *Chambers Europe 2023* ranked us in Band 1 for patent litigation in Germany and *Legal 500 Deutschland* 2023 ranked us Tier 1 for patent litigation in Germany. QE partners ranked as "national leaders" for patent litigation in *Who's Who Legal* Germany 2023. The firm was shortlisted by *Managing IP* Awards 2021 in the "Germany: Firm of the Year – Patent Contentious (Law Firms)" category. The prestigious German legal directory, *JUVE*, named us the "IP Law Firm of the Year" in 2020, making our firm the only one to have won the prestigious award twice in the last decade. We were the first foreign firm to ever win this award. In 2019, BTI Consulting named Quinn Emanuel as one of the "15 Best of the Best Law Firms in IP Litigation," and we were named a "Top Law Firm 2019 for Patent Litigation" by *Wirtschaftswoche* ("Business Week"). In 2018, the firm was listed as a Tier 1 firm by *Benchmark Litigation* in the area of Intellectual Property, and the firm received a top ranking for Patent Litigation from *JUVE*.

We have litigated in many different settings, including jury trials, bench trials, administrative proceedings, and arbitrations. And we have won many important patent cases both before and at

trial. Our cases are venued in courts throughout the United States, including in well-known patent litigation hotbeds such as California, Texas, New Jersey, and Delaware. For each case, we make sure we know our audience and identify how best to litigate in the particular jurisdiction. Over time, this particularized approach has sometimes led us to establish a local presence in area. For example, as Texas has become increasingly important for patent litigation, we expanded our presence in the State; we opened offices in Austin and Dallas, alongside our Houston office.

Many of our cases also involve parallel litigations in the EU, and our lawyers in different offices work seamlessly with each other in these cross-border disputes, coordinating strategy to ensure efficiency and success. Our winning record in Germany, where more than two thirds of EU patent litigations are filed, is unparalleled. Those cases have involved a wide range of technologies and have often been the subject of substantial media attention. The "Smartphone Wars" and the Qualcomm v. Apple litigations are recent examples. We have represented Qualcomm, Google, Motorola, Samsung, and HTC in epic battles with Apple in Germany, as well as in the United States.

Despite the UK's departure from the EU, the UK remains a key strategic jurisdiction for patent litigation in Europe and worldwide, particularly for high value and technically complex patent cases. The IP framework in the UK ranks second only to the United States according to the International IP Index (US Chamber of Commerce). Our firm is excited to continue growing our IP Litigation Practice in the UK under Dr. David Lancaster's leadership and expertise.
Our clients hire us because we win. We win because we focus on what matters without wasting resources on irrelevant issues that will not, in the end, persuade the trier of fact. We are known as trial lawyers and, as trial lawyers, we know what will ultimately make a difference. We have a saying at our firm: "The side that figures out first what will ultimately matter wins."

Of course, that is true only in part: A client still needs experienced trial lawyers that know how to try the case. No firm has as much trial experience – as successful trial experience – in patent cases than we do.

We have won many IP trials representing companies as plaintiff, including what was at the time the largest jury verdicts in the history of California and Massachusetts. We are equally adept at winning trials when our clients are defendants. For example, we are one of the few law firms to have obtained multiple defense verdicts in the Eastern District of Texas.

Large and small companies trust us because we have more patent-related experience than nearly any other law firm in the world. More than 250 of our lawyers are experienced IP litigators, including 96 Patent Partners More than 200 of our litigators are scientists or engineers, with degrees and professional backgrounds that our clients need, including:

> *Physics, chemistry, pharmacology, molecular biology, bioethics, neurobiology and neuroscience, physiology, biochemistry, genetics and immunology, environmental science, geology, computer science, computational linguistics, software and database design and information systems, mathematics, statistics, missile guidance systems, and numerous types of engineering: civil, materials science, chemical, biochemical, electrical, environmental, industrial, mechanical, automotive, aeronautical, and nuclear.*

This diversity of knowledge and experience enables us to quickly learn even the most complex technologies. And because we try so many cases, we have mastered the art of explaining complex technologies to judges and juries that do not have technical backgrounds.

We have experience with a wide range of technologies, including computer architecture, enterprise and consumer software, network systems, error correction codes, high-power metal oxide semiconductor field effect transistors (MOSFETS), DRAMs, semiconductor fabrication processes, database architectures, flash and computer memory devices, computer graphics, MPEG

compression techniques and devices, set-top boxes, satellite, DSL and voiceband modem technology, television remotes, pharmaceuticals, medical devices, biomedical products, plasmas and LCD displays, microprocessor architectures, automated gaming systems, semiconductor image scanning and inspection equipment, MRI technologies, hazardous waste remediation equipment, home banking systems, wind turbines, monoclonal antibodies, electronic controls, automotive technologies, consumer packaging, chemical adhesives, building materials, balloon dilatation catheters, fiber optic communications, cellular communications, radio frequency identification systems, smart battery technology, night vision systems, inertial navigations systems, aircraft safety systems, industrial automation and direct broadcast satellite systems. There is no technology that is too complex for our attorneys to understand and effectively prosecute to judges and juries.

We have represented clients in patent litigation on a fixed or contingent fee basis in appropriate cases.

REPRESENTATIVE PATENT CLIENTS

Abbott Labs
Activision
Aliph (aka Jawbone)
Alliance Atlantis
ALZA Corp.
American Express Company
AOL
Applied Materials
Avery Dennison
Bally Technologies
Belkin
Bio-Rad
Borland Software
Cablevision
Caltech
Catalina Marketing
Charter Communications
Cisco
Coinbase
Connetics Corp./Stiefel Laboratories
D-Link
Dassault
Dexcom
DIRECTV
DreamWorks Animation SKG
DreamWorks Studios
EKR Therapeutics, Inc.
Electromagnetic Geo Services
Electronic Arts
Epson America, Inc.
Epson Portland Inc.
Forest Laboratories, Inc.
Fox
Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.
Genentech
General Electric

GlaxoSmithKline
Google
Harbor Freight Tools
H. Lundbeck A/S
HTC Corp.
IAC Search and Media
IBM
IDEC Pharmaceuticals
Intuit
Johnson & Johnson
Johnson Controls
KeyMe
Kraft Foods
KV Pharmaceutical
Lockheed Martin
Macrovision
MediaTek
Micron
Monsanto
Motorola
NantWorks
Napster
Netgear
NetSuite
Northrop Grumman Corp.
Nuance
NVIDIA Corporation
Oppo Digital Corp.
Oracle
Qualcomm
RealNetworks
Recording Industry Association of America
Roche Molecular Systems
Samsung
Seiko Epson
Shell Oil
Sony
Stiefel
Surgetech
Symantec
Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Corp (TSMC)
Teledyne
Tredegar Corp. / Tredegar Film Products Corp.
Toshiba Corporation
The Dow Chemical Company
The Walt Disney Company
Verkada
Yahoo!
Zynga, Inc.

REPRESENTATIVE PHARMACEUTICAL/LIFE SCIENCE PATENT CLIENTS

Abraxis BioScience
Allergan
Becton Dickinson
Bio-Rad
The Broad Institute
Celgene
Corcept Therapeutics
Dow AgroSciences
Forest Laboratories
Fresenius Medical Care
H. Lundbeck A/S
Jazz Pharma
Johnson & Johnson
Merck & Co
Merz Pharmaceuticals
Pfizer
Thermo-Fisher
Twist Bioscience
Vifor Pharma

REPRESENTATIVE PATENT CASES

UNITED STATES – DISTRICT COURTS

CALIFORNIA

- *Splunk Inc. v. Cribl, Inc. et al.* (N.D. Cal. 2024). We defended a big data observability pipeline software start-up, Cribl, Inc., and its chief executive officer in a bet-the-company litigation filed by a much larger big data platform company, Splunk Inc., alleging patent and copyright infringement. In addition to obtaining a complete dismissal or entry of judgment in our clients' favor of the patent claims, claims brought under the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, claims for tortious interference and unfair competition claims, and all claims asserted against the officer defendant individually, we obtained a district court decision holding, based on a jury's factual findings after a two-week trial, that Cribl's uses of plaintiff's software for reverse engineering, testing, and troubleshooting were protected "fair use" under the copyright law and that any infringing activities or license-breaching activities by Cribl warranted only nominal damages of $1 instead of the nearly $155 million plaintiff sought.

- *Impact Engine Inc. v. Google LLC* (S.D. Cal. 2022). We prevailed at summary judgment for **Google** against startup-turned-patent assertion entity Impact Engine, Inc., represented by a large multinational firm. Impact Engine filed suit in July 2019 **in the Southern District of California,** alleging that various Google advertising products infringe eight patents related to online automated ad creation. We responded that Impact Engine's patents were not subject-matter eligible, and that any claims that were found to contain an "inventive concept" under *Alice* could not be practiced by Google, which like the rest of the Internet had long abandoned the Flash-based technology described in the asserted

patents. **Judge Cathy Ann Bencivengo granted Google's motion for summary judgment** on the remaining claims as either invalid or not infringed, resulting in a clean sweep for the team as the Court already had invalidated four of the asserted patents. By invaliding Impact Engine's patents or limiting them to Flash-based technology, we stymied Impact Engine's efforts to tax the online advertising industry.

- *California Institute of Technology v. Broadcom Ltd. et al., (*C.D. Cal. 2022). We obtained a major appellate victory for **Caltech** in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in Broadcom's and Apple's appeal of a $1.1 billion patent infringement judgment our firm obtained for Caltech after a jury trial in the Central District of California. The case concerns Caltech's inventions related to error correction in digital communications that are practiced by Broadcom's Wi-Fi chips and Apple's devices using those chips. Broadcom and Apple argued on appeal that the district court had erred by denying them judgment as a matter of law on infringement, admitting and excluding various expert testimony related to damages, and precluding certain invalidity defenses, among other issues. A 2-1 panel majority rejected almost all of those arguments, upholding the liability judgment for Caltech and making new law limiting patent estoppel based on proceedings before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board. The court remanded for a new trial on damages because the jury had found two different royalty rates, one for Broadcom and one for Apple. The district court will now hold new proceedings on the damages remand.

- *Eolas Technologies Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc. et al. (*N.D. Cal. 2022). The firm is pleased to announce a sweeping victory on behalf of our client **Google** in the Northern District of California. The suit arose out of allegations by Eolas Technologies that Google infringed one of Eolas's patents relating to distributed computing and web browsers. The Court granted summary judgment to Google based on a finding that the asserted patent claims were invalid because they were directed to patent-ineligible subject matter.

- *Wisk Aero LLC v. Archer Aviation Inc.* (N.D. Cal. 2021). We represent **Wisk Aero** in a patent infringement and trade secret misappropriation case against competitor Archer Aviation. Wisk is a joint venture of Boeing and Kitty Hawk, and began development of electric vertical takeoff and landing (eVTOL) aircraft over a decade ago. In late 2019 and early 2020, a startup competitor, Archer Aviation, began recruiting and hiring a number of engineers from Wisk. After conducting a forensic investigation, Wisk discovered that one of those engineers downloaded thousands of files containing valuable trade secrets shortly before he left for Archer. Another engineer downloaded numerous other confidential files, while yet another wiped any trace of his computer activities, in each case shortly before departing to Archer. Wisk reported the theft to the authorities, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and Department of Justice (DOJ) began an investigation. In February 2021, Archer announced that it would soon be going public and release its own eVTOL aircraft, which appeared strikingly similar to a potential design Wisk had developed for its next-generation aircraft and submitted in a confidential patent application to the USPTO in 2020. In April 2021, Wisk filed its lawsuit against Archer. In response, Archer revealed that it, and three of its employees, had received federal grand jury subpoenas related to a government investigation. In August 2023, one month before trial, the parties settled the matter, with Archer agreeing to substantial compensation to Wisk and making Wisk its exclusive provider of autonomy technology in the future to support pilotless aircraft.

- *Contour IP Holding, LLC v. GoPro, Inc, et al*. (N.D. Cal. 2022). We represented **GoPro,** an action sports camera manufacturer, in a patent infringement action brought by a holding company that acquired the patent assets of GoPro's former competitor, Contour. We obtained summary judgment for GoPro based on a finding that the asserted patents were invalid because they were directed to patent-ineligible subject matter.

- *QC Manufacturing v. Solatube* (JAMS arbitration Ref No. 1210037272). Quinn Emanuel represented **Solatube**, a manufacturer of whole house fans, against competitor QC Manufacturing. QC sued Solatube for breach of a prior agreement settling a patent lawsuit. In the arbitration, filed in March 2020, QC alleged nearly 2,000 breaches of the parties' 2018 settlement agreement that imposed a $5,000 per breach liquidated damages provision. After trial, in February 2021, the arbitrator ruled in Solatube's favor, rejecting QC's breach of contract claims, invalidating key terms of the parties' 2018 settlement agreement and its liquidated damages provision, holding the contract and QC's conduct constituted an illegal restraint on a lawful business under California Business & Professions Code section 16600, and that QC engaged in patent misuse. The arbitrator deemed Solatube to be the prevailing party. Solatube subsequently obtained a $2 million fee award, prevailed over QC's petition to vacate, and had it entered as a court judgment.

- *QC Manufacturing v. Solatube,* (C.D. Cal. 2021). In a follow-up matter to the arbitration discussed above, shortly before the arbitration hearing, QC filed a second lawsuit in the Central District of California, alleging that Solatube infringed a recently issued patent, and then filed a motion for a preliminary injunction. After briefing, Judge Cormac Carney issued an order vacating the oral argument and denying the preliminary injunction motion. He accepted every one of Solatube's arguments in opposition to the preliminary injunction motion, and questioned whether the patent can survive the case. Judge Cormac subsequently granted Solatube's Motion for summary judgment of invalidity and awarded Solatube its attorneys' fees.

- *California Institute of Technology v. Broadcom Ltd. et al.* (C.D. Cal. 2020). We represented the **California Institute of Technology ("Caltech")** in a patent infringement lawsuit against Apple and Broadcom. After a two-and-a half-week trial, the jury awarded Caltech over $1.1 billion in damages. The patents protected Caltech's invention of a novel advancement in error correction coding that is now used in WiFi.

- *ASM International, et al v. Hitachi Kokusai Electric, et al.* (N.D. Cal. 2019). We represented **ASM** in patent infringement actions against Kokusai Electric (previously Hitachi Kokusai Electric) in the U.S. and Japan as well as multiple IPR proceedings and ultimately secured a $115 million royalty payment through July 2021.

- *Qualcomm Inc v. Apple Inc.* (S.D. Cal. 2019). We represented **Qualcomm** in a case against Apple asserting that Apple infringes three patents. After an eight day trial, a jury found that Apple infringed all three patents asserted against Apple, awarding Qualcomm the full $1.41 per iPhone royalty it sought. The jury also rejected the only invalidity defense Apple raised (inventorship).

- *mSIGNIA, Inc. v. InAuth, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. 2019). We achieved a complete victory for **American Express** subsidiary, **InAuth, Inc.**, in a patent infringement case directed

to mobile device authentication technologies. Plaintiff mSIGNIA filed suit alleging that InAuth infringed mSIGNIA's asserted patent. In January 2019, the court issued a tentative order granting in full InAuth's motion for summary judgment of non-infringement. Shortly thereafter, plaintiff stipulated to a complete dismissal of all infringement claims with prejudice and waived any right to appeal. During the litigation, InAuth was twice awarded attorney's fees incurred in connection with discovery motions upon which it prevailed.

- *Huawei Technologies, Co., et al. v. Samsung Electronics Co., et al.* (N.D. Cal. 2018). We represented **Samsung** in a case brought by Huawei involving the assertion by both parties of numerous essential standards patents and FRAND defenses. Samsung also asserted an antitrust counterclaim for attempted monopolization. We persuaded the court to issue an antisuit injunction barring Huawei from enforcing an injunction order it obtained on two SEPs in China while the N.D. Cal action was pending.

- *Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.* (N.D. Cal. 2018). We represented **Samsung** in a case involving Apple patents relating to minor user interface features. Following a $100 million award of damages for patent infringement, Apple sought more than $117 million in additional ongoing royalties for Samsung's designed around phones. Following a January 2018 hearing, the court agreed with Samsung, finding no liability for any of Samsung's design arounds.

- *Finjan v Blue Coat.* (N.D. Cal. 2017). We were brought in to try **Blue Coat**'s second case against Finjan months before trial. In the case, Finjan asserted several security patents against Blue Coat's network security products, in which Finjan sought nearly $50 million in damages. The first case, in which Blue Coat was represented by different counsel, had resulted in a $40 million verdict in Finjan's favor. We obtained a favorable jury verdict, winning on non-infringement on two asserted patents, with a total damage award of less than $500,000 on patents found to be infringed.

- *Carucel Investments, LP v. Novatel Wireless, Inc., Verizon Communications, Inc. and Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless* (S.D. Cal. 2017). We represented **Novatel Wireless** and **Verizon** in a case involving mobile wireless hotspots and obtained a jury verdict of non-infringement on all seven asserted claims from four asserted patents. The plaintiff, a non-practicing entity, asserted four patents related to a movable base station that they argued covered Novatel's MiFi hotspot. We argued to the jury that the patents were not infringed, but if read broadly enough to cover the MiFi hotspot, they were invalid. The jury agreed there was no infringement.

- *France Telecom S.A. v. Marvell Semiconductor, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. 2015). We represented **Marvell Semiconductor** in a patent lawsuit filed by France Telecom in NY federal court. We successfully moved to transfer the lawsuit to San Francisco. Despite the fact that a number of licensees took licenses under the patent-in-suit, including competitors of our client, and allegations of willful infringement, we successfully obtained critical pre-trial rulings on partial summary judgment, claim construction and to exclude infringement under the doctrine of equivalents and obtained a very favorable jury verdict well below what France Telecom sought, with no enhanced damages and no finding of willfulness. On post-trial motions, the court granted judgment as a matter of law and entered a defense judgment, giving Marvell Semiconductor a complete defense victory.

- *ViaSat v. Loral* (S.D. Cal. 2014). We represented **ViaSat, Inc.,** a company that develops and designs satellites, in a patent infringement and breach of contract suit against Space Systems Loral. The jury found ViaSat's asserted patents valid. The jury also found that Space Systems Loral infringed the asserted patents and breached its contractual obligations to ViaSat by improperly using and disclosing ViaSat proprietary information to manufacture a competitive satellite for Hughes Network Systems. The jury's findings on liability were affirmed by the district court. Thereafter, the parties entered into a global settlement on terms favorable to ViaSat, including $100 million in cash.

- *Network Protection Sciences LLC v. Fortinet, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. 2013). We represented **Fortinet, Inc.**, a publicly traded network-security company, in patent litigation against a non-practicing entity, NPS. In litigation pending in federal court in Northern California, NPS targeted Fortinet's franchise product line, FortiGate firewall products, and sought damages of over $18 million, trebled to over $50 million. We succeeded in procuring numerous court orders finding that NPS had engaged in litigation misconduct, including attempts to conceal evidence and making false or misleading statements to the court. We also succeeded in procuring a court order excluding NPS's damages expert from trial. In the face of those rulings, NPS agreed to abandon its campaign outright. The case was dismissed with prejudice and—as disclosed in Fortinet's recent SEC filing—Fortinet paid nothing at all to NPS for that result. This was a complete win for Fortinet. It was reported widely by *Law360*, *Courthouse News*, *TechDirt* and *Network World*.

- *Vasudevan Software, Inc. v. MicroStrategy, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. 2013). We represented **MicroStrategy, Inc.**, a database and business intelligence company, in a patent litigation suit filed by Vasudevan Software, Inc., a NPE. The plaintiff asserted that MicroStrategy infringed four related patents. The court granted summary judgment that all four patents were invalid due to lack of enablement and adopted our construction of a key claim term that prompted the plaintiff to stipulate to non-infringement.

- *Applied Medical Resources Corp. v. Tyco Healthcare Group LP d/b/a Covidien* (C.D. Cal. 2012). We won summary judgment of non-infringement for **Covidien** against Applied Medical Resources Corp., obtaining a judgment that Covidien's VERSAPORT™ PLUS surgical trocar products do not infringe Applied's patent.

- *Plantronics, Inc. v. Aliph, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. 2012). We obtained a complete defense victory in a patent case for **Aliph, Inc.**, the maker of popular Bluetooth products known as Jawbone headsets and Jambox speakers. Aliph, a venture backed company, was sued by the much larger headset manufacturer, Plantronics, Inc., for infringement of a patent allegedly covering the earbud component of all Jawbone headsets. We were retained after the patent had emerged from reexamination and the case had been transferred from Texas to California. We obtained a favorable claim construction relatively early in the case, then moved for summary judgment of both noninfringement and invalidity. The court issued a 32-page opinion in Aliph's favor, finding that Aliph both did not infringe and that the patent was invalid, despite Plantronics' argument that the reexamination strengthened the patent against an invalidity challenge.

- *Software Rights Archive, LLC v. Google Inc., Yahoo! Inc., IAC Search and Media, Inc., AOL, LLC, and Lycos, Inc.* (E.D. Tex., N.D. Cal. 2010). Our client, **IAC Search and Media, Inc. ("IACSAM")**, was sued for the alleged infringement of several patents that allegedly covered key parts of the search algorithms used in IACSAM's Internet search engine. The plaintiff, who was represented by several

firms, sought extensive damages for the alleged infringement by IACSAM and other search engine operators, such as Google and Yahoo!. Our firm played a key role in the preparation of invalidity contentions on behalf of the joint defense group, and the filing of a motion to transfer the case to the Northern District of California, which was granted. The plaintiff agreed to a favorable settlement for IACSAM in an amount that was significantly smaller than the plaintiff's initial demand.

- *Sony Corporation v. Westinghouse Digital Electronics, LLC* (C.D. Cal. 2009). We won a Final Judgment by Consent on behalf of client, **Sony Corporation**, in a patent-infringement suit against Westinghouse Digital Electronics, LLC over patents directed to digital closed captioning, on-screen display and digital copy protection technologies used in digital televisions and monitors. Sony filed a complaint for infringement of seven of its patents and later amended its complaint to add three additional patents. Just nine months after Sony filed its original complaint, Westinghouse Digital acknowledged infringement of each of Sony's ten patents. Westinghouse Digital also admitted to the validity and enforceability of each of the patents and agreed to take a license under the patents, which was a complete victory for Sony.

- *Activision Publishing Inc. v. Gibson Guitar Corp.* (C.D. Cal. 2009). We represented **Activision** and won summary judgment of non-infringement in a patent infringement litigation, disposing of all patent claims in the case. The litigation concerned the popular Guitar Hero® video games. Activision sought a declaration that the accused video games did not infringe a patent owned by Gibson directed to a "System and Method for Generating and Controlling a Simulated Musical Concert Experience." The court's ruling was issued less than a year after the case was filed.

- *Litton/Northrop v. Tyco* (C.D. Cal. 2008). We won six consent judgments and over $170 million on a single patent covering optical fiber amplifiers.

- *Bio-Rad v. Eppendorf* (N.D. Cal., E.D. Tex. 2008). We represented **Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc.** as lead counsel in multiple patent infringement suits regarding microplate, electroporation, and multiporation technology. Multiple cases were settled on favorable terms for Bio-Rad.

- *Friskit v. RealNetworks* (N.D. Cal. 2007). We represented **RealNetworks** and won summary judgment of invalidity due to obviousness on all four asserted patents, based on *KSR Int'l v. Teleflex*, in a case involving Internet media search and playback technology. This was the first reported post-KSR summary judgment decision resulting in a dismissal based on obviousness.

- *Unova/Intermec v. Hewlett Packard* (C.D. Cal. 2006). We represented patentee **Unovo** and obtained seven consent judgments and $250 million on a portfolio of patents covering the smart batteries used in notebook computers.

- *Regents of the University of California v. Monsanto* (N.D. Cal. 2006). We defended **Monsanto** when the plaintiff alleged that Monsanto's recombinant bovine growth hormone product infringed its patent. The plaintiff sought $1.8 billion in treble damages and a permanent injunction. After we won summary judgment eliminating one of the two accused products, the case settled favorably the day before trial.

- *Szoka v. ALZA* (N.D. Cal. 2006). We defended **ALZA** in a patent inventorship dispute in which two individuals alleged that they were the inventors of an ALZA

patent covering liposomes used for the targeted delivery of pharmaceuticals. After a one-week bench trial, the court rejected the claim of inventorship and entered judgment for ALZA.

- *TME Enterprises v. Dakota Block* (C.D. Cal. 2005). We won summary judgment of non-infringement for multiple defendants on patents involving chemical adhesives for construction materials.

- *Adkins v. Mattel* (C.D. Cal. 2005). We successfully defended **Mattel** in a patent infringement suit involving clam-shell packaging used for Mattel's famous HOT WHEELS line of die-cast cars. The final judgment included a declaration of non-infringement.

- *Genentech v. Columbia University* (N.D. Cal., D. Mass. 2004). When a university demanded that **Genentech** license a "new" patent on co-transformation—a widely used recombinant DNA technique for producing protein in a host cell—we sued for obviousness-type double patenting. With our summary judgment motion looming, the university filed a broad covenant not to sue Genentech for past, current or future infringement of the "new" patent or any reissued patent with the same or similar claims.

- *Farmer v. Medo Industries* (C.D. Cal. 2003). We were retained two months before trial by **Medo Industries** and **Pennzoil-Quaker State** in a two-patent patent infringement action related to various after-market automobile products. We obtained summary judgment of non-infringement on all claims asserted.

- *InTouch v. Amazon* (N.D. Cal. 2002). We won a summary judgment for an entertainment company that invalidated the independent claims of a notable online music patent asserted against over 200 online music companies. The court found non-infringement as to the remaining claims, ruled that the case was exceptional and awarded defendant its costs and fees.

- *Tegic Communications v. Zi* (N.D. Cal. 2002). We were retained by AOL subsidiary **Tegic Communications** less than three months before the trial date. During a three-week jury trial involving complex text input software technology, we defeated the attack on the validity of two Tegic patents and won a unanimous verdict of willful infringement and $9 million in compensatory damages.

- *Xircom v. 3Com/Palm* (C.D. Cal. 2002). In patent infringement suits involving PC card technology, we obtained for **3Com/Palm** an approximately $15 million settlement payment and cross-licenses.

- *Cadence v. Audio DigitalImaging* (C.D. Cal. 2000). Representing **Audio DigitalImaging**, we defeated Cadence's motion for a temporary restraining order against our client and successfully compelled arbitration in a dispute regarding patent rights to MPEG video chips. Cadence then abandoned and dismissed the suit.

- *Avery Dennison v. ACCO* (C.D. Cal. 1999). We represented **Avery Dennison** in a suit for infringement of several adhesive patents. After Avery Dennison moved simultaneously for a preliminary injunction and summary judgment, the defendant agreed to cease manufacture of all goods utilizing the accused materials.

- *Mentor H/S v. MDA and Lysonix* (C.D. Cal. 1999). We prevailed in a jury trial regarding a pioneering patent on the ultrasonic liposuction method, winning a

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

multi-million dollar verdict for our client **Mentor H/S** and a finding of willful infringement later affirmed by the Federal Circuit.

TEXAS

- *Ningde Amperex Technology Limited v. Zhuhai CosMX Battery Co. Ltd. et al.* (E.D. Tex. 2024). We represented **ATL** in a case against CosMX involving three ATL patents covering lithium ion battery technology. ATL is the world's leading innovator of lithium ion batteries for consumer products and CosMX also manufacturer's lithium ion batteries. The jury found CosMX guilty of wilful patent infringement and awarded ATL a running royalty on critical technology. We also beat back a $148 million antitrust counterclaim from CosMX. For QE, this win adds to our growing battery practice and reputation with Chinese tech companies.

- *Evolved Wireless, LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.* (E.D. Tex. 2024). We successfully represented **Samsung** against Evolved Wireless LLC ("Evolved") in a long-running patent dispute spanning multiple courts, relating to patents that Evolved alleged were essential to practicing the LTE cellular standard. Evolved alleged that over 350 Samsung flagship LTE products infringe its patents. Evolved initially asserted five patents against Samsung in the District of Delaware in 2015. Those patents were all found invalid, not infringed, or exhausted, and the case was eventually dismissed following Evolved's unsuccessful appeal to the Federal Circuit. Shortly thereafter, Evolved brought suit in the International Trade Commission ("ITC"), asserting three new, but related patents. That case proceeded until January 2022, at which time Evolved withdrew its ITC complaint shortly before the ITC hearing was set to occur. Evolved then pursued its claims against Samsung in the Eastern District of Texas. We tried the case for Samsung before the Texas jury in November 2023 and obtained a full defense verdict of non-infringement. The Court denied Evolved's post-trial motions in July 2024. The case is now on appeal.

- *Voxer, Inc. v. Meta Platforms, Inc*. (W.D. Tex. 2023): We represented **Voxer, Inc.** in a case against Meta Platforms involving two Voxer patents directed to Voxer's Live Messaging and Store-and-Stream technologies, which were utilized by Facebook and Instagram Live. In July 2023, following a jury verdict for $174.5 million against Meta for patent infringement, the court awarded Voxer supplemental damages and interest, bringing the total to $206 million, along with ongoing running royalties.

- *Alacritech Inc. v. Dell, CenturyLink, Wistron, Intel, Cavium* (E.D. Tex. 2023). We represented silicon-valley startup **Alacritech, Inc.**, a pioneer in TCP/IP acceleration, in a sweeping a patent infringement campaign against Dell, CenturyLink, and Wistron. The patents related to various hardware offloads commonly used in the send- and receive-side of TCP/IP networking processing. Network interface card ("NIC") chip makers, Intel and Cavium, intervened in the lawsuit. After a successful Markman hearing in which the court ruled in our favor on almost every claim term, the defendants and intervenors filed a barrage of petitions for inter parties review (IPRs) trying to invalidate the patents. When those weren't successful, they then filed requests for ex parte reexams with the Patent Office. After multiple oral arguments at the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit on the validity of the asserted patents, three patents remained for trial. Trial commenced in October 2023 before Judge Robert W. Schroeder III. The parties settled hours before the case was submitted for deliberation by the jury.

- *SynQor v. Vicor* (E.D. Tex. 2022). We obtained a favorable defense verdict on behalf of **Vicor** in its long-standing patent infringement litigation against SynQor. The jury found that Vicor did not infringe the primary SynQor patent asserted, and awarded less than

10% of the damages sought by SynQor on a second patent.

- *Carucel Investments, L.P. v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC et al. (*N.D. Tex 2022). We represented Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC, Mercedes-Benz U.S. International, LLC, and Daimler AG in a case involving patents directed to CDMA "soft handoff" used by cell phones. Plaintiff Carucel Investments L.P. sued Mercedes for patent infringement, alleging that these patents covered the Wi-Fi hotspots in Daimler's cars. We successfully stayed the litigation after filing Inter Partes Reviews against the asserted patents at the US Patent Trial and Appeals Board ("PTAB"), asserting that the patents were invalid. The PTAB agreed, finding all claims unpatentable.

- *The Hillman Group Inc. v. KeyMe LLC* (E.D. Tex. 2021). We obtained a complete defense verdict from a jury in a six-patent case. Our client **KeyMe** provides more than 4,000 automated key-duplicating machines throughout the United States using innovative AI and cloud-based technologies. KeyMe's competitor, the Hillman Group, also makes key duplicating machines, albeit using outdated technology. After KeyMe successfully displaced Hillman from multiple retailers, Hillman asserted six patents against KeyMe, seeking a large running royalty and a permanent injunction. In a six-day jury trial, we presented substantial evidence, including from KeyMe's founder and engineers, that the technology used in KeyMe's machines differed in fundamental ways from the outdated technology claimed in Hillman's patents. On cross-examination, Hillman's witnesses were forced to admit that KeyMe's technology was more sophisticated than Hillman's. After deliberating less than three hours, the jury returned its verdict that KeyMe did not infringe any of the 18 asserted claims, and further invalidated a majority of the asserted claims.

- *Personalized Media Communications, LLC v. Google LLC* (E.D. Tex. 2020). We won a complete defense verdict for our client **Google** before a jury in Marshall, Texas. PMC, a licensing company, had sued Google for infringement of four patents. The accused technology included YouTube's content delivery system. PMC sought a running royalty that allegedly came to $183 million as of trial. After less than an hour of deliberation, the jury delivered a complete defense verdict, finding no infringement on any of the asserted patents. This result is important not just for Google, but to an entire market segment, as PMC was trying to stretch its patents to cover internet streaming services.

- *Traxcell Technologies, LLC v. Nokia Solutions and Networks US LLC et al* (E.D. Tex. 2019). We represented **Nokia** in a patent infringement suit against Traxcell Technologies, LLC. The plaintiff claimed to have invented a fundamental technique for optimizing modern cellular networks through performance and location information of cellular handsets, and claimed that Nokia implemented this invention in nearly all of its cellular base station products. After months of discovery disputes and contentious expert depositions, we moved for summary judgment of non-infringement on all claims. The court found in Nokia's favor on every ground it considered, securing an important victory against a serial plaintiff and thorn in Nokia's side.

- *Brite Smart Corp. v. Google Inc.* (E.D. Tex and N.D. Cal. 2016). We obtained a dismissal of all claims brought by Brite Smart Corp. against our client **Google**. Brite Smart filed suit in July 2014 in the Eastern District of Texas asserting four patents allegedly directed at the problem of "click fraud" and accusing Google's online advertisement systems of infringement. After taking over the case from predecessor counsel, we obtained an unprecedented writ of mandamus from the Federal Circuit directing the district court to rule on our long-

pending motion to transfer and staying all proceedings pending a ruling on that motion. The district court subsequently granted our motion and transferred the case to the Northern District of California. Following transfer, plaintiff's counsel withdrew from the litigation and we obtained a dismissal of all claims for want of prosecution.

- *Adaptix v. Alcatel-Lucent USA, Inc.* (E.D. Tex. 2015). We won a complete victory on behalf of our client, **Alcatel-Lucent USA**, against Acacia, a noted patent assertion entity. In the immediate aftermath, Acacia's CEO resigned and its stock price plummeted, but the firm pushed for an even more complete victory. We successfully moved for our attorneys' fees based on Acacia's discovery improprieties.

- *SimpleAir v. Google* (E.D. Tex. 2015). We obtained a complete defense verdict for **Google** in a patent case where plaintiff SimpleAir sought hundreds of millions in damages. In a prior case on related patents handled by predecessor counsel, SimpleAir had prevailed against Google in a 2014 jury trial and obtained an award of $85 million. SimpleAir had also previously sued on related patents and obtained settlements from a number of large technology companies, including Apple, Microsoft, Amazon, and Facebook. SimpleAir then filed suit again on two continuation patents, accusing the same Google product of infringing the continuation patents. We were retained as replacement lead counsel to handle the appeal of the 2014 verdict and to try the second case. Our team successfully obtained pretrial rulings that precluded SimpleAir from using the 2014 verdict to bolster its infringement and validity arguments in the new trial. After nearly six hours of deliberation, the jury returned a verdict of no infringement. *The Recorder* headlined Google's victory aptly as "Google Gets Sweet Revenge in E.D. Texas Patent Case," and *The American Lawyer* headlined the win as "Google Avoids New IP Headache With Help from Quinn Emanuel."

- *MicroUnity Systems Engineering, Inc. v. Apple, Inc. et al.* (E.D. Tex. 2014). We represented **Qualcomm** in patent infringement suit brought by MicroUnity Systems Engineering, Inc. MicroUnity accused Qualcomm of infringing 10 of its patents relating to certain computer architecture and software used to facilitate efficient computer operation and performance, including architectures and software useful in parallel processing. The case resolved prior to trial through a settlement on terms favorable to Qualcomm.

- *Motorola vs. TiVo* (E.D. Texas 2013). We represented **Motorola Mobility** and **Time Warner Cable** against TiVo in a case involving patented DVR technology and obtained a successful settlement for a fraction of the amount sought by TiVo during trial. We took over the case during expert discovery and less than three months before the start of trial. Our trial strategy resulted in key victories in pre-trial motions that led to a successful settlement.

- *Soverain Software LLC v. J.C. Penney et al.* (E.D. Tex. 2011). We won a unanimous jury verdict on both infringement and validity on behalf of our client **Soverain Software**. The technology at issue in this case concerned e-commerce technology that retailers use to facilitate sales made through their websites.

- *Bright Response LLC v. Google Inc. and Yahoo Inc.* (E.D. Tex 2010). Defending **Google** against a $128 million patent infringement claim brought by Bright Response against Google's AdWords advertising system, we won a complete non-infringement and invalidity verdict after a six-day jury trial.

- *PA Advisors, LLC v. Google Inc. and Yahoo! Inc.* (E.D. Tex. 2010). On behalf of **Google**, we obtained summary judgment of non-infringement, of all asserted claims of the patent owned by a non-practicing entity of Erich Spangenberg. The plaintiff had accused Google's personalized search and advertising products of infringing a patent that involved a method of personalizing search results based on "linguistic patterns" favored by a user. Plaintiff had sought $121 million in damages and an ongoing royalty.

- *Tyco Healthcare Group LP, et al. v. Applied Medical Resources Corp.* (E.D. Tex. 2010). We successfully represented **Tyco Healthcare Group** in a patent infringement jury trial against Applied Medical Resources to enforce Tyco patents against certain of Applied's surgical trocar products. The jury returned a verdict of infringement by Applied and awarded Tyco $4,810,389 in damages, out of Applied's alleged total profit of $6,734,544 on the infringing sales.

- *Intertainer, Inc. v. Apple Computer, Inc., Google Inc., and Napster, Inc.* (E.D. Tex. 2008). We represented **Google** in a case brought against it, Apple and Napster by Intertainer claiming infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,925,469, which relates to a digital entertainment service platform. We responded by requesting an inter partes reexamination of all claims of the '469 patent. The Patent Office issued a non-final office action rejecting all claims. As a result of the reexamination victory, the plaintiff sought a stay of the infringement lawsuit pending completion of the reexamination proceedings.

- *3M v. Seiko Instruments* (W.D. Tex. 2001). Representing **Seiko Instruments**, we obtained a summary judgment of non-infringement of 3M patents directed to fiber optic ferrule designs and manufacturing techniques.

NEW JERSEY

- *Axsome Therapeutics v. Multiple Generic Defendants (D.N.J. 2026).* We secured a settlement for Axsome Therapeutics in multi-defendant patent litigation over its sleep drug Sunosi, maintaining patent exclusivity until 2040 — 21 years from launch and effectively the full life of the patents. The litigation involved 6 generic defendants, 23 separate actions, and 32 patents-in-suit. This follows the firm's earlier settlement in 2025 protecting Axsome's major depressive disorder drug Auvelity until 2039. Since we began representing Axsome, the company's stock price has quadrupled to approximately $235 following the settlement announcement.

- *Jazz Pharmaceuticals Research UK Limited v. Teva Pharmaceuticals, et al.* (D.N.J. 2025). We represented Jazz Pharmaceuticals Research UK Limited against ten different generic drug companies that sought to market generic versions of the drug product Epidiolex (cannabidiol) prior to the expiry of our client's patents, the latest of which expires in 2039. We reached a favorable settlement with all ten defendant groups that maximizes the value of our client's patent portfolio.

- *Celgene Corp. v Hetero Labs Ltd., et al.* (D.N.J. 2022). The firm recently settled an eight-generic challenge to Celgene's (now BMS's) blockbuster cancer treatment, Pomalyst® (pomalidomide). The product is used for a variety of cancer treatments and has sales in excess of $3 billion per year. Due the firm's efforts, Pomalyst® will remain patent protected until 2026.

- *Celgene v. Dr. Reddy's Laboratories* (D.N.J. 2020). We served as outside counsel for Celgene in patent litigation in the District of New Jersey related to Celgene's Revlimid drug product, which has revenue approaching $10 billion per year, and DRL's proposed generic copy of that product. After nearly 4 years of litigation, we obtained a favorable settlement for our client that protects Celgene's Revlimid patents and does not permit DRL to sell its generic product until a confidential date after March 2022, at which time DRL can begin selling a volume-limited quantity of its proposed generic product. DRL cannot begin selling unlimited quantities of its product until after January 31, 2026. This settlement ensures that Revlimid will have been on the market for more than 16 years before any generic product is sold, and for more than 20 years before unlimited generic sales commence. This settlement comes after we successfully defended against 3 petitions for inter partes review filed by DRL, and 3 other petitions filed by other potential generic manufacturers.

- *Chiesi USA, Inc. et al. vs. Aurobindo Pharma USA, Inc. et al.* (D.N.J. 2019). The firm obtained a complete victory in a patent litigation for **Chiesi** against generic manufacturer Aurobindo. The case arose from Aurobindo's filing of an Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) seeking to market a generic version of Chiesi's Cleviprex® (clevidipine) injectable product. Chiesi sued Aurobindo for patent infringement. After a 7-day bench trial, Chiesi prevailed on all issues. The decision meant that Aurobindo could not launch its generic product until the patents-in-suit expire in October 2031

- *Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC* (D.N.J. 2018). We represented **Jazz** in a Hatch-Waxman patent litigation involving Jazz's Xyrem® (sodium oxybate) drug product, which is indicated to cataplexy and excessive daytime sleepiness in narcolepsy patients. The case began in 2010 with one generic filer and five patents-in-suit. By October 2018, there were nine generic filers and nearly 20 patents-in-suit. The settlement permits entry of generic sodium oxybate before the Jazz's last-to-expire patent-in-suit, but generic entry will not occur until January 2023, with an authorized generic from which Jazz will receive a royalty. Generic entry will be allowed after the term of the authorized generic expires which may occur from July 2023 to January 2028 depending on whether various options are exercised by the parties.

- *Gilead Sciences, Inc. and Royalty Pharma Collection Trust v. Watson Labs., Inc.* (D.N.J. 2017). We represented **Gilead Sciences, Inc.** against two generic companies in a Hatch-Waxman patent dispute concerning Gilead's life-extending, $800 million/year cardiovascular drug, Letairis. With the final Pretrial Order filed and trial about to be scheduled, we achieved a very favorable, confidential settlement. The client was thrilled with the result.

- *Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Roxane Laboratories, Inc.* (D.N.J. 2017). We represented **Jazz Pharmaceuticals**, Inc. in a Hatch-Waxman patent litigation involving Jazz's Xyrem® (sodium oxybate) drug product, which is indicated to treat cataplexy and excessive daytime sleepiness in narcolepsy patients. After more than six years of litigation, we obtained a favorable settlement for Jazz that does not permit generic entry until 2023, after the majority of the 20 patents covering Xyrem have expired.

- *Celgene Corporation v. Natco Pharma Limited, et al.* (D.N.J. 2015). We represented **Celgene Corporation** in a Hatch-Waxman patent litigation involving Celgene's Revlimid® (lenalidomide) drug product, which is indicated to treat multiple myeloma and other types of cancer. After more than five years of

litigation, we obtained a favorable settlement for Celgene that does not permit full generic entry until 2026, after all but one of the nearly 30 patents covering Revlimid have expired.

- *Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Roxane Laboratories, Inc.* (D.N.J. 2012). On September 14, 2012, we obtained a favorable claim-construction ruling for **Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Inc.** in a patent-infringement action against Roxane Laboratories, Inc. regarding Jazz's narcolepsy treatment Xyrem® in which the court ruled in Jazz's favor on virtually all disputed claim terms.

- *PDL Biopharma, Inc. and EKR Therapeutics, Inc. v. Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd.* (D.N.J. 2009). We obtained summary judgment in favor of our **client EKR Therapeutics, Inc.**, in a Hatch Waxman dispute involving infringement of EKR Therapeutics' patent covering the manufacturing formula for its brand name drug Cardene® I.V. Cardene® I.V. is one of the leading therapies for the treatment of acute hypertension in emergency settings. Generating sales of about $360 million per year, Cardene® I.V. came under attack from the generic drug company Sun Pharmaceuticals Industries, Ltd., which was threatening to launch a generic copy of Cardene® I.V. prior to expiration of the patent-in-suit. Believing that it would prevail on a theory that it characterized as "unavoidable," Sun Pharmaceuticals filed an early motion for summary judgment of noninfringement in July 2008. The firm's decision to oppose that motion by having EKR Therapeutics file its own cross-motion for summary judgment paid off. The court issued an order and opinion finding that Sun Pharmaceuticals' generic copy of Cardene® I.V. infringes the patent-in-suit, both literally and under the doctrine of equivalents.

- *Connetics v. Agis Industries* (D.N.J. 2005). We represented **Connetics** in Paragraph IV patent infringement litigation involving Olux® clobetasol propionate foam. The case settled following a favorable claim construction and after the defendant's motion for summary judgment of no infringement was denied.

DELAWARE

- *Globus Medical, Inc. v. Life Spine, Inc.,* (D. Del, 2026): We represented **Life Spine** against Globus Medical, a much larger competitor, in a multi-year patent dispute over eight patents that Globus asserted against Life Spine's spinal implant products. We eliminated seven of the patents through IPR proceedings, summary judgment, and trial, and secured a Federal Circuit reversal of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board invalidating the last remaining patent's final claims. The result is expected to wipe out the $9.5 million jury verdict entered against Life Spine, delivering a clean sweep for our client.

- *TVision v. Nielsen* (D. Del, 2026): We represented **TVision** in a patent infringement lawsuit brought by Nielsen, in which Nielsen alleged that TVision's core audience-measurement technology infringed a patent covering automatic content recognition (ACR) technology. After stepping in shortly before trial to replace existing litigation counsel, our team secured a complete defense verdict in which the jury rejected Nielsen's infringement claim. The result is particularly significant given the broader context of Nielsen's filing several other patent suits against TVision as part of what TVision contends was a campaign to stifle competition in the audience-measurement industry. The verdict eliminates a damages claim of $23 million.

- *Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Avadel CNS Pharmaceuticals, LLC.,* 21-691 (D. Del., 2025): We represented **Jazz Pharmaceuticals** in a high-stakes dispute involving patent litigation claims brought by Jazz, and antitrust, trade secrets, and patent infringement claims brought by Avadel Pharmaceuticals relating to Jazz's oxybate franchise for treating narcolepsy and idiopathic hypersomnia. In March 2024, the jury in Jazz's patent case found Jazz's patent valid and awarded Jazz damages for Avadel's infringement. We also obtained a partial injunction from the Court preventing Avadel from marketing its oxybate product for any indication other than narcolepsy, and defended that injunction order through appeal in early 2025. Concurrent to Jazz's patent case, through coordinated litigation across antitrust, trade secrets, and patent practices, our cross-office team built a record demonstrating that Avadel's allegations were without merit. When the parties' agreed to a comprehensive settlement of their claims, Avadel abandoned all trade secrets and patent infringement claims, accepted substantially reduced damages on its antitrust claim, and agreed to pay Jazz royalties that will accumulate through 2036.

- *Natera, Inc. v. CareDx, Inc* (D.Del. 202). We represented **Natera, Inc.** in a case involving two of its key patents covering its cell-free DNA testing technology. Natera asserted that CareDx, a competitor in the cell-free DNA transplant testing space, infringed those patents through the use and sale of its AlloSure and AlloSeq cfDNA products. In January 2024, a Delaware jury found that CareDx infringed one of the asserted patents and upheld the validity of both asserted patents, awarding Natera about $96 million in compensation.

- *Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc. v. AngioDynamics, Inc.* (D. Del. 2022). We represented **Bard Peripheral Vascular** in a patent case relating to power injectable vascular access ports. The jury found that defendant AngioDynamics willfully infringed three Bard patents and that AngioDynamics failed to establish that the patent were invalid.

- *Vifor Fresenius Medical Care Renal Pharma Ltd. et al. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.* (D. Del. 2022). We won a complete victory for our client **Vifor Fresenius Medical Care Renal Pharma Ltd.** in a patent case against Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. The case arose from Teva's seeking FDA approval to market a generic version of Vifor's Velphoro, which is a phosphate binder indicated for the treatment of hyperphosphatemia. Vifor asserted that Teva infringed U.S. Patent No. 9,561,251 ("the '251 patent"), and Teva counterclaimed seeking declaratory judgments of non-infringement, invalidity, and unenforceability of the '251 patent. On August 18, 2022, the Court found in our favor on all issues, finding that Teva's product will infringe all asserted claims of the '251 patent, and that Teva failed to meet its burden to establish that any of the asserted claims were invalid as obvious or for lack of enablement. As a result, Teva will be enjoined from bringing their product to market until July 2030, when the '251 patent expires.

- *Complete Genomics Inc. v. Illumina Inc., C.A.* (D. Del. 2022). Quinn Emanuel obtained a sweeping victory on behalf of client **Complete Genomics, Inc.** The suit arose out of allegations that Illumina, a dominant player in the sequencing field, infringed two CGI patents relating to DNA sequencing. CGI was awarded $333.8 4 million in damages after a Delaware federal jury unanimously found that Illumina had willfully infringed CGI's two asserted patents. In addition, the jury found that CGI invalidated the three sequencing patents that Illumina asserted. Pre-judgment interest, an accounting for damages for 2022, an injunction and the Court enhancing the damages award because of the willfulness finding are all potential further remedies.

- *PureWick Corp. v. Sage Products LLP* (D. Del. 2022). We represented **PureWick Corp.** in a patent case involving External Urinary Catheters. On April 1, 2022, a jury returned a verdict finding that the defendant, Sage Products LLC, willfully infringed two PureWick patents by making and selling Sage's PrimaFit female external urine collection device, and infringed a third PureWick patent by making and selling Sage's PrimoFit male external urine collection device. The jury awarded PureWick $26.2 million in lost profits from Sage's sales of the PrimaFit and an additional $1.8 million based on a 6.5% reasonable royalty on Sage's sales of the PrimoFit.

- *Pixeltide Pathway, LLC v. Tile, Inc.* (D. Del. 2022). We represented **Tile** in a patent infringement case in which the plaintiff asserted two patents against Tile's signature Tile Bluetooth tracking devices, and obtained a dismissal with prejudice with $0 paid to the plaintiff. Immediately upon being retained, we crafted non-infringement positions and drafted a motion to dismiss under 35 U.S.C. section 101. We informed plaintiff's counsel of our non-infringement arguments and our intention to file the motion to dismiss on the responsive deadline. The day before the deadline, plaintiff informed us they would dismiss the case with prejudice to prevent us from moving to dismiss.

- *Sprint Communications Company L.P. v. Charter Communications, Inc. et al* (D. Del. 2022). We represented **Charter Communications** in a patent infringement case against Sprint in the District of Delaware. Sprint asserted that Charter Communications infringed three patents. We obtained early dismissal of one patent based on a Rule 11 letter demonstrating Sprint's baseless claim for infringement. We then obtained favorable claim constructions based on collateral estoppel for the remaining two patents. Based on these favorable claim constructions, we successfully moved for early summary judgment of non-infringement for the remaining two patents. The court's granting of the motion for summary judgment of non-infringement resulted in a complete victory for Charter Communications.

- *Rex Computing, Inc. v. Cerebras Systems Inc.,* (D. Del. 2022). We represent **Cerebras Systems**, a computer systems company that manufactures deep learning systems, in a patent infringement action brought by Rex Computing. The asserted patents generally relate to microprocessor architecture.

- *CareDx, Inc. et. al. v. Natera Inc.,* (D. Del. 2021). We represent **Natera Inc.** in patent litigation against CareDx. On September 29, 2021, we obtained a Section 101 ruling invalidating Stanford University patents licensed to CareDx, a developer of commercial tests for kidney transplant rejections. Judge Connolly of the U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware found that the asserted claims, which were directed to means for detecting an organ donor's cell-free DNA in a transplant receiver, were natural phenomena under Section 101 and thus not patentable. CareDx and Stanford accused Natera's kidney transplant rejection test, described as an "organ transplant rejection assay" and "allograft rejection" test, of infringing three patents. With all of CareDx's patents invalidated, the only patents left in the case are Natera's offensive patents.

- *Trusted Knight Corporation v. International Business Machines Corporation and Trusteer Inc.* (D. Del. 2015). We obtained a complete defense victory for **IBM** in a District of Delaware patent case brought by plaintiff Trusted Knight Corp, a small software company with a single issued patent. Before the close of discovery, we crafted a strategy to knock out every claim of Trusted Knight's bet the company patent on invalidity grounds. At claim construction, we argued that every claim of

the patent was indefinite, a strategy that is not often successful in Delaware, particularly in front of Chief Judge Stark. Judge Stark ultimately found that every claim of Trusted Knight's patent is indefinite.

- *Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. v. Xellia Pharms. ApS & Xellia Pharms. Inc.* (D. Del. 2015). We represented **Merck** in a Hatch-Waxman patent litigation involving Xellia's proposed generic version of Merck's CANCIDAS product. After a two-day bench trial, the Court found that Xellia's proposed generic product infringes Merck's patent and issued an injunction prohibiting approval of Xellia's generic product until the expiration of Merck's patent.

- *Agincourt Gaming LLC v. Zynga, Inc., et. al.* (D. Nev. and D. Del. 2014). We represented **Zynga, Sony Online Entertainment,** and **Blizzard** in the District of Delaware against Agincourt Gaming LLC's allegations that our clients infringed three patents directed to awarding prizes based on game outcomes. We obtained a favorable settlement after filing Markman briefs and winning a critical discovery motion in two jurisdictions.

- *Personalized User Model, LLC v. Google Inc.* (D. Del. 2014). We won a complete defense verdict for client **Google Inc.** Google was accused to have infringed two patents relating to personalization services, and the plaintiff asserted that four different Google products infringed those patents. The jury unanimously found in Google's favor. It found that one of the named inventors breached his employment agreement with his prior employer (whose rights Google had purchased) by failing to assign the inventions to his employer, that none of Google's products infringed a single asserted claim of the patents, that the asserted claims were invalid as anticipated by three separate prior art references, and that the asserted claims were invalid as obvious in light of the prior art.

- *Micron Technology, Inc. v. Rambus Inc.* (D. Del. 2013). On behalf of **Micron Semiconductor Products, Inc.** and **Micron Technology, Inc.**, we obtained a ruling declaring 12 Rambus patents unenforceable due to Rambus's bad faith spoliation of evidence.

- *Finjan v. Symantec* (D. Del. 2012). We obtained a complete defense verdict for **Symantec Corporation** following a three week jury trial before Chief Judge Gregory M. Sleet. The jury concluded that Symantec and two other defendants did not infringe two patents owned by Finjan Inc. relating to the protection of computers and networks against hostile "downloadable" programs. The jury further found the asserted patents to be invalid, handing the defense a complete victory. Finjan asserted that Symantec's consumer and enterprise security products—including its popular Norton AntiVirus and Symantec Endpoint Protection lines—violated the asserted patents. Finjan's attorneys argued that the patents covered "behavior-blocking" technology to protect against known and unknown malware threats, and it sought over $1 billion dollars in damages from Symantec based on past damages, willful infringement, and an ongoing running royalty. This victory comes on the heels of an earlier case brought by Finjan against Secure Computing, in which Finjan prevailed in a jury trial before Judge Sleet that involved one of the two patents later asserted against Symantec.

- *Stiefel Labs v. Perrigo* (D. Del. 2012). We represented plaintiff **Stiefel** in Paragraph IV patent infringement litigation involving Olux®–E clobetasol propionate emulsion foam. The case settled on terms favorable to our client.

- *LifeCycle Pharma A/S v. Impax Laboratories, Inc.* (D. Del. 2010). We represented **LifeCycle Pharma** and **Shionogi Pharma** in Hatch Waxman action related to the cholesterol lowering drug Fenoglide®. We obtained a settlement on favorable terms to our clients.

- *Micron Technology, Inc. v. Rambus Inc., et al.* (D. Del. 2009). We represented **Micron Technology** in its long running battle against Rambus in a patent case arising out of Dynamic Random Access Memory ("DRAM") technology. The court trifurcated the trial into three phases – the "unclean hands" phase, the "patent" phase, and the "conduct" phase. In the unclean hands phase, the court, following a five-day bench trial, issued a written opinion finding that Rambus spoliated evidence and declared the patents in the suit unenforceable. The case was appealed to the Federal Circuit which upheld the finding that Rambus destroyed documents in anticipation of litigation and remanded for further proceedings regarding bad faith and prejudice.

- *Girafa.com v. Amazon Web Services LLC; Amazon.com, Inc., Alexa Internet, Inc.; IAC Search & Media, Inc.; Snap Technologies, Inc.; Yahoo! Inc.; Smartdevil, Inc.; Exalead, Inc.; and Exalead S.A.* (D. Del. 2009). On behalf of **IAC Search & Media Inc.**, we defeated a patent infringement suit at the pre-trial stage, having claims declared either invalid or not infringed. The patent addressed the use of thumbnails and storage and the retrieval of the same in the context of a search engine.

- *Reliant Pharmaceuticals v. Abbott Laboratories* (D. Del. 2004). Representing **Reliant** in a patent litigation related to competing branded fenofibrate products, we sought a declaratory judgment of non-infringement, invalidity and unenforceability due to inequitable conduct. The case then settled on favorable terms.

ADDITIONAL STATES

- *Bitsight Technologies, Inc. v. Normshield Inc. d/b/a Black Kite Inc.* (D. Mass. 2024). In August 2023, Bitsight Technologies, Inc. filed a lawsuit in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts asserting infringement of five patents, and claims for false advertising under the Lanham Act, against our client Black Kite Inc. The companies are leading companies in the cybersecurity space. Following an initial motion to dismiss by Black Kite, Bitsight amended its complaint on December 11, 2023, dropping a patent and adding another. Black Kite filed a renewed motion to dismiss on January 12, 2024. In a written opinion issued on September 20, 2024, the Honorable Myong Joun issued his ruling granting the motion to dismiss all asserted patent claims by Bitsight, deeming them invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for failing to claim patentable subject matter. The case subsequently settled and Bitsight's lawsuit was dismissed with prejudice.

- *Natera, Inc. v. NeoGenomics Laboratories, Inc.,* (M.D.N.C. 2023). We represent **Natera** as plaintiff in a highly contentious patent infringement case in the Middle District of North Carolina against defendant NeoGenomics Laboratories regarding NeoGenomics' cancer diagnostic test, RaDaR. Within four months of filing suit, we obtained an unprecedented victory in an accelerated preliminary injunction proceeding, enjoining all making, use, sale, or offers to sell RaDaR, effective immediately. This is the first time a medical diagnostic has ever been enjoined through a preliminary injunction. Following the Federal Circuit's affirmance of the

preliminary injunction, we obtained a stipulated permanent injunction of NeoGenomics' use of RaDaR in September 2024.

- *Ouster, Inc. v. Hesai Photonics Technology Co., Ltd.* (D. Del. 2023). We represent **Hesai** against Ouster's allegations that certain of Hesai's LiDAR systems and components infringe five patents. Ouster filed its complaint in the United District Court for the District of Delaware, but this case was stayed pending the results of a separate U.S. International Trade Commission ("ITC") investigation. Through our representation, the ITC terminated the investigation in its entirely in October 2023 based upon an arbitration agreement.

- *Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. Salesforce.com, Inc.* (D. Nev. 2023). A decade ago, Applications in Internet Time ("AIT") sued Salesforce, asserting patent infringement. On behalf of **Salesforce**, Quinn Emanuel obtained a summary judgment victory over AIT in October 2023. The summary judgment order found non-infringement and invalidity on all asserted claims, ending the decade-long litigation with hundreds of millions in damages at stake. The appeals court recently vacated the summary judgment rule.

- *BlephEx, LLC v. Myco Industries, Inc. et al.,* (E.D. Mich. 2022). We obtained a preliminary injunction on behalf of our medical device client **BlephEx** in its ongoing patent litigation against Myco Industries and John Choate. BlephEx's device and Myco's accused device (the AB Max) compete in the ophthalmic market for dry eye treatment devices. On October 8, 2020 the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan granted BlephEx's Motion for Preliminary Injunction against Myco and Mr. Choate and determined that it "will enjoin [Myco and Mr. Choate] from selling or offering to sell the ABMax™ device until a final judgment is entered in this action." In February 2022, we obtained a further victory for BlephEx when the Federal Circuit unanimously affirmed in full the district court's grant of a preliminary injunction. The parties settled soon after, with our client's adversary agreeing to entry of a permanent injunction against any further sales of the accused product in the US and payment of damages to our client.

- *WalkMe Ltd. v. Pendo.io Inc. (S.D.N.Y. 2019).* For **a multi-national startup internet company**, Quinn Emanuel obtained dismissal at the pleading stage and a complete defense victory of a patent infringement suit asserted by an adversary, on the grounds that the patent failed to claim patentable subject matter.

- *Desktop Metal v. Markforged, et al. v. Ricardo Fulop, et al.* (D. Mass. 2018). We won a jury trial during phase one of a bet-the-company litigation involving major players in the desktop 3D metal printing market. The case may have set a record for our firm's fastest time to trial ever in a patent suit (11 weeks from initial scheduling conference to trial). At trial, after hearing three weeks of evidence, the jury returned a verdict against Desktop Metal and in favor of our client, **Markforged**, finding no infringement by Markforged on any of the asserted patents. Markforged also filed counterclaims for trade secret misappropriation, breach of fiduciary duty, and breach of contract, which were tried before another jury during phase two of the litigation. We obtained a very favorable (confidential) settlement on behalf of Markforged after opening statements and our CEO taking the stand on direct examination for multiple days.

- *The Lincoln Electric Company et al. v. Harbor Freight Tools USA, Inc.* (N.D. Ohio 2018). Lincoln is a prominent maker of welding power supplies. Lincoln filed an omnibus complaint against our client **Harbor Freight** asserting patent

infringement, trade dress infringement, and other ancillary claims in connection with Harbor Freight's line of competing welding power supplies. Shortly thereafter, Lincoln moved for a preliminary injunction to block future all future sales of Harbor Freight's products based on their alleged infringement of three Lincoln patents. Operating under a highly compressed schedule, we took discovery and put together a robust opposition to Lincoln's motion. Based on the strength of our opposition, Lincoln voluntarily withdrew two of the three patents and provided Harbor Freight with Covenants Not to Sue. The Court denied the preliminary injunction based on the remaining patent.

- *ChargePoint, Inc. v. SemaConnect* (D. Md. 2018). We defended **SemaConnect, Inc.** in a patent infringement lawsuit brought by one of its competitors, ChargePoint, Inc. SemaConnect won a contract to install electric vehicle charging stations as part of the $15 billion settlement of Volkswagen's vehicle emissions scandal. ChargePoint sought a TRO to prevent SemaConnect from installing those electric vehicle charging stations. We defeated the TRO motion within a week of being hired and filed a motion to dismiss ChargePoint's Complaint within a month. Approximately two months later, the Court issued a 70-page decision invalidating all of ChargePoint's asserted claims. The Court entered judgment in SemaConnect's favor.

- *Broadband iTV, Inc. v. Time Warner Cable, Inc.; Oceanic Time Warner Cable, LLC* (D. Hawaii 2015). The plaintiff, BBiTV, is a Honolulu-based company that failed in the video-on-demand (VOD) business and turned to asserting its patent portfolio. BBiTV sued our client, **Time Warner Cable** for infringement of a patent directed to creating a bridge between the internet and closed, cable systems by using metadata to facilitate the automation, hierarchical organization, and display of video content on customers' electronic programming guides. TWC invalidated the asserted patent under Section 101, and obtained affirmance of the judgement on appeal..

- *Everlight Electronics Co., Ltd. v. Nichia Corporation and Nichia America Corporation* (E.D. Mich. 2015). We represented **Everlight Electronics, Co., Ltd.** and its subsidiary **Everlight Americas, Inc.**, in a case involving two patents relating to specific LED technology. After a two-week trial, the jury found that all claims asserted against Everlight were invalid for obviousness, and that certain of the asserted claims were also invalid for lack of enablement.

- *Furuno Electric Co., Ltd., et al. v. Raymarine UK Limited* (D. Or. 2014); *Furuno Electric Co., Ltd., et al. v. Raymarine, Inc.* (D. Or. 2014); *Certain Navigation Products, Including GPS Devices, Navigation and Display Systems, Radar Systems, Navigation Aids, Mapping Systems and Related Software* (ITC 2014). We represented **Furuno Electric** in cases brought to enforce their IP rights in maritime navigation patents. Cases were brought in U.S. district court and the ITC. The cases settled on extremely favorable terms with each defendant.

- *Classen Immunotherapies, Inc. v. Shionogi, Inc. and Merz Pharmaceuticals, LLC* (D. Md. 2014). We represented **Merz** in a patent infringement case involving Merz's Cuvposa drug product brought by Classen Immnunotherapies. We successfully had the Complaint dismissed in the early stages of the case, avoiding costly litigation and potential damages for Merz.

- *3M v. Tredegar* (D. Minn. 2012). We obtained a complete victory on behalf of our client **Tredegar** against 3M. 3M had asserted four patents related to elastomeric film laminates commonly used in diapers. The court issued a *Markman* order in

which we won on virtually every issue. After considering the devastating effect of this ruling on its infringement claims, 3M stipulated to non-infringement and the court entered judgment in favor of Tredegar.

- *University of Virginia Patent Foundation v. General Electric Company et al.* (W.D. Va. 2011). We defended **GE** in a patent infringement case brought by The University of Virginia Patent Foundation in the Charlottesville Division of the Western District of Virginia—the Patent Foundation's "home court." The Patent Foundation's asserted patent covered magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) technology. Shortly after the Patent Foundation filed the case, GE successfully sought reexamination of the asserted patent. During reexamination, the Patent Foundation filed an amendment and, in response, the USPTO issued a reexamination certificate. We then filed a motion for partial summary judgment of no liability prior to the issuance of the reexamination certificate. The court granted our motion—substantially reducing the potential damages that the Patent Foundation could recover if it prevailed on liability—and the case soon settled on very favorable terms.

- *Apotex Inc. v. Forest Laboratories, Inc., Forest Laboratories Holdings, Ltd. and H. Lundbeck A/S* (E.D. Mich. 2011). We helped innovator pharmaceutical companies **Forest Laboratories, Inc.**, **Forest Laboratories Holdings, Ltd.**, and **H. Lundbeck A/S** protect their multi-billion-dollar blockbuster antidepressant LEXAPRO® in a lawsuit brought by generic drug company Apotex Inc. Through early motion practice, we made the case unwinnable for Apotex, which voluntarily dismissed the case only six months after filing it.

- *Medicis Pharmaceutical Corp. v. Nycomed U.S. Inc. et al.* (S.D.N.Y. 2011). We represented **Medicis Pharmaceutical** in series of Hatch Waxman actions related to Loprox® shampoo. We obtained a settlement favorable to our client.

- *Zamora Radio, LLC v. Last.FM, Ltd et al.* (S.D. Fla. 2010). On behalf of clients **Real Networks** and **Rhapsody**, we won summary judgment of non-infringement on all grounds in an internet radio patent infringement case.

- *Catalina Marketing Corporation and Catalina Health Resource v. LDM Group, LLC.* (E.D. Mo. 2010). We were retained by plaintiffs **Catalina Marketing Corporation** and its wholly owned subsidiary, **Catalina Health Resource** (collectively "Catalina"), to take over as lead counsel in an action alleging infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,394 ("the '394 patent") shortly before the *Markman* hearing. The '394 patent disclosed and claimed a novel method and computer system for generating targeted messages for pharmacy patients at the point of sale. Catalina alleged that LDM Group LLC's "Carepoint" product and related services infringed the '394 patent. The parties resolved the case informally pursuant to a confidential settlement agreement.

- *Medicis Pharmaceutical Corp. v. Taro Pharmaceuticals U.S.A., Inc. et al.* (S.D.N.Y. 2010). We represented **Medicis Pharmaceutical** in series of Hatch Waxman actions related to the topical steroid Vanos®. We obtained a settlement favorable to our client.

- *Desenberg v. Google, Inc.* (S.D.N.Y 2009). We defended **Google** in a patent infringement suit brought by Roger Marx Desenberg, the inventor of U.S. Patent No. 7,139,732. The patent claims a method for connecting consumers and service providers with matching interests. Mr. Desenberg alleged that Google's AdWords system infringed the patent by targeting users of its search engine for service-related advertisements based on the user's queries. Mr. Desenberg

claimed more than $1 billion in damages and sought a preliminary injunction. We successfully defeated the preliminary injunction and simultaneously obtained dismissal of Mr. Desenberg's claims. The asserted claims required acts by multiple independent parties, including separate "users" and "service providers" to interact with a third-party matching system, and then purchase services based on that match. Google did not and could not play each of these separate roles, and could not credibly be alleged to control the acts of Internet users. The court accepted our position in its entirety, denying the preliminary injunction and dismissing Mr. Desenberg's claims with prejudice.

- *IGT v. Alliance Gaming Corp., Bally Gaming, Inc., and Bally Gaming International, Inc.* (D. Nev. 2009). We defended **Bally** in a patent infringement suit brought by IGT, a Fortune 100 Company and the dominant player in the gaming machine industry. IGT asserted patents pertaining to its Wheel of Fortune slot machine, which is widely regarded as the most successful slot machine in the history of gaming. Bally counterclaimed that IGT violated federal and state antitrust laws by asserting these wheel game patents it knew to be invalid and unenforceable in an attempt to eliminate competition from the marketplace. Bally prevailed on invalidity, with the court finding one of the wheel patents indefinite and the remainder invalid as obvious. The court also granted Bally's summary judgment motion of non-infringement with regard to the wheel patents and found all but one of the remaining asserted patents not infringed, invalid, or both. The court denied IGT's motion for summary judgment on Bally's antitrust counterclaims. When word of the impending summary judgment rulings obtained by our firm reached the market (the day before the written orders issued), Bally's stock price increased 10%, even though the Dow Jones Industrial Average declined over 8% that day.

- *Connetics v. Pentech Pharmaceuticals* (N.D. Ill. 2009). We represented plaintiff **Connetics** in Paragraph IV patent infringement litigation involving Luxiq® betamethasone valerate foam. The case settled on terms favorable to our client.

- *Connetics v. Pentech Pharmaceuticals* (N.D. Ill. 2009). We represented again **Connetics** in Paragraph IV patent infringement litigation, this time involving Olux® clobetasol propionate foam. The case settled on terms favorable to our client.

- *Web Tracking Solutions, LLC and Daniel Wexler v. Google, Inc.* (E.D.N.Y. 2008). We represented **Google** against an Acacia entity (Web Tracking Solutions) and a Brooklyn-based inventor (Daniel Wexler) in a suit alleging infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5,960,409. The patent purported to cover basic tracking mechanisms for online advertisements, including the use of a third-party tracking service. Plaintiffs claimed they were owed royalties on essentially all of Google's advertising revenues. Based on aggressive claim construction strategies, we secured favorable claim constructions with two Brooklyn-based judges: first, a favorable ruling by Magistrate Jose Reyes, following an eight-hour *Markman* hearing; and second, a confirmation of that favorable ruling by Judge Roslyn Mauskopf, after several months of briefing. In light of the court's claim construction, plaintiffs stipulated to dismiss the case.

- *Shuffle Master v. Bally Technologies* (D. Nev. 2008). On behalf of multiple defendants, we won a summary judgment of non-infringement and obviousness on asserted patents concerning casino table game monitoring.

- *IBM v. PSI* (S.D.N.Y. 2008). We represented **IBM** in a patent, trade secret, and antitrust case involving mainframe computer technology. The case settled on terms favorable to IBM.

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

- *Gillette v. Dorco* (D. Mass 2008). Representing **Pace Shave** and various **Dorco entities** as defendants, we successfully obtained a cost-effective and early global settlement in this razor industry litigation involving eleven patents spanning over 250 claims, as well as numerous assertions of trademark and trade dress.

- *Ethos v. RealNetworks* (D. Mass. 2006). We won a defense jury verdict of patent invalidity and non-infringement for **RealNetworks, Inc.**, a major Internet digital media delivery company, in a five-week trial in which plaintiff sought in excess of $200 million in damages.

- *Freedom Wireless Inc. v. Boston Communications Group Inc.* (D. Mass. 2005). We conducted a 15-week trial against 12 defendants for infringement of prepaid wireless telephone systems and methods. We won a $128 million jury verdict against several wireless telephone carriers. The verdict was the largest ever awarded in Massachusetts, and was the eighth biggest verdict awarded in the U.S. that year.

- *Seiko Epson v. Print-Rite* (D. Or. 2004). We obtained a summary judgment of infringement of **Epson**'s ink jet cartridge patent portfolio against a major aftermarket supplier.

- *Bancorp v. Hartford* (E.D. Mo. 2002). We earned a jury verdict of $118.3 million and a judgment of $134 million for **Bancorp Services LLC,** a financial products company, in a misappropriation of trade secrets and breach of confidentiality agreement case against a major insurance company.

UNITED STATES – APPELLATE COURTS

- *Taction Technology, Inc. v. Apple Inc.* (S.D. Cal. 2026). We represented **Taction Technology**, a San Diego company that designs haptic transducers, in a patent case against Apple over the Taptic Engine technology behind the vibrations in certain iPhones and Apple Watches, and obtained the largest patent infringement jury verdict in U.S. history. The case had been dismissed on summary judgment before our team persuaded the Federal Circuit to revive it, and the verdict caps a five-and-a-half-year fight that began in 2021.

- *CSPS Pharmaceutical Group Limited v. Ipsen Biopharm Ltd.* (Patent Trial and Appeal Board, 2026): We represented Ipsen Pharmaceuticals in defending an Inter Partes Review (IPR) petition filed by CSPC and Conjupro that challenged Ipsen's patent covering the use of its drug Onivyde as a chemotherapy treatment for metastatic pancreatic cancer. The IPR petition was based on a strong prior art record that included Ipsen's own prior publications, and Ipsen's existing litigation counsel declined to take on the defense. Quinn Emanuel stepped in five days after the petition was filed and successfully preserved three critical patent claims. The patent survives, and Ipsen retains the ability to enforce it against generic competitors.

- *Myco Industries, Inc. v. BlephEx, LLC* (Fed. Cir. 2020). We obtained an important appellate victory in the Federal Circuit for our medical device client **BlephEx, LLC**. A rare case in the patent world, this appeal focused on free speech: specifically, BlephEx's right to speak freely regarding its patents and Myco's infringement of those patents. Before we were retained, the district court entered a preliminarily injunction enjoining BlephEx from making allegations of patent infringement or threatening Myco's customers with patent litigation. The Federal Circuit reversed the district court's injunction. As an added bonus, the Federal Circuit vacated the

district court's tentative claim construction in the injunction order, leaving Myco with no credible non-infringement defense.

- *Kannuu Pty., Ltd. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.* (Fed. Cir. 2021, Fed. Cir. 2023) We successfully represented **Samsung** against Kannuu in its request for a preliminary injunction that sought to bar Samsung's participation in inter partes review (IPR) proceedings based on a forum selection clause in a non-disclosure agreement. We first successfully represented Samsung in the district court proceedings below (defeating the preliminary injunction motion) and the related IPRs (invalidating the subject patents). On appeal, the majority affirmed the district court on all grounds, in a wholesale endorsement of Samsung's positions, finding that IPR proceedings did not "relate" to non-disclosure agreements, which implicate confidentiality and not intellectual property rights. Since then, Samsung has invalidated two of Kannuu's patents in successful IPR proceedings, and ex parte reexamination proceedings filed by Samsung have led to final rejections of three additional Kannuu patents, affirmed on appeal to the PTAB. On October 11, 2023, the Federal Circuit unanimously affirmed the PTAB decision invalidating the two patents.

- *In re: Juniper Networks, Inc.* (Fed. Cir. 2021) On behalf of **Juniper Networks**, we obtained a writ of mandamus from the Federal Circuit reversing an order denying Juniper's transfer motion from the Western District of Texas to the Northern District of California. The Federal Circuit ordered the Western District of Texas to transfer the case, and the case has since been transferred to the Northern District of California, Juniper's preferred venue.

- *In re: Google* (Fed. Cir. 2021) On behalf of **Google LLC** in a patent litigation case brought by Sonos LLC, we obtained a writ of mandamus from the Federal Circuit reversing an order denying Google's transfer motion from the Western District of Texas to the Northern District of California. The Federal Circuit ordered the Western District of Texas to transfer the case, and the case has since been transferred to the Northern District of California, Google's preferred venue. After a three-week jury trial in May 2023, the judge found that the patents Sonos had asserted against Google at trial were unenforceable under the doctrine of prosecution laches. As a result, Google prevailed on its equitable defense of prosecution laches.

- *Liqwd, Inc. v. L'Oréal USA Inc.* (Fed. Cir. 2019). We represented **Olaplex LLC**, a California hair-care start up, in a Federal Circuit appeal concerning the attempted invalidation of Olaplex's patent by French beauty conglomerate L'Oréal. Olaplex's patent covers a process for protecting and strengthening hair during bleaching treatments. L'Oréal filed a post-grant review petition at the Patent Trial and Appeal Board seeking invalidation of the patent on the ground that it was obvious in light of the prior art. The PTAB agreed with L'Oréal and invalidated the patent. The PTAB found as a fact that L'Oréal had copied Olaplex's then-unpublished patent application, but ruled as a matter of law that this finding was not legally relevant to the objective indicia of obviousness under Federal Circuit precedent. We convinced the Federal Circuit otherwise; it held that the finding of copying is relevant to obviousness, and remanded for the PTAB to consider the finding further.

- *ChargePoint, Inc. v. SemaConnect, Inc.* (Fed. Cir. 2019). We defended **SemaConnect, Inc.** in a patent infringement lawsuit brought by one of its competitors, ChargePoint, Inc. SemaConnect won a contract to install electric vehicle charging stations as part of the $15 billion settlement of Volkswagen's

vehicle emissions scandal. We successfully sought and obtained dismissal of ChargePoint's complaint at the pleading stage on an expedited schedule and the case was dismissed mere months after filing. ChargePoint appealed the district court's decision to the Federal Circuit. ChargePoint also brought in new lead appeal counsel, Steffan N. Johnson, Vice Chair of Winston & Strawn's Appellate & Critical Motions Practice. We knew the record and the law better than opposing counsel and it showed both in briefing and at oral argument. We were able to fully address every issue ChargePoint threw at us, including responding to a notice of supplemental authority filed by ChargePoint the day before oral arguments. The result speaks for itself: a unanimous panel at the Federal Circuit affirmed SemaConnect's victory in a precedential opinion.

- *Carucel Investments, LP v. Novatel Wireless, Inc., Verizon Communications, Inc. and Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless* (Fed. Cir. 2018). We represented **Novatel Wireless and Verizon** in a case involving mobile wireless hotspots and obtained a jury verdict of non-infringement on all 7 asserted claims from 4 asserted patents. The plaintiff, a non-practicing entity, asserted four patents related to a movable base station that they argued covered Novatel's MiFi hotspot. We argued to the jury that the patents were not infringed, but if read broadly enough to cover the MiFi hotspot, they were invalid. The jury agreed there was no infringement. The plaintiff appealed the decision to the Federal Circuit and requested that they reverse the verdict and render judgment for the plaintiff, or in the alternative, order a new trial on all 7 asserted claims with a revised claim construction order. The Federal Circuit rejected all of plaintiff's requested relief and affirmed the jury trial verdict of no infringement on all asserted claims.

- *Power Integrations Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Corp.* (Fed. Cir. 2018). We obtained vacatur of a $139.8 million patent infringement judgment for our client **ON Semiconductor/Fairchild Semiconductor** in its long running battle with its rival Power Integrations. The Federal Circuit ruled that the patentee had improperly relied on the entire market value rule to prove damages for patents related to switching regulation in power supplies. The case is the latest in a series of important Federal Circuit damages decisions narrowing the entire market value rule.

- *Cascades Projection LLC v. Sony Corp. of Am. et al.; Petitioner Sony Corporation v. Exclusive Licensee Cascades Projection LLC* (C.D. Cal., USPTO, Fed. Cir., 2018). We represented **Sony Corp.** in patent proceedings relating to optical display system technologies, obtaining complete victories at each stage of the IPR life cycle. After non-practicing entity Cascades Projection, LLC sued Sony for infringement in federal court, we quickly obtained a stay and filed for *inter partes* review of Cascades' patent. The PTAB instituted all seven challenges and invalidated each claim in its final written decision. On appeal, the Federal Circuit summarily affirmed the PTAB's decision, and also rejected Cascades' petition to hear constitutional challenges *en banc*. The district court action was dismissed shortly thereafter.

- *Liqwd, Inc. and Olaplex LLC v. L'Oreal USA, Inc., et al.* (Fed. Cir. 2018). We represent **Olaplex** in a patent infringement case against the cosmetic conglomerate, L'Oreal. On a motion for preliminary injunction, the district court misconstrued a critical claim term and denied Olaplex's preliminary injunction. On appeal, the Federal Circuit entirely agreed with Olaplex's construction of the claim term, vacated the denial of the preliminary injunction, and remanded the case for further proceedings.

- *Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd.* (N.D. Cal., Fed. Cir., U.S. Supreme Court 2018). On behalf of our client **Samsung**, we obtained a landmark opinion in the United States Supreme Court in the first design-patent case to reach the Supreme Court in over a century. A federal jury had awarded Apple $399 million—the entire profits on Samsung's accused Galaxy phones—for supposed design-patent infringement of certain narrow portions of an iPhone's external appearance. After successfully petitioning for certiorari, we obtained a stunning 8-0 reversal vacating that award and adopting Samsung's argument that, in a multicomponent device, infringer's profits under Section 289 of the Patent Act are limited to profits from the component of the device to which the patented design is applied, not profits from the entire device. The high court win was one of the last chapters of the "smartphone wars" between Apple and Samsung, in which our firm has represented Samsung in all trials and appeals for the past seven years. Earlier in this case, we had already overturned a different $382 million portion of the initial judgment, convincing the Federal Circuit to reverse all trade-dress dilution awards and to invalidate Apple's iPhone trade dresses. All in, therefore, we eliminated almost all of the original $930 million judgment. A retrial on certain design and utility patent damages occurred in May of 2018 with the parties settling the dispute shortly thereafter, bringing an end to seven years of litigation between the parties.

- *Barco, N.V. et al. v. EIZO Corporation et al.* (N.D. Ga., Fed. Cir. 2018). We represented **EIZO** in a patent infringement action filed by Barco – EIZO's chief competitor – related to high-end liquid crystal displays (LCDs) for medical applications. Between 2011 and 2016, the case was stayed while Quinn Emanuel successfully invalidated a majority of asserted claims in post-grant proceedings. Once the case resumed, Quinn Emanuel swiftly obtained summary judgment invalidating all but three asserted claims. Barco took its appeal after dismissing the three remaining claims with prejudice. The Federal Circuit heard oral argument on April 2, 2018 and issued a summary affirmance of the district court's ruling a mere 24 hours later, resulting in a complete victory for our client.

- *Robert Bosch Tool Corporation v. International Trade Commission and SawStop, LLC* (Fed. Cir. 2017). Quinn Emanuel obtained an important victory in the Federal Circuit for our client **SawStop**, upholding an exclusion order issued by the U.S. International Trade Commission against SawStop's chief competitor in the table saw market, Robert Bosch Tool Corporation.

- *Merck Sharp & Dohme B.V. v. Warner Chilcott Company, LLC, et al.* (Fed. Cir. 2017). We achieved a significant appellate victory for our long-time client **Merck (US)** in connection with its NuvaRing® contraceptive product. On October 19, 2017, the Federal Circuit reversed the district court's finding that Merck's patent covering NuvaRing® was obvious. The decision prevents generic competition for NuvaRing® until after the patent expires.

- *Trusted Knight Corp. v. International Business Machines Corporation and Trusteer Inc.* (D. Del., Fed. Cir. 2017). We represented **IBM** and its subsidiary Trusteer in a patent infringement case involving fraud protection software. We obtained a determination of invalidity by indefiniteness of all asserted claims in the district court, and that ruling was affirmed by the Federal Circuit.

- *Nova Chemicals Corp. v. Dow Chemical Co.* (Fed. Cir. 2017). We obtained a unanimous victory for **Dow** in the Federal Circuit, which affirmed an award of attorneys' fees under 35 U.S.C. § 285 following several years of contentious litigation. In 2010, Dow obtained a $61 million patent-infringement judgment

against its competitor Nova. The Federal Circuit affirmed in 2012. More than a year later, Nova filed an "independent action in equity" seeking to set aside the long-final judgment, alleging that Dow and its witnesses had committed fraud and fraud on the court. The district court dismissed Nova's independent action from the bench, and the Federal Circuit summarily affirmed in 2015. Dow sought an award of attorneys' fees on grounds that the independent action failed to clear the high burden for a plaintiff to undo a long-final judgment. The district court granted the motion and awarded Dow some $2.5 million in attorneys' fees. Nova appealed, and the Federal Circuit affirmed in a unanimous published decision. The decision is an important new application of the Supreme Court's rulings in *Octane Fitness* that maintaining an exceptionally weak litigating position can be a sufficient ground to award fees under § 285

- *Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC, et al.* (Fed. Cir. 2017). We successfully defended **Cisco Systems Inc.** and **Cisco Webex LLC** in a patent case accusing their Cisco WebEx products of infringing claims directed to a "distributed learning environment." Central District of California Judge S. James Otero granted our Motion for Summary Judgment of Unpatentability, finding that every asserted claim was invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The plaintiff appealed, and the Federal Circuit affirmed the Judge Otero's order *per curiam*, deeming no opinion necessary.

- *David Netzer Consulting Engineer LLC v. Shell Oil Co. et al.* (Fed. Cir. 2016). We represented **Shell** in a patent infringement appeal involving benzene purification, and won a unanimous affirmance from the Federal Circuit that Shell did not infringe the asserted patent. In a precedential opinion, the Federal Circuit adopted our claim construction and non-infringement arguments in full, holding that the patent required a boiling-point purification process and that Shell's solubility-based purification process did not infringe as a matter of law.

- *SimpleAir, Inc. v. Sony Ericsson Mobile Communications AB* (Fed. Cir. 2016). At the Federal Circuit, we obtained a complete reversal of an $85 million verdict of patent infringement against **Google** in the Eastern District of Texas. Plaintiff SimpleAir, Inc. had sued Google, Microsoft, and numerous other providers of smartphones and software, claiming its patents covered the technology used to send notifications to mobile devices. Google, while represented by previous counsel, had been found by two juries to infringe and to owe $85 million in royalties. On Quinn Emanuel's successful appeal, the appellate court first reversed the district court's key claim construction ruling, namely that the term "data channel" could not be a device's connection to the Internet because that would make the term redundant. Instead, the Federal Circuit held that the well-known canon of construction that each claim term should be given meaning could not trump the overriding requirement to stay true to the patent's specification. As a result, the court of appeals agreed with Quinn Emanuel that the verdicts should be reversed, and instructed the Eastern District of Texas to enter a judgment of non-infringement in favor Google.

- *Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., et al.* (N.D. Cal. 2014, Fed. Cir. 2016). In a decision by the Federal Circuit that press reports labeled "a major victory for **Samsung** in a years-long, multi-case patent dispute over smartphones," we won an appellate victory that completely eliminated a $120 million judgment that Apple had obtained against Samsung in the Northern District of California. In the second of two trials in that court, Apple had sued Samsung for infringement of five patents, demanding more than $2 billion in damages. We succeeded at trial in limiting Apple's damages to $120 million for

supposed infringement of three patents. On our appeal, the Federal Circuit reversed as to all three, holding that Samsung did not infringe Apple's '647 (Quick Links) patent and that Apple's '721 (Slide to Unlock) and '172 (Auto Correct) patents are invalid as obvious in light of the prior art. At the same time, the Federal Circuit affirmed all the rulings we won at trial, including the jury's findings that Samsung did not infringe Apple's '959 (Remote and Local Search) patent or Apple's '414 (synchronization) patent, and that Apple infringed Samsung's '449 (compressing and organizing photos) patent. With this ruling, Samsung emerges as the net winner: the only remaining damages are $158,400 that Apple owes to Samsung for infringement of Samsung's '449 patent.

- *3M v. TransWeb, LLC* (D.N.J. 2014, Fed. Cir. 2016). We represented **TransWeb** in the defense of patent infringement claims asserted by 3M and the pursuit of antitrust claims against 3M. After a two-and-half-week trial, we obtained a unanimous jury verdict that 3M's asserted patent claims were invalid, not infringed, and (in an advisory capacity) unenforceable due to inequitable conduct. The jury also found that 3M violated the antitrust laws by attempting to enforce fraudulently obtained patents against TransWeb and awarded lost profits and attorneys' fees as antitrust damages, resulting in an approximately $26 million judgment. The district court subsequently adopted the jury's advisory verdict that 3M had committed inequitable conduct rendering the asserted patents unenforceable. On appeal by 3M, the Federal Circuit issued a unanimous and precedential decision affirming the judgments entered below, including specifically the finding of inequitable conduct before the Patent and Trademark Office and the award of trebled attorneys' fees as antitrust damages pursuant to the *Walker Process* fraud claim.

- *Smartflash v. Samsung Electronics & HTC* (Fed. Cir. 2015). We represented **Samsung** and **HTC** in a case involving patents related to the online payment for and distribution of content, such as apps, videos, and music. Weeks before trial, we obtained a reversal of the district court order denying a motion to stay the case pending covered business method review of the patents by the PTAB.

- *Vasudevan Software, Inc. v. Microstrategy, Inc., et al.* (Fed. Cir. 2015). We represented **Microstrategy, Inc.** in a case involving four patents relating to online analytical processing. After achieving a complete win at the district court, we obtained a decision affirming the district court's rulings on claim construction and non-infringement from the Federal Circuit.

- *Avanir Pharmaceuticals, Inc. et al. v. Par Pharmaceutical Inc. et al.* (Fed. Circ. 2015). We secured a key victory at the Federal Circuit for our client **Avanir Pharmaceuticals**, Inc., an innovator pharmaceutical company, in a "bet-the-company" Hatch-Waxman patent litigation relating to Avanir's flagship Nuedexta® product. Chief Judge Leonard P. Stark of the District of Delaware had previously issued a well-reasoned and thorough 63-page opinion in Avanir's favor. Our adversary appealed, and oral argument was held on Friday, August 7, 2015. The morning of Monday, August 10, 2015—less than one business day later—the Federal Circuit issued a Rule 36 affirmance of the District Court's decision, thereby ensuring patent protection for Nuedexta® until 2026.

- *Gemalto v. HTC et al.* (E.D. Tex. 2013, Fed. Cir. 2014). We represented defendants **Google**, **Motorola Mobility**, **HTC**, and **Samsung** against French digital security company Gemalto, brought and won a motion for summary judgment of non-infringement in the Eastern District of Texas, affirmed by the Federal Circuit. Plaintiff alleged that Defendants' Android devices infringed three of its

patents directed at allowing Java-based applications to run on smart cards and microcontrollers.

- *Function Media, LLC v. Google, Inc. and Yahoo, Inc.* (E.D. Tex. 2010, Fed Cir. 2013). We were brought in five months before trial to defend **Google**'s AdSense advertising products against Function Media's $600 million claim of infringement of three patents. We won a unanimous jury verdict of both non-infringement and invalidity in the Eastern District of Texas in Google's first patent trial and a complete affirmance of the judgments from the Federal Circuit.

- *SpendingMoney LLC v. American Express Company and Visa U.S.A. Inc. d/b/a Visa U.S.A.* (D. Conn. 2012, Fed. Cir. 2013). We won a Federal Circuit affirmance of the summary judgment of non-infringement that we won for **American Express Company** against SpendingMoney LLC in the District of Connecticut, in which the court ruled that American Express's Travelers Cheque Card does not infringe SpendingMoney's patent. Confirming the strength of our brief and oral argument on appeal, the Federal Circuit entered its affirmance under Fed. Cir. Rule 36, meaning that we showed that each of SpendingMoney's appellate arguments lacked substantial merit.

- *Deep9 Corporation v. Barnes & Noble* (W.D. Wash. 2012, Fed. Cir. 2013). After being brought into the case as lead trial counsel several months before trial, we obtained summary judgment of non-infringement on behalf of **Barnes & Noble** in a case involving allegations that Barnes & Noble's NOOK eReader devices infringed two patents claiming methods of synchronizing data in multiple devices over a network. The Federal Circuit subsequently affirmed the summary judgment of non-infringement.

- *Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co.* (N.D. Cal., Fed. Cir. 2012). In a widely covered decision, the court vacated a preliminary injunction issued against our client **Samsung** in the Apple-Samsung smartphone wars, holding that Apple failed to show causal nexus to harm that would justify a preliminary injunction against Samsung's Galaxy Nexus. The opinion clarifies and strengthens the legal standard for finding causal nexus between patent infringement and the irreparable harm required to issue an injunction. For products like modern smartphones, which contain hundreds or thousands of patented features, this decision will make it more difficult for any patent holder to justify an injunction based on alleged infringement of a single feature patent. The court also held that, under the proper claim construction, the Galaxy Nexus likely does not infringe Apple's '604 patent.

- *OptimumPath, L.L.C. v. Belkin International et al.* (N.D. Cal. 2011, Fed. Cir. 2012). We obtained a complete summary judgment victory for clients **Belkin**, **Cisco**, **D-Link**, and **NETGEAR**. The plaintiff filed suit against our clients in the District of South Carolina. We successfully moved to have the case transferred to the Northern District of California. We then obtained summary judgment of non-infringement and invalidity on all asserted claims. On appeal, we won affirmance of summary judgment of non-infringement and invalidity.

- *SmartMetric, Inc. v. American Express Company* (C.D. Cal. 2011, Fed. Cir. 2012). In June 2011, we won a stipulation of non-infringement in a patent infringement case for **American Express** concerning Amex's contactless ExpressPay® card products. The suit was originally filed in December 2010 in the Central District of California, and we structured the case for an early claim construction. A claim construction hearing, consolidated with a related case, was held in March 2011, and the court adopted verbatim American Express's proposed construction of the

key claim term, issuing its claim construction ruling in May 2011. This construction completely undermined the plaintiff's case, making it impossible for the plaintiff to prove infringement. The stipulation of non-infringement followed. Plaintiff appealed the key claim construction to the Federal Circuit, and we won an appellate affirmance in April 2012.

- *Paid Search Engine Tools, LLC v. Yahoo! Inc., et al.* (E.D. Tex. 2010, Fed. Cir. 2012). Representing **Google**, we brought and won an early summary judgment motion of invalidity. The patent-in-suit was asserted against Google by Paid Search Engine Tools ("PSET"). PSET had accused Google's AdWords system of infringing the patent, which involved a bid management system that could adjust bidders' bids in online auctions in order to obtain their desired positions and eliminate "bid gaps." The Federal Circuit affirmed the district court's order *per curiam*.

- *The Dow Chemical Co. v. Nova Chemicals Corp. and Nova Chemicals Inc.* (D. Del., Fed. Circ. 2012). We represented **The Dow Chemical Company** in a supplemental damages proceeding of a patent infringement suit against Nova Chemicals Corporation (Canada) and Nova Chemicals Inc. The district court awarded Dow more than $30 million in supplemental damages following up on an earlier verdict that Nova infringed Dow's patents on a new type of plastic. The total damages awards between the two cases, including interest, was $107 million.

- *Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland v. Genentech, Inc. and Biogen Idec, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. 2011, Fed. Cir. 2012) We successfully defended **Genentech, Inc.** in high-stakes patent litigation brought by Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland in the Eastern District of Texas. Sanofi sought damages on Genentech's Rituxan® and Avastin® products, which earn billions of dollars in revenues each year. After we secured a writ of mandamus from the Federal Circuit transferring the case to the Northern District of California—in an opinion now routinely cited in transfer motions—the district court granted summary judgment of non-infringement of all asserted claims, which the Federal Circuit subsequently affirmed.

- *ICHL, LLC v. Sony Electronics Inc. et. al.* (E.D. Tex. 2010, Fed. Cir. 2011). We obtained a complete victory for **Sony Electronics Inc.** ("Sony") and 15 other defendants in a patent infringement action in the Eastern District of Texas and the Federal Circuit against Intellectual Capital Holdings Limited ("ICHL"). In a case that had far reaching damages implications for Sony and other manufacturers of computers, gaming consoles, televisions and any other products that use a heat sink to reduce internal heat, we convinced the Magistrate Judge, District Court Judge, and the Federal Circuit that the defendants' products did not infringe ICHL's patent.

- *Eon-Net LP et al. v. Flagstar Bancorp* (Fed. Cir. 2011). We obtained a complete victory on claim construction, a stipulated judgment of non-infringement, and an award of $600,000 in attorney fees and sanctions for our client **Flagstar Bancorp** in a patent infringement case related to converting hard copy documents to computer files using templates and content instructions. On appeal, the Federal Circuit affirmed the judgment for our client in its entirety.

- *Creative Internet Advertising Corp. v. Yahoo! Inc.* (Fed. Cir. 2011). We obtained a complete reversal of a $12 million patent infringement judgment on behalf of **Yahoo! Inc.** The plaintiff alleged that the Yahoo! Instant Messenger feature called "IMVironments" infringed a patent on displaying advertisements in the background of electronic messages. The trial in the Eastern District of Texas, at which Yahoo! was represented by another firm, resulted in a finding of willful

infringement and no invalidity, and the district court ordered a 23% ongoing royalty. On appeal, we persuaded the Federal Circuit that the district court erred by not resolving a key claim construction dispute and not granting Yahoo!'s motion for judgment as a matter of law of no infringement.

- *PrivaCash, Inc. v. American Express Company et al.* (W.D. Wis. 2010 and Fed. Cir. 2011). We successfully represented **American Express and its affiliate** in a patent infringement action targeting their gift card products, in which plaintiff PrivaCash sought over $100 million in past damages and future royalties. The firm obtained a dismissal of co-defendant American Express Incentive Services, LLC ("AEIS") early in the case after proving that AEIS's gift cards were distributed and sold in the business-to-business environment and therefore could not infringe plaintiff's patent. We then sought and secured a favorable claim construction ruling for remaining defendant American Express, and shortly thereafter filed a motion for summary judgment of non-infringement. Approximately one month before trial, the District Court granted American Express's motion and entered summary judgment of non-infringement. In August 2011, the Federal Circuit affirmed the District Court's summary judgment of non-infringement in favor of American Express.

- *Affymax, Inc. v. Ortho-McNeil-Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.* (7th Cir. 2011). We represented **Ortho-McNeil**, a Johnson & Johnson subsidiary, in a unanimous victory that made an important new law narrowing "manifest disregard of the law" almost to the vanishing point as a ground for district court vacatur of arbitral awards. Some courts have treated this ground as a freestanding warrant to vacate arbitral awards for purported legal error even though it falls outside the statutory criteria in the Federal Arbitration Act. The Seventh Circuit flatly rejected such an approach, reversing the district court's partial vacatur of the award and remanding for full confirmation of an award that favored Ortho in a dispute over inventorship and ownership of two patent families relating to new biological drugs for the production of red blood cells—products potentially worth billions of dollars in annual sales.

- *Billups-Rothenberg Inc. v. ARUP Laboratories and Bio-Rad Laboratories Inc.* (C.D. Cal. 2010, Fed. Cir. 2011). We achieved a complete defense victory in a biotech patent case relating to genetic testing for an iron disorder. We obtained a ruling that one patent was invalid for failing the written description requirement of the patent laws, and another patent was invalid over prior art. This successful judgment was affirmed in a precedential opinion in Federal Circuit on April 29, 2011.

- *Infosint S.A. v. H. Lundbeck A/S, Lundbeck, Inc., Forest Laboratories, Inc., and Forest Pharmaceuticals, Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. 2010 and Fed. Cir. 2011). We successfully represented **Forest Laboratories** and **H. Lundbeck** as defendants in a patent infringement action brought by Infosint in the Southern District of New York regarding the manufacture of their antidepressant drugs CELEXA® and LEXAPRO®, which had over $2 billion in annual U.S. sales. In June 2010, the S.D.N.Y, Judge Kaplan presiding, ruled that no reasonable jury could fail to find the asserted patent invalid due to obviousness. The Federal Circuit subsequently affirmed, and did so decisively, issuing a Rule 36 affirmance three days after the appellate oral argument in March 2011. The district court JMOL and Federal Circuit affirmance eliminated a claim for damages and ongoing royalties of roughly $600 million, and removed the possibility of any type of injunction being entered with respect to CELEXA® or LEXAPRO®.

- *Stanford University v. Roche Molecular Systems and Roche Diagnostics* (U.S. Supreme Court 2011). We represented **Roche** in a patent infringement case brought by Stanford University for infringement of Stanford HIV patents relating to viral load and AIDS therapy decisions. Roche initially asserted that it owned the patents because the patents arose from a collaboration between Stanford and Roche's predecessor, Cetus Corporation. The Court denied this defense. After extensive litigation and claim construction, Roche moved for—and the Court granted—summary judgment that the Stanford patents asserted against Roche were invalid because they were obvious in light of the prior art. The lead prior art reference was a joint publication between Stanford and Cetus in the Journal of Infectious Diseases. On appeal, the Federal Circuit agreed with our defense that Roche was a co-owner of the patents in suit due to the collaboration. With the support of the Solicitor General's office, Stanford petitioned the United States Supreme Court to reverse the Federal Circuit and allow Stanford to void its prior contracts based on the existence of federal funding for research at Stanford. The Supreme Court agreed with Roche and ruled 7-2 that Stanford must abide by its contracts and that the Bayh Dole Act—the statute governing federal research funding—does not give automatic ownership of patents to universities.

- *Performance Pricing Inc. v. Google Inc., et al.* (E.D. Tex., Fed. Cir. 2010). On behalf of **Google** and **AOL**, we won affirmance of summary judgment of non-infringement in a patent infringement litigation in which the patent-in-suit was asserted against the defendants in September 2007 by Performance Pricing Inc., an Acacia entity. Performance Pricing had accused Google's AdWords and AOL's Search Marketplace systems of infringing the patent, which involved a method of doing business over the Internet "wherein various forms of competition and/or entertainment are used to determine transaction prices between buyers and sellers."

- *ESN, LLC v. Cisco Systems, Inc.* (E.D. Tex. 2010, Fed. Cir. 2010). We obtained a complete victory for **Cisco** in this closely watched patent infringement dispute. The plaintiff, a patent holding company, asserted a patent on a method for Voice over Internet Protocol telephony against Cisco's line of Integrated Services Routers. We discovered that the invention had been conceived while the inventor was subject to an invention assignment agreement with his former employer. We moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of standing, arguing that because the patent was related to the former employer's business, ownership was automatically transferred to the employer under the assignment agreement. The court agreed and dismissed the case. The Federal Circuit subsequently affirmed after oral argument.

- *Source Search Technologies, L.L.C. v. LendingTree, LLC, IAC/InterActiveCorp, and ServiceMagic, Inc.* (D.N.J. 2009, Fed. Cir. 2010). On behalf of our clients, **IAC/InterActiveCorp**, **LendingTree**, and **ServiceMagic**, we obtained a summary judgment of invalidity. The District Court granted our motion for summary judgment that the asserted claims were invalid for obviousness. If the patent had survived, it could be asserted against any and all Internet buyer-vendor matching sites.

- *Bid For Position v. AOL* (Fed. Cir. 2009). We won affirmance of summary judgment of non-infringement for **Google** in a patent infringement litigation in which plaintiff sought in excess of $150 million in past damages and a royalty on future revenue in the billions. The litigation concerned the AdWords auction system used by Google to sell advertisement space on search results pages for Google.com and partner sites.

- *University of Texas v. BenQ* (W.D. Tex. 2007, Fed. Cir. 2008). We represented **most of the cell phone industry** (30+ defendants) in a patent case in Texas brought by the University of Texas involving predictive text messaging. After convincing the court to stay discovery on everything except claim construction and hold a separate trial on validity of the patent, the court granted defendants' motion for summary judgment of non-infringement. The Federal Circuit upheld this judgment on appeal.

- *KSR, International v. Teleflex* (U.S. Supreme Court 2007). Representing **Time Warner**, **IAC/Interactive** and **Viacom**, we filed an amicus brief. The Supreme Court adopted an argument we made that many high technology inventions are not published, thus making that strict requirement of documentary evidence unwarranted.

- *Planet Bingo LLC v. GameTech International 472 F.3d 1338* (Fed. Cir. 2006). We obtained by motions in limine a judgment of non-infringement in the defense of **GameTech** and three of its officers or directors, and won an order invalidating various claims of the plaintiff's asserted patents. Those rulings were affirmed by the Federal Circuit.

- *eBay v. MercExchange* (U.S. Supreme Court 2006). Representing **Time Warner**, **Amazon**, **Chevron**, **Cisco**, **Google**, **Shell**, **Visa**, **IAC/Interactive**, **Infineon**, and **Xerox**, we filed an amicus brief arguing against automatic injunctions because with respect to high technology products, a patent may relate only to a small and relatively insignificant component. Justice Kennedy's concurring opinion adopted our argument as a basis for opposing the issuance of automatic injunction.

- *Hoffer v. IBM* (N.D. Cal., Fed. Cir. 2005). We won a summary judgment of non-infringement and invalidity on behalf of **IBM** in a case alleging infringement by IBM's Universal Description Discovery and Integration offering. The Federal Circuit affirmed the lower court's finding of non-infringement.

- *LL International Shoe Co. v. Nike* (C.D. Cal., Fed. Cir. 2004). We defended **Nike** in $40 million trade dress and design patent infringement claims over Nike's Air Jordan basketball shoes. We obtained a concession on the trade dress claims and summary judgment of non-infringement on the patent infringement claim, which was later affirmed by the Federal Circuit.

UNITED STATES – ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS

- *The Broad Institute of Harvard and MIT v. The Regents of the University of California, University of Vienna, and Emmanuelle Charpentier (CVC)* (Patent Trial and Appeal Board 2026). We represented **The Broad Institute of Harvard and MIT** in its landmark decade-long patent dispute over CRISPR-Cas9 gene-editing technology and secured a complete victory before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, which confirmed that Broad's scientist Dr. Feng Zhang is the rightful inventor of the eukaryotic CRISPR-Cas9 invention — not the Nobel Prize-winning opposing team. Delivered on remand from the Federal Circuit under exceptionally challenging circumstances, this fourth consecutive ruling in Broad's favor cements the Institute's intellectual property rights in one of the most consequential technologies in the history of modern medicine and science.

- *In the Matter of Certain Vaporizer Devices, Cartridges Used Therewith, And Components Thereof* (ITC 2025). We represented **Juul Labs Inc. ("JLI")** in an ITC investigation involving assertion of JLI patents against Altria and NJOY. After a

one-week hearing in front of ALJ Johnson Hines, we obtained an initial determination finding a violation of all four asserted JLI patents. On Jan. 30, 2025, the ITC Commission affirmed the ultimate violation finding and issued an exclusion order against the importation of infringing goods.

- *Certain Wearable Electronic Devices with ECG Functionality and Components Thereof* (ITC 2022). We represented **AliveCor** in an ITC investigation asserting patent infringement against Apple in connection with the cardiac functionality of Apple Watch series 4-7. Specifically, the technology involved using the smartwatch to detect and confirm the presence of potentially fatal cardia arrhythmia, including the often asymptomatic and episodic Atrial Fibrillation, using a background heart monitoring feature (PPG sensors). When an episode was detected, the user may take an ECG using a feature on the watch to confirm whether they have the cardiac arrhythmia. On June 27, 2022, the administrative law judge (ALJ) for the ITC found Apple infringed 2 of 3 AliveCor patents directed to this technology, and found the patents' claims valid. The ALJ recommended that full commission of the ITC impose a limited exclusion order against the Apple Watch, prohibiting the watches from being imported into the U.S. containing the accused features—and that Apple be precluded from selling Apple Watches with these features in the United States following importation.

- *The Regents of the University of California, et al., v. The Broad Institute, Inc., et al.,* Patent Interference No. 106,115 (Patent Trial and Appeal Board 2022). We achieved a major victory for **The Broad Institute** against the University of California, University of Vienna, and Emmanuelle Charpentier ("CVC") when the Patent Trial and Appeal Board ("PTAB") issued an opinion and judgment confirming Broad's entitlement to foundational patents on the use of CRISPR-Cas9 in eukaryotic cells (including humans and plants). The PTAB further found CVC's claims to the same invention unpatentable. CVC scientists Jennifer Doudna and Emmanuel Charpentier were awarded the Nobel Prize for CRISPR-Cas9, and CVC contended that they were entitled to patents covering eukaryotic uses. The PTAB disagreed, and found in favor of our client.

- *In the Matter of Certain Magnetic Tape Cartridges and Components Thereof* (ITC 2019). We represented **Sony** in a multifront battle against Fujifilm arising from Fujifilm's anticompetitive conduct seeking to exclude Sony from the Linear Tape-Open magnetic tape market. LTO tape products are used to store large quantities of data by companies in a wide range of industries, including health care, education, finance and banking. Sony filed a complaint in the ITC seeking an exclusion order of Fujifilm's products based on its infringement of three Sony patents covering various aspects of magnetic data storage technology. In August 2018, the ALJ issued the initial determination finding multiple Section 337 violations by Fujifilm, and in March 2019 the full Commission of the ITC affirmed Sony's victory in all respects and issued exclusion orders barring Fujifilm's magnetic tape products from being imported into the US.

- *Alvogen Pine Brook LLC v. Celgene Corp.* (PTAB 2019). We represented **Celgene Corporation** in connection with a petition seeking Inter Partes Review of Celgene's U.S. Patent No. 7,968,569 that was filed by Alvogen Pine Brook and Lotus Pharmaceuticals. Quoting liberally from our preliminary response, the PTAB denied institution, soundly rejecting Alvogen's position on the merits and upholding the validity of Celgene's patent, which covers methods of using Celgene's Revlimid drug product for the treatment of multiple myeloma. The patent expires in October of 2023.

- *In the Matter of Certain Graphics Processors and Products Containing Same*, (ITC 2019). We represented **NVIDIA Corporation**, a pioneering developer of graphics processing technology, and a number of its customers (ASUS, MSI, Gigabyte, PNY, Zotac, and EVGA), in patent infringement actions filed by ZiiLabs in the District of Delaware and at the ITC. ZiiLabs is a subsidiary of Creative Labs. ZiiLabs claimed that various NVIDIA GPUs along with graphics cards and computers containing the same infringe eight patents (three are currently asserted in the ITC investigation) relating to graphics processing and rendering technology. ZiiLabs previously used its patent portfolio (including some of the patents at issue here) to sue Apple, Samsung, ARM, AMD, Sony, Qualcomm, Lenovo, MediaTek and LG and obtain substantial settlements. Over the ITC investigation, the ALJ terminated one of the four asserted patents from the ITC investigation, denied ZiiLabs' Motion for Summary Determination on the Economic Prong of the Domestic Industry Requirement, denied all relevant portions of ZiiLabs' motion to strike our expert reports, and granted large portions of our own motion to strike, include striking the vast majority of ZiiLabs' validity case for one of the three remaining patents. On the eve of trial—with multiple, case dispositive, motions for summary determination pending—the parties resolved the multiple pending actions on confidential terms.

- *In the Matter of Certain Modular LED Display Panels and Components Thereof* (ITC 2019). The firm secured a full dismissal of all the claims against its client **Ledman** Optoelectronics Co., Ltd. in an ITC investigation launched by Ultravision Technologies, Inc. in March 2018, against 44 respondents. Ultravision accused Ledman's LED modules, which are used in large indoor and outdoor digital displays around the world, of patent infringement. We were the lone respondent to develop and assert defenses of improper inventorship and inequitable conduct against Ultravision at the outset, and we later led the effort to aggressively pursue these defenses during the investigation. Facing a court order granting Ledman's motion to compel emails and depositions related to the defenses, Ultravision voluntarily dismissed its complaint and filed a motion to terminate the investigation.

- *Apotex Inc. et al. v. Celgene Corp.* (PTAB 2018). We won a complete victory for our client **Celgene Corporation** in an inter partes review challenging U.S. Patent No. 8,741,929, which expires in 2028. The patent covers methods of using Celgene's Revlimid drug product for the treatment of mantle cell lymphoma ("MCL"), a deadly and hard-to-treat blood cancer. Apotex is seeking to market a generic version of Revlimid with a label indication for MCL. The PTAB rejected Apotex's positions in their entirety, upholding the validity of the '929 patent.

- *Inter Partes Review Proceedings filed by 10X Genomics* (PTAB 2018). We represented **Bio-Rad Laboratories** in a series of twelve *inter partes* review proceedings filed by 10X Genomics that challenged a family of patents Bio-Rad was asserting against 10X in parallel litigation. We filed Preliminary Responses on behalf of Bio-Rad, challenging 10X's primary positions that Bio-Rad's patents were simple combinations of inventions that were already known. The PTAB agreed and denied institution of all twelve petitions, thus preventing 10X from challenging the validity of the patents Bio-Rad was asserting against it.

- *Apotex Inc. et al. v. Abraxis BioScience; Cipla Ltd. v. Abraxis BioScience* (PTAB 2018). QE won three complete victories for our clients **Celgene Corporation** and **Abraxis BioScience, LLC**, in inter partes reviews challenging U.S. Patent Nos. 7,820,788, 7,923,536, and 8,138,229. These patents cover aspects of Celgene's Abraxane drug product, which is approved to treat metastatic breast

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

cancer and other aggressive cancers. Inter partes review of all three of these patents had previously been instituted based on identical prior art, arguments, and expert testimony in a related case that had settled. We prevailed in these IPRs by obtaining key admissions from the opposing parties' expert during his deposition. The PTAB relied on these fatal admissions in denying institution of each IPR, despite having previously instituted on the same grounds. We had previously successfully defended against another IPR covering an unrelated patent related to Abraxane, U.S. Patent No. 8,853,260.

- *Certain Table Saws Incorporating Active Injury Mitigation Technology and Components Thereof* (ITC 2017). We recently obtained a Limited Exclusion Order from the U.S. International Trade Commission on behalf of our client **SawStop, LLC**. The Limited Exclusion Order prevents SawStop's main competitor, Robert Bosch Tool Corporation, from importing certain table saws into the United States. Following a week-long trial, the presiding Administrative Law Judge determined that Bosch's table saws infringe SawStop's patents related to revolutionary "active injury mitigation technology." The Commission recently adopted the ALJ's findings and issued a Limited Exclusion Order as a remedy for Bosch's infringement. This is a significant win for Quinn Emanuel's International Trade and Patent practices in a bet-the-company case for our client.

- *The Broad Institute, Inc. v. The Regents of the University of California, University of Vienna, and Emmanuelle Charpentier* (PTAB 2017). We represented **The Broad Institute, Inc.** in a patent interference requested by the University of California and Emmanuelle Charpentier in order to challenge key Broad patents directed to use of the breakthrough CRISPR gene-editing technology. We obtained a victory as the PTAB declared there was no interference in fact and dismissed the interference, thereby allowing our client to retain its key eukaryotic-related patents. The PTAB decision was widely reported in the press, where it was described as "A Knockout in the Biotech Fight of the Century" (Fortune) and "a blow to the University of California" in "a bitterly fought dispute" (NY Times).

- *In the Matter of Certain Radiotherapy Systems and Treatment Planning Software, and Components Thereof* (ITC 2016). We represented **Complainants Varian Medical Systems** and affiliates against Respondents Elekta AB and affiliates before the International Trade Commission, asserting patents related to radiotherapy equipment and software that help to treat cancer. After a two-week trial, the Administrative Law Judge issued a 465-page decision in which he found that Elekta infringed three Varian patents, and that such patents were not invalid. The judge further recommended that the ITC issue a limited exclusion order and cease and desist order covering Elekta's infringing radiotherapy systems.

- *Sata GmbH & Co. KG v. Anest Iwata Corp* (PTAB 2016). We defended **Anest Iwata Corporation** against an *inter partes* review petition filed by its competitor Sata GmbH, obtaining a complete denial of the petition and of Sata's request for rehearing.

- *Certain Light-Emitting Diode Products and Components Thereof* (ITC 2015). We represented **Cree** in an ITC victory against light bulb retailer Feit and its Taiwanese supplier Unity. After a one-week trial, the ITC judge rendered a 500+ page decision finding that Feit/Unity infringed five Cree patents and that Feit falsely advertised its products as being ENERGY STAR compliant. Within days of the ITC's final determination and the ensuing exclusion order, Feit took a royalty-bearing license.

- *Certain Opaque Polymers* (ITC 2014). We are representing **The Dow Chemical Company** and **Rohm and Haas** against Turkish chemical company Organik Kimya in the International Trade Commission alleging infringement of two patents and numerous trade secrets related to opaque emulsion polymers made in Turkey and imported into the United States. Over the course of a six month discovery period, we obtained multiple orders for forensic inspection of Organik Kimya's computers and networks, uncovering evidence of alleged trade secret misappropriation and spoliation. Organik Kimya consented to a 25-year exclusion order.

- *Certain Audiovisual Components and Products Containing the Same* (ITC 2014). We successfully defended respondents **MediaTek, Ralink** and **Funai** in an investigation brought by LSI and Agere alleging infringement of four patents concerning Wi-Fi and MPEG technology.

- *Denso Corporation and Clarion Co. Ltd. v. Beacon Navigation GmbH* (PTO 2014). We recently won a complete victory for our client, **Clarion Co. Ltd**, in one of the first-ever filed and argued inter partes review (IPR) proceedings. We coordinated across our Tokyo and Los Angeles offices to identify the strongest Japanese and English language prior art references. Working with a technical expert, we presented a report and extensive briefing to explain the complex references that were found. Because depositions are allowed in IPRs, as opposed to the prior inter partes reexamination system, we were able to establish a number of key admissions from the opposition's expert that were then used in the invalidation procedure. The IPR culminated in our successful oral argument at the PTAB before a gallery well-attended with legal and automotive industry observers. The IPR concluded when the PTAB issued its final written decision, finding every challenged claim unpatentable and giving our client a total victory.

- *Certain Electronic Digital Media Devices and Components Thereof* (ITC 2013). We represented **Samsung** against Apple in the U.S. International Trade Commission in an investigation based on seven Apple patents. After a trial in June 2012, the Commission issued its Final Determination on August 9, 2013. We completely prevailed against Apple's design patent claims based on the Commission's findings of non-infringement. In addition, although some older products were found to be infringe certain utility patents, we defeated any meaningful exclusion order by demonstrating to the Commission that Samsung's design arounds were non-infringing.

- *Certain Projectors with Controlled-Angle Optical Retarders, Components Thereof, and Products Containing Same* (ITC 2012). We represented **Sony** in an ITC Investigation regarding ultra-high resolution LCD projectors, including those used in movie theaters throughout the U.S. Two weeks before trial and for nothing in return, Complainants requested that the investigation be terminated in its entirety, securing a total defense victory on behalf of Sony.

- *Coalition for Affordable Drugs VI LLC v. Celgene Corporation* (PTAB 2015). We represented **Celgene Corporation** in connection with an IPR petition filed by Hedge fund manager Kyle Bass and frequent patent plaintiff Erich Spangenberg (and related funds and other entities) against Celgene Corporation's U.S. Pat. No. 5,635,517, which covers the active ingredient in Celgene's blockbuster cancer therapy, Revlimid®. The PTAB denied institution of the IPR, adopting nearly all of Celgene's arguments against institution.

UNITED STATES – ARBITRATION

- *Quid, LLC f/k/a Quid, Inc. v. Sean Gourley* (JAMS 2021). We represented **Dr. Sean Gourley** and the groundbreaking artificial intelligence company he founded, **Primer Technologies, Inc.**, in a lawsuit filed by Dr. Gourley's former employer, Quid, alleging that Dr. Gourley misappropriated Quid's trade secrets and used them to found Primer. After successfully moving to compel the claims against Dr. Gourley to arbitration, we prevailed in a six-day arbitration. Quid had sought up to $160 million in damages, a broad injunction, and ownership of a patent application belonging to Primer. But the arbitrator found that Dr. Gourley had not misappropriated trade secrets, awarded Quid only $1 of nominal damages for a small technical breach of his employment contract due to Dr. Gourley inadvertently retaining Quid files, and rejected Quid's other claims. As the prevailing party, the arbitrator awarded Dr. Gourley $6.2 million of his fees and costs.

- *Toshiba Corporation v. Coby Electronics Co., Ltd.* (AAA/ICDR 2011). We won a $18.5 million dollar AAA/ICDR arbitration award for **Toshiba Corporation** (as Licensor for the DVD6C Patent Licensing Group) in a patent license dispute against Coby Electronics, a manufacturer of DVD video players, for unpaid and underreported royalties.

- *Wade v. Nobel Biocare USA* (JAMS 2006). We represented an **individual inventor** in an arbitration involving a snap-fit device used for dental implants. Immediately following the claim construction hearing, Nobel initiated discussions that resulted in a favorable settlement.

EUROPEAN UNION

- *Google v. Netlist* (Düsseldorf District Court, Germany, 2026). Quinn Emanuel represented **Google** in an invalidity case as a co-plaintiff together with Samsung and Micron against Netlist obtaining a complete invalidation of the patent-in-suit by the German Federal Patent Court, which the Federal Supreme Court affirmed.

- *Ottobock SE & Co.v. BrainPortfolio Inc.* (UPC_CFI_1927/2025). We represented **BrainPortfolio Inc. (DBA BrainRobotics)**, a US-based robotics company developing advanced prosthetic technology, in a high-stakes preliminary injunction proceeding before the Unified Patent Court (UPC) Local Division Duesseldorf. Ottobock, a global market leader in prosthetics, sought emergency injunctive relief alleging infringement of a broad patent by our client's prosthetic knee, 'Kneuro'. We secured a full dismissal of Ottobock's application. The court adopted our key arguments on claim construction, non-infringement, and urgency in their entirety.

- *SIG Sauer, Inc. et al. v. LoneStar Future Weapons Inc.* (Düsseldorf District Court, Germany, 2025). We represented **SIG Sauer, Inc.** in a complex patent infringement action relating to an impulse-averaging technology for machine guns which was brought by LoneStar Future Weapons before the Regional Court of Düsseldorf, Germany. We achieved a complete dismissal of the action for lack of infringement. The judgment of the District Court is subject to appeal.

- *Netflix v. Avago* (German Federal Patent Court, 2024). We represented **Netflix** in an invalidity case against Avago obtaining a complete invalidation of the patent-in-suit by the German Federal Patent Court.

- *K.Mizra vs. Niantic* (Munich Court of Appeals, 2024). We successfully represented **Niantic** against K.Mizra in proceedings for alleged patent infringement by the mobile game "Pokémon GO". The Court of Appeal fully dismissed the complaint for lack of infringement.

- *Neo Wireless v. Tesla* (District Court Mannheim, 2024). We represented **Tesla** against Neo Wireless in a patent infringement action brought by Neo Wireless based on a patent allegedly essential for the LTE standard before the District Court Mannheim.

- *Deutsche Telekom v. IPCom* (Higher Regional Court of Karlsruhe, 2023). We successfully represented **IPCom** in defending against a claim for damages brought by Deutsche Telekom alleging anti-competitive discrimination following a patent license agreement concluded by the parties in 2013. The Court of Appeal affirmed the District Court's decision to dismiss the complaint, upholding the distribution of risk contractually agreed upon by the parties.

- *Netflix International B.V. v. DivX, LLC* (Federal Patent Court 2023) We represent **Netflix** in a multinational patent litigation dispute against DivX, which involves proceedings in the United States, Brazil, Netherlands and Germany. In Germany DivX asserts two European Patents pertaining to complex video streaming technology. With judgment of June 15, 2023 Quinn Emanuel achieved a major victory as one of these patents was nullified in first instance by the Federal Patent Court. The other asserted Patent has already been revoked by the EPO in March 2023 (appeal pending). With the judgement of the Federal Patent Court the validity of both asserted patents has been successfully challenged by Quinn Emanuel in first instance.

- *DivX v. Netflix* (European Patent Court 2023) We represent **Netflix** in a multinational patent litigation dispute against DivX. DivX asserts two European Patents pertaining to video streaming technology against Netflix in Germany. With the victory on March 30, 2023 one of the patents was revoked in the first instance by the EPO in its entirety.

- *Apple Inc. and Intel Corporation v. Qualcomm Inc*. (Germany 2022) We represented **Qualcomm Inc**. in EPO opposition proceedings initiated by Apple Inc. and Intel Corp. in December 2017 concerning a patent about envelope tracking implemented in mobile devices using LTE and 5G. After the Opposition Division had revoked the patent in suit in May 2019 based on lack of novelty (regarding the patent as granted) and on lack of inventive step (regarding our first auxiliary request), we lodged an appeal with the Board of Appeal. During appeal proceedings, we demonstrated in our briefs why the assessment of the relevant prior art by the Opposition Division was wrong and Apple's arguments on obviousness were technically flawed. In its preliminary opinion, the Board completely followed our arguments indicating that it considered the patent in the form of the first auxiliary request to be novel and inventive. At the oral proceedings on December 8, 2022, we succeeded in rejecting all further objections from Apple and confirming the Board's preliminary opinion. As a consequence, the Board set the first instance decision of the Opposition Division aside and maintained the patent in the form of the first auxiliary request.

- *Netflix v. DivX – EP 666* (Germany 2022) We represent **Netflix** in ongoing proceedings against DivX in Germany. DivX asserts several patents against Netflix in various jurisdictions. QE successfully prevented DivX from obtaining a preliminary injunction against Netflix Services Germany GmbH

- *Google Germany GmbH v. Sonos Inc.* (European Patent Court 2022) We represented **Google Germany GmbH** in opposition proceedings before the European Patent Office (EPO) against Sonos patent EP 3 554 005 ("Playback Queue Control via a Playlist on a Mobile Device") and obtained a decision revoking the patent in its entirety. The decision is appealable.

- *Deutsche Telekom v. IPCom* (Mannheim District Court 2022): We defended IPCom against Deutsche Telekom's cartel damages claim before the District Court Mannheim. The case is currently pending before the German Federal Court of Justice.

- *Voxer IP v. Facebook, Instagram* (Federal Patent Court 2022): We represent **Voxer** which sued Facebook and Instagram before the Regional Court Munich for the infringement of two patents by the "live" functions of Facebook and Instagram and represent Voxer in the corresponding nullity actions. There are parallel infringement proceedings before the District Court for the Western District of Texas in the United States and IPR proceedings before the United States Patent Office, all of them also handled by Quinn Emanuel for Voxer.

- *Google Inc. v Koninklijke Philips N.V.* (2021): We represent Google against Philips in a patent litigation campaign before the courts in Mannheim/Karlsruhe and Düsseldorf started by Philips in 2017. QE also filed nullity actions with the Federal Patent Court or oppositions with the EPO against the asserted patents for Google.

- *BASF v. PUMA* (Germany 2022): We represented **BASF** on the side of the plaintiff in a patent infringement case brought by BASF against Puma in Germany as well as in the parallel opposition proceeding (opponent: Puma and Huntsman) before the European Patent Office and the nullity proceedings brought by PUMA before the Federal German Patent Court. The enforced patent is covering specific hybrid foams. In April 2020 we secured an injunction for BASF. In March 2021, the patent was fully upheld in the parallel opposition proceedings. PUMA has withdrawn its appeal against the decision by the opposition division.

- *Netflix v. Broadcom/Avago* (Mannheim/Munich/Hamburg District Court 2022): We represent **Netflix** in several patent infringement cases brought by plaintiffs Broadcom and Avago in 2018/2019. In all proceedings, the action was either dismissed (appealed) or the infringement proceedings were stayed. Parallel validity proceedings are pending, the four asserted patents have in the meantime been invalidated in first instance (appeal lodged and can be lodged, respectively). In 2021, Broadcom brought further infringement actions that are now pending before the Munich and the Hamburg District Court.

- *Daimler AG and Automotive OEMs v Nokia Technologies Oy, Conversant Wireless Licensing S.á.r.l. and Sharp* (Federal Patent Court 2021): We represented **Daimler** against several owners of essential patents for mobile telecommunications standards (Nokia, Sharp, Conversant) before the infringement courts in Mannheim/Karlsruhe, Munich and Duesseldorf as well as in the corresponding and further validity proceedings before the Federal Patent Court and the European Patent Office. A total of 19 patents were asserted and we conducted 24 validity proceedings for Daimler. These were the first patent infringement cases worldwide dealing with how mobile telecommunications patents are to be licensed in the automotive industry. Notably, none of the SEP owners was in a position to enforce an injunction against Daimler after more than two years of litigation when the cases were settled.

- *Bio-Rad v 10X Genomics* (District Court Munich 2021) We represented **Bio-Rad** against 10X Genomics before the District Court and Court of Appeals Munich, the Federal Patent Court and the German Patent Office. The cases involved two patents and a utility model.

- *Sonos Inc v. Google Germany GmbH* (District Court Hamburg 2021). We represent **Google** in patent litigation cases filed by Sonos currently pending in the US (district court and ITC) and in Europe (Germany, Netherlands, France). Among others, Sonos filed a motion for a preliminary injunction (rare in patent matters) at the Hamburg district court in Germany based on a just recently issued patent that has not gone through inter partes opposition. They attacked Google's cast functionality as applied in the YouTube Music app (with that cast function one can play songs on loudspeakers like Google Nest). We completely turned around a bench that had told us at the outset of the decisive hearing that they were willing to follow Sonos' contentions on all counts and wanted to grant the PI.

- *Qualcomm v. Apple Inc.* (D.C. Munich I 2019). We obtained an ex parte preliminary injunction for **Qualcomm** against Apple in an unfair competition case.

- *SWM v. Hydac* (German Patent and Trademark Office 2018). We represented **SWM** in an opposition proceeding against Hydac, involving a patent covering filter materials for fluids and, in particular special plastic netting used for such filter materials and methods of creating such plastic netting. The German PTO revoked the patent for lack of sufficient disclosure.

- *Philips v. Google et al.* (Mannheim District Court 2018). We represented **Google**, first as intervener and later on also as co-defendant, in a patent infringement action before the Mannheim District Court brought by Dutch company Philips against several mobile phone and tablet manufacturers. On May 16, 2018 the court handed down a judgement dismissing Philips' case in its entirety.

- *Manchester Mobile v. Google* (Landgericht/District Court Düsseldorf 2018). On January 25, 2018, the Düsseldorf Court dismissed all claims asserted by Manchester Mobile against **Google** for alleged infringement of Manchester's German Patent 10 2004 026 183 B4 on a "Method and device for the management and presentation of information." The patent teaches that an information pool is stored on a central server that is connected with a user terminal which automatically sends search requests to the central server based on search profiles stored in the user terminal. Manchester alleged that "Google Now," "Google Assistant," "Google Home" and "Google Allo" as well as the "Pixel" and "Nexus" phones would infringe the Patent but the Court found that the central server would not transmit information corresponding to the search request as claimed in the asserted claims.

- *SWM v. Glatz.* (Appellate Court Düsseldorf 2017). The Düsseldorf Appellate Court confirmed the District Court's finding that **SWM**'s patent EP 1 482 815 is infringed enjoining Julius Glatz GmbH and its affiliates from manufacturing LIP cigarette papers and also affirming the grant of full damages for our client (quantum to be determined). SWM is a world market leader in engineering papers, films, nets and non-wovens (headquarters in Atlanta). Particularly, SWM has been the market leader for the supply of special paper for the cigarette industry. Due to regulatory changes some years ago, all cigarettes in Europe and US have to be made of low ignition proclivity paper (LIP paper) ensuring that the cigarettes do not continue to burn if not smoked. This is done by way of specific polymer films on the paper (covering discrete areas, like rings). Our client SWM

was granted a basic patent defining such polymer films by way of the polymers and its viscosity. Before SWM won the appeal infringement proceedings the Technical Board of Appeal (EPO) had uphold the patent which had been attacked by three parties (inter alia Glatz) incorporating only one additional feature. This additional feature was not relevant for the question of infringement.

- German Federal Supreme Court, case no. X ZR 120/15 (German Federal Supreme Court 2017). We represented **the leading tire repair kit manufacturer** in a case against a foreign competitor involving the foreign competitor's sales of patent infringing products to third parties outside of Germany. These third parties sold these products in Germany and the Supreme Court held that our client's competitor can be held liable for these sales, overturning the Court of Appeals' decision on this issue.

- Win for Patent Applicant (EPO Board of Appeal 2017). We represented a **patent applicant** in front of the Board of Appeal of the EPO arguing against four decisions of the Examining Division rejecting applications concerning DSL-technology; the first instance decisions were set aside and the cases were sent back to the first instance following our arguments pointing to procedural mistakes made by the Examining Division.

- *TEK v. DunlopTech* (District Court Mannheim 2016). We represent **Sumitomo Rubber Industries** against its competitor TEK in both offensive and defensive patent litigation involving tire repair kits.

- *Philips v. Archos, ASUS, HTC, and Wiko* (District Court Mannheim 2016). On October 11, 2016, the Mannheim Court dismissed all claims asserted by Philips against the Android OEMs HTC, Asus, Archos and Wiko for infringement of their key speech codec patent EP 0 821 848, allegedly essential for the AMR standard. Speech codecs (codecs for compression of digital speech information) can be used in Android functionalities such as dictation (,e.g., as an input method). This patent was the most serious threat in a series of patent infringement actions that Philips filed globally against Android OEMs (8 patents in Germany, four standard essential, four feature patents). **Google** decided to intervene in those actions relating to Android, coordinating and actually leading the defense.

- Opposition against EP 1 482 815 (Board of Appeal of the European Patent Office 2016). We represented **Schweitzer-Mauduit International, Inc.** in opposition proceedings before the European Patent Office which resulted in the maintenance of one of their key patents relating to certain types of low-ignition proclivity paper wrappers for smoking article ("LIP" technology).

- Win in patent infringement case about insulation materials (Germany 2015): We represented **one of the leading German suppliers of insulation materials** against a competitor. We defended the client's patent in front of the Federal Patent Court and in front of the Federal Supreme Court and finally obtained a victory through three instances in the parallel infringement case confirming infringement on the client's patent by its competitor.

- *Google v. Nokia EP'375* (German Federal Patent Court, Sixth Nullity Senate 2015). We represented **Google** in a nullity action against Nokia concerning the German part, of Nokia's European patent EP 0 882 375 on "a communication network terminal supporting a plurality of applications." We obtained a complete victory for our client, with the German Federal Patent Court revoking Nokia's patent in its entirety and rejecting all of Nokia's 40 auxiliary requests.

- *SME Holding GmbH v. Thomson Sales Europe S.A.* (District Court of Hamburg 2015). Our client **Technicolor** was sued by SME Holding GmbH for damages incurred through third party patentees against a distressed company that Technicolor had sold to SME. QE took over after the initially retained firm had spent three years litigating without bringing the case any further. We completely changed the line of defense and the court dismissed the complaint with prejudice, following us on every major argument.

- *Motorola Mobility Germany GmbH v. Microsoft Corp.* (German Federal Patent Court 2014). We represented **Motorola Mobility** in a nullity action filed with the German Federal Patent Court against Microsoft Corp. regarding the German Part of the European Patent EP 1 304 891. Based on the prior art identified and submitted by the firm, the German Federal Patent Court completely revoked this patent.

- *Motorola Mobility Germany GmbH et al. v. Apple Inc.* (European Patent Office 2014). We represented **Motorola Mobility Germany GmbH** in an opposition proceeding against Apple concerning Apple's European patent EP 2 098 948 on a touch event model. We obtained a complete victory for our client, with the European Patent Office revoking Apple's patent in its entirety and rejecting all of Apple's auxiliary requests.

- *Motorola v. Apple* (German Federal Patent Court 2013). We represented **Motorola** in a nullity action against the German part of EP 2 059 868 (member of Apple's 'rubber band patent' family) and obtained full nullification.

- *Nokia v. HTC et al.* (District Court of Mannheim 2013). We represented **Google**, intervening in a case involving the alleged infringement of one of Nokia's video coding patents through the VP 8 codec used in Android and obtained a dismissal for non-infringement.

- *Motorola Mobility Germany GmbH vs. Apple Inc.* (Federal Patent Court of Germany 2013). We represented **Motorola Mobility** in a nullity action against Apple concerning the German part of Apple's European patent EP 1 430 380 on dynamic light effects for computing devices. We obtained a complete victory for our client, with the German Federal Patent Court revoking Apple's patent in its entirety and rejecting all of Apple's auxiliary requests.

- *Motorola Mobility Germany GmbH et al. v. Apple Inc.* (Federal Patent Court of Germany 2013). We represented **Motorola Mobility Germany GmbH** in a nullity action against the German part of EP 1 964 022, Apple's often cited 'slide to unlock patent' and obtained nullification in its entirety (first instance).

- *Microsoft Incorporation v. Motorola Mobility Germany GmbH* (District Court Munich 2012). We represented **Motorola** in a preliminary injunction proceeding for patent infringement brought by Microsoft. We obtained a full dismissal of the action.

- *Motorola v. Apple* (District Court Mannheim 2011/2012 and Court of Appeal Karlsruhe 2012). In the ongoing patent dispute between Motorola Mobility and Apple, we scored an important strategic victory for **Motorola**. In December 2011, we achieved a widely noticed first-instance victory for Motorola when the Mannheim District Court awarded an injunction against Apple Sales International out of a standard essential mobile communications patent. In February 2012, we scored a second offensive victory for Motorola against Apple Sales International,

this time based on a patent claiming the synchronization of, inter alia, the message status of a plurality of transceivers such as mobile phones or tablet computers. Very recently, this first-instance victory was repeated against the ultimate parent company of the Apple group, Apple Inc. Motorola asserted said synchronization patent against Apple's MobileMe and iCloud services. The patent was also asserted against Apple's mobile devices for contributory infringement. The Mannheim court found that Apple's synchronization method directly infringed Motorola's patent and issued an injunction. The court also found that the accused mobile devices indirectly infringed Motorola's patent and issued an injunction in this regard as well. Following the judgment, Apple switched off the "push" synchronization functionality of its iCloud and MobileMe services in Germany.

- *Motorola Mobility Inc. v. Microsoft* (District Court Mannheim 2011 and Court of Appeal Karlsruhe 2012). We have been representing **Motorola Mobility Inc.** and its subsidiaries in the German courts on a regular basis. We won very important first instance victories for Motorola Mobility Inc. and its subsidiary General Instrument Corp. in patent infringement cases against Microsoft Corp. and its subsidiaries Microsoft Germany GmbH and Microsoft Ireland Operations Ltd. On behalf of General Instrument, we asserted two patents essential to the H.264 video coding standard which is used e.g. in the software products Windows 7, Internet Explorer 9, Media Player 12, and the video game console Xbox 360. General Instrument sued Microsoft for infringement of its patents with the District Court Mannheim back in July 2011, and we achieved a full win for the client. We won another important first instance victory for Motorola Mobility Inc. and its subsidiary Motorola Mobility Germany GmbH in defending the Android operating system against a complaint brought by Microsoft Corp. After two oral hearing, we achieved a complete dismissal of the complaint by establishing non-infringement on the patent.

- *St. Gobain Isover v. Knauf* (German Federal Supreme Court 2011 (nullity action), District Court Mannheim 2011/2012 and Court of Appeal Karlsruhe (infringement case)). We are representing **St. Gobain-Isover** in a patent infringement case against Knauf and in the parallel nullity action. We managed to maintain the patent in suit before the German Federal Supreme Court in December 2011. Following this decision, infringement was litigated before the Mannheim court. We obtained a full win for the client. The hearing in the infringement case was mostly about claim construction, but also on rules for evidence (when does the burden of proof shift from the plaintiff to the defendant).

- *BSN Medical v. Mölnlycke Healthcare AB* (German Federal Patent Court 2012). We represented **Mölnlycke Healthcare AB** ("MHC"), a global leader in the field of wound care products, in a German nullity action filed by BSN medical. The action concerned the German part of a European patent covering gel coated wound dressings. At the end of the trial, the German Federal Patent Court maintained MHC's patent in the form requested by MHC.

- *Alpla Werke Alwin Lehner GmbH & Co.KG v. Cobarr S.p.A.* (Nullity action before German Federal Patent Court, Munich). We obtained a complete victory in a patent nullity action on behalf of **INVISTA Resins** and **Fibers GmbH** who joined the action as intervener. The patent-in-suit related to a gas barrier functionality of polyester bottles. The nullity action was filed in response to a patent infringement action brought before the District Court Düsseldorf by Cobarr S.p.A. (a subsidiary of M&G). The court adopted our position and revoked the relevant claims of the

patent-in-suit. As a result, the corresponding infringement action was fully withdrawn.

- *Atos Medical AB v. Servona GmbH* (District Court Munich 2011). In Germany, we obtained reversal of ex parte preliminary injunction preventing our client from selling medical products based on alleged infringement of competitor's patents.

- *Societa Italiana per lo Sviluppo dell'Elettronica S.p.A. (Sisvel S.p.A.) v. Hamg Shing Technology Corp.* (Court of Appeal Karlsruhe/Germany 2010). We have been representing **Sisvel** for years enforcing the Philips, France Telecom, IRT and TDF patents covering MP3 in numerous cases. In March 2010, the first decision was rendered by the Court of Appeal Karlsruhe confirming infringement and rebutting the counterpart's antitrust defense based on the standard essentiality of the enforced patent.

- *Mölnlycke Health Care AB v. Smith & Nephew GmbH and Smith & Nephew Medical Ltd.* (District Court Düsseldorf 2010). We are representing **Mölnlycke Health Care**, one of the world's leading providers of single-use surgical and wound care products and services to the health care sector. Defendants are its competitors (i.e. the Smith & Nephew group), which is another leading player in this field. Accused devices are certain wound care products. This new generation of wound care products with silicone are significant for the leading players in this market. We achieved a full victory for the client in the first instance.

WORLDWIDE

- *China Lithium Battery Technology Co., Ltd. v. Contemporary Amperex Technology Co., Limited*. We represented **CATL,** the largest EV battery maker in the world, in an patent dispute against its competitor China Lithium Battery Technology (CALB). This was a part of a larger dispute between the parties pending in China. In November 2021, CALB filed a Petition for Post-Grant Review of CATL's U.S. Patent No. 10,930,932 with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board of the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The Petition asserted 19 different grounds of invalidity of the '932 Patent, which related to the positive electrode plate in the battery, including based on prior use, anticipation, obviousness, lack of written description support, lack of enablement, and failure to further limit. We opposed institution on March 9, 2022, and on June 6, 2022, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board issued a decision denying Institution of post-Grant Review, finding that none of the 19 grounds asserted by CALB established that it is more likely than not that claims 1-19 of the '932 patent are unpatentable.

- *Apple et al. v. Qualcomm re. EP '737 (Carrier Aggregation)*. We represented **Qualcomm Inc.** in EPO opposition proceedings initiated by Apple Inc. and Intel Corp. in December 2017 concerning a wireless communications patent. After the Opposition Division had revoked the patent in suit in April 2019, the Board of Appeal set the decision aside due to formal reasons and remanded the case for retrial. Being before exactly the same panel again, we rebuilt the case in light of the previous decision and presented the patented technology in an even more nuanced way. During oral proceedings on March 22, 2022, we were able to overcome all objections by filing a new auxiliary request. As a consequence, the Opposition Division maintained the patent in slightly amended form.

- *Qualcomm v. Apple Global Settlement.* The firm was lead counsel for **Qualcomm** in a series of worldwide disputes between Apple and Qualcomm in California

state and District Courts, the International Trade Commission, the UK, and Germany. We had a series of successes in all of these disputes that led to a very successful settlement for our client Qualcomm. A couple of the larger successes within the context of this representation are outlined below. We were lead counsel in the only patent infringement case that proceeded to jury trial in the Southern District of California. In that case, Qualcomm alleged that Apple infringed five U.S. Patents directed to a variety of technologies. The jury returned a verdict finding all of the patents infringed by Apple and valid. The jury also found that Apple was liable at a royalty rate of $1.41 per iPhone, which importantly helped set up royalty rate to allow the global settlement. We were also lead counsel for Qualcomm in two patent infringement actions against Apple in the International Trade Commission. Qualcomm alleged that Apple engaged in the unlawful importation and sale of iPhones that infringe one or more claims of five Qualcomm patents covering key technologies that enable important features and function in the iPhones. After a seven-day hearing in the second International Trade Commission case, Administrative Law Judge McNamara issued an Initial Determination finding for Qualcomm on all issues related to claim 1 of U.S. Patent 8,063,674 related to an improved "Power on Control" circuit. The ALJ recommended that the Commission issue a limited exclusion order with respect to the accused iPhone devices. The parties settled shortly after the ruling, which would have resulted in the exclusion of all infringing iPhones and iPads from the United States. Apple agreed to settle all of the worldwide disputes for a significant, but confidential settlement in Qualcomm's favor. The settlement was so favorable that Qualcomm's stock jumped 23% when hearing the news of the settlement.

- Win for Innovator of Novel Technology (2017). We acted for **a start-up innovator of novel technology** that had entered into exclusive commercialization arrangements with a multinational partner. That partner had fallen short of its obligations to our client but refused to release our client from its exclusive relationship. We were instructed to find a route for the client to terminate their arrangements. This involved two ICC arbitration proceedings and proceedings in the Commercial Court in London. We have obtained a full exit for our client, together with the transfer to them of substantial additional intellectual property. The effect of this is that our client can now enter into alternative commercialization arrangements with a new partner.

"Exceptional litigators who have achieved massive results over the years."
Client Testimonials, ***Chambers and Partners***