Younger members: get involved!

M yra McCormack will hand off the AIPLA presidency to Sheldon Klein during the Annual Meeting. This past year as President, she is most proud of her work facilitating a cultural shift at the leadership level toward focusing more on long-term projects. These include initiatives to remain relevant to millennials joining the organization, as well as to locally engage with members.

McCormack, who is Associate Patent Counsel at Johnson & Johnson, has been involved with AIPLA in various capacities since 1995. Her first step was to encourage AIPLA to engage locally. Over the past year, engagement activities such as informal receptions and brown bag lunches have been launched both in the US and abroad. Going forward AIPLA will continue to target metropolitan areas with a concentration of IP practitioners. “We don’t want to step on [the toes of] local IP associations; the intent is to provide practitioners with more networking opportunities,” explains McCormack. “CLE is available everywhere, so it’s more about developing a community of practitioners within the US and even globally.”

McCormack engaged directly with AIPLA’s global community this year in her travels to Japan, Latin America, and the IPS meeting in New Orleans. The goal was mostly to educate and update colleagues’ understanding of IP law in the US, but it also served as a community-building exercise. “The opportunity to spend time with people outside the US promoting the work of one another is nice. You get to really develop relationships,” she says.

Additionally, AIPLA has been very active in efforts to harmonize international procedural IP issues, to streamline the system and ultimately help inventors save time and money, and help companies manage complex international IP portfolios. Substantive issues have proven more difficult to harmonize because various countries’ systems of law are so different. “A long-term goal is to harmonize globally, but that’s a big ask, even in a lifetime,” McCormack says.

The trip to Latin America was particularly impactful for McCormack. “It was eye-opening to see what happens in economies where you don’t have strong patent systems,” she says. “We saw firsthand how, when the culture isn’t focused on innovation because the patent system isn’t as strong, companies take a lot longer to get funding and to get off the ground than they do in the United States. Countries with established patent systems like the US, Canada, Europe, and Japan have their warts, but they really support the economy in ways that I had taken for granted.”

Still, the US system can always be improved, and that’s what AIPLA is about. McCormack says AIPLA is “unique among IP organizations because we’re set up to be consensus-driven,” referring to how issues are tackled by diverse committees and task forces assigned with generating proposals for the Board to discuss. She adds that AIPLA’s diversity is its strength: “We make a conscious effort to have people in industry, law firms, tech, biotech/pharm, and people doing standards work. We have trademark people and usually at least one copyright person on the Board, and we end up with very robust discussions.”

One issue that an AIPLA Task Force has tackled is Section 101 subject matter eligibility. It was a multi-year project that has recently culminated in a joint proposal with IPO, which is available on AIPLA’s website. McCormack says the two other organizations’ harmonization of their stance led to other IP associations endorsing the proposal.

McCormack is excited to see good friends and acquaintances at the Annual Meeting. “It’s a great organization,” she says, “and I really hope that young practitioners can find the time and energy to get involved and make it their association.”

Iancu focused on benefits of innovation

T he Annual Meeting has a strong line-up of keynote speakers this year. One must-attend speech promises to be today’s luncheon speaker, USPTO Director Andrei Iancu.

AIPLA Executive Director Lisa Jorgenson comments: “The new Director has been very open and very transparent with the stakeholders, and we think that that is a very good thing. We appreciate the fact that he has been reaching out to the stakeholders to get their input on a lot of the issues that they’re facing at the USPTO.”

Iancu only took on the role in February this year but has been busy making a raft of changes at the Office as well as making headlines with his speeches.

At the IPO’s Annual Meeting last month, Iancu made waves by promising new Section 101 guidance to help get patentable subject matter eligibility out of a “rut”. And just last week, he had some strong words to share on the issue of patent trolls, at the Eastern District of Texas Bar Association Inaugural Texas Dinner.

Iancu said: “For many years now the dialogue surrounding IP has devolved into a discussion about – shall we say – scary monsters? You know, the green creatures that dwell under bridges or lurk in the forests and are poised to terrorize anyone who dares take the risk of venturing out into the innovation ecosystem.”

He added: “Remarkably, in what I believe amounts to Orwellian ‘doublethink’, those who’ve been advancing the patent troll narrative argue that they do so because they are actually pro-innovation. That by their highlighting, relentlessly, the dangers in the patent system, they actually encourage innovation. Right?”

Iancu concluded: “Repeatedly telling ‘patent troll’ stories is indeed odd, especially when they’re being told to the people who have been responsible for the greatest advances in human history. The narrative must change. And, at least as far as the USPTO is concerned, it has now changed. We are now focusing on the brilliance of inventors, the excitement of invention, and the incredible benefits they bring to all Americans and to the world.”
Antitrust in SEPs and pharma patents

The intersection of antitrust and IP occurs in two main areas: standard essential patents (SEPs) and pharmaceutical patents. A session this morning will include focus on the trajectories of these issues, according to its moderator Rick Stark, partner at Cravath Swaine & Moore.

On SEPs, Stark says: "The trend for a number of years has been more intense scrutiny of the licensing and litigation practices of standard essential patent holders. For example, a big issue has been: under what circumstances may an injunction be awarded on an SEP?" However, while the trend of fairly intense scrutiny has been true in the past, Stark expects the scrutiny on SEP holders to lighten up as a result of the Trump administration’s reevaluation of the issue.

In particular, Makan Delrahim, the assistant attorney general for the Department of Justice’s antitrust division, has introduced the “New Madison” approach, named for the fourth US president James Madison’s advocacy for IP rights to be included in the Constitution. In a speech on September 18, Delrahim said that the first prong of the approach is that “antitrust law should not be used as a tool to police FRAND [fair, reasonable, and non-discretionary] commitments that patent-holders unilaterally make to standard setting organizations.” He added that refusing to license SEPs should be considered legal, and that standard setting organizations and courts should have a high burden before they adopt rules that restrict the right to exclude.

For these reasons, Delrahim finds antitrust law to be inappropriate to deal with SEPs, and proposes that they be litigated under contract law instead. "Violation of a FRAND commitment," he said, "may warrant remedies under contract law, but the important difference is that contract remedies do not involve the threat of treble damages that can deter lawful, pro-competitive conduct." Other issues that Delrahim has identified as warranting attention are patent hold-up, reverse patent hold-up, and patent hold-out. Patent hold up is the idea that an SEP holder could assert infringement claims after the standard has been set in order to hold-up implementers for unreasonably high royalties. Reverse patent hold-up is when the standard implementers who make the products hold up the SEP holder to negotiate lower royalties.

Cravath’s Stark says: “People who talk about patent hold-up tend to talk about it only going in one direction, but the economic concept could go either way.” Lastly, hold-out is simply when standard implementers refuse to pay royalties to SEP holders in order to gain leverage. Stark adds that whether or not any of these theoretical issues have actually happened yet is "hotly contested.” SEPs have been around for a number of years, Stark says, but we’re seeing this topic becoming more important now because “it takes a while for issues to percolate through the system.”

Aside from SEPs, the panel will discuss pharmaceutical patents and how they run into antitrust issues. The first point of intersection is reverse payments. When brand pharmaceutical drugs run out of exclusivity, the first generic drug to gain FDA approval and challenge the branded drug’s patent wins six months of exclusivity under the Hatch-Waxman Act. However, brands and generics can game the system: brands can pay generic challengers more than they would have made in six months of exclusivity to settle the litigation, and both parties come out ahead.

This type of deal is known as a reverse payment. Stark says settlements like this “now appear less and less frequently.” He adds: “I would expect to see some continued litigation but would not expect to see legislative activity.”

The second point of intersection of antitrust and pharmaceutical patents is a rising issue called product hopping. This is when brand pharmaceutical drugs are minimally altered and repatented toward the end of their exclusivity periods so that they essentially get a new lease of life and generics are prevented from entering the market. Stark calls this a “controversial area” in which he would “not be surprised to see more litigation activity.”

"Watch Out for the Forest: The Collision of IP and Antitrust” will be covered in Track 2: Patent Litigation between 9:00am-12:00pm today.
Avoiding complacency in obviousness

"O"ur session is going to be about the oldest topic in patents, but also always the most current topic in patent law." That’s how moderator Charles Bieneman of Bejin Bieneman describes today’s session titled "The Nonobviousness of Obviousness: Best Practices for Overcoming Obviousness Rejections". He says: "People have been trying to figure out for centuries what makes something patentable over the prior art."

Bieneman says the aim of the session is "to focus on the practical aspects of obviousness. The Supreme Court’s ruling on obviousness in KSR v Teleflex in 2007 is still the most important case of this century.

Bieneman says that patent examiners may utilize the teachings of KSR differently. "But there are still a number of longstanding mechanisms in the law that let you challenge obvi-
ousness rejections. One of our panels is going to talk about the nuts and bolts of what an obviousness rejection entails, what a prima facie case of obviousness is, the old Graham v John Deere case, and what you really need to do to hold the examiners feet to the fire with respect to whether they examined and made a prima facie case or not."

I would say that most examiners tend to ignore Graham v John Deere in my experience

The session will also cover the role of inherency in prior art rejections and tactics for leveraging objective indicia of nonobviousness during patent prosecution.

The law in obviousness is not changing as quickly as other areas, such as the law in patent eligibility. "But I think that’s all the more why it’s current because people think KSR means that you can’t really argue inability to combine anymore, or that KSR means you can’t really effectively argue reference A would make reference B inoperable anymore," says Bieneman. "It’s not always easy and you need to observe certain strictures, but you can still argue those things. That’s why our panel can be really useful for people in showing them some things that they probably learned about but maybe have not been using or thinking about as much as they should because we’ve all gotten complacent about obviousness."

The determination of obviousness can be frustratingly subjective. There have been no big obviousness cases recently and the USPTO has made no big changes to its guidance. "I would say that most examiners tend to ignore Graham v John Deere in my experience," says Bieneman. "Most examiners don’t really understand what a prima facie case with obviousness requires and most examiners think if they’ve got two refer-
ences that seem to show everything if you add them up, then they’ve got an obviousness case. All of these things leave a lot of room for examiners to fall short in making the rejections. A lot of times there’s room for argument that you might not necessarily see if you take what they’re saying at face value, but there’s a room to dive in there and get between the different points the ex-
aminer is making and expose where they’ve left a gap."

“The Nonobviousness of Obviousness: Best Practices for Overcoming Obviousness Rejections” is a session on the Patent Prosecution Track taking place between 10.45am-12.00pm today.

Government weighs in on SCOTUS case

The United States’ has filed a brief in Fourth Estate v Wall-Street.com urging the Supreme Court to affirm the appeal court decision, which favored the registration approach in copyright infringement litigation.

The question the Court will consider is whether parties can sue for copyright infringement once they have filed a registration application, or whether they must wait until their application has been evaluated by the Copyright Office. The Court took the case because there is a circuit split on the issue.

In its brief, the government argues that the provision “which allows an infringement suit to be commenced when ‘registration has been refused,’ would be superfluous if ‘registration were ‘made’ at the moment a copyright owner submits the required materials to the ‘register.’”

Waiting for the Office’s determination before filing suit is important, the govern-
ment says, because the court handling the infringement case “will benefit from know-
ing what [the Copyright Office’s] conclusion is.” On one hand, if a registration is granted it constitutes “prima facie evidence of the validity of copyright and the facts stat-
ed in the certificate.” On the other hand, if a registration is denied, the Office may interven-
e in the case “with respect to the issue of registrability of the copyright claim.”
Social media gets up to speed with false advertising

Last year, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) sent hundreds of letters to celebrities, athletes, and other social media influencers to educate them directly on the dos and don’ts of sponsored advertising. The social media rules were laid out in an update to the FTC’s endorsement guides in 2015. A panel on false advertising this afternoon will update attendees on the issue.

Lesley Fair, senior attorney at the FTC, will discuss the Commission’s stance and progress on enforcement. The basic guideline is that if there’s a connection between an endorser and a marketer that would likely impact how consumers weigh the endorsement, the connection should be disclosed.

Jennifer Millones, panelist and chief legal officer at Newman’s Own, says: “Courts are looking at false advertising through a different lens because of social media.” While the laws and principles around false advertising have remained stable, the details of applying them to modern media platforms – from YouTube to Instagram – can be a complicated question.

One issue is what does “above the fold” mean when pages are navigated with scrolling. Generally, the disclosure must be immediately visible, and not require scrolling or clicking “read more.” Also, the disclosure must not be hidden in a string of other announcements.

Another issue is which hashtags are deemed as sufficient disclosures. For example, “#ad” or “#sponsored” are accepted, but “#spon” is not universally recognized and may confuse viewers. Other variations are being determined case-by-case.

If a social media influencer has an established, long-term connection with a brand, must they disclose the relationship in every single post, or is it safe to assume their followers get it? Depending on how well-known the sponsorship relationship is, a disclosure may not be required in every post. Still, how can endorsers or marketers definitively say how well-known their relationship is? Can surveys be accepted as evidence?

Consumers are increasingly tech savvy, and courts are beginning to recognize this. For example, the initial interest confusion doctrine in trademark law is losing steam because of consumers’ sophistication – they know how to use the back button and get back to a trusted page. For this reason, maybe “#spon” and other variations will soon become accepted disclosures as consumers get up to speed with recognizing modern ads.

The advertising game has changed in recent years from print, to online, to targeting the hottest new social media platforms. The FTC, federal court, and Advertising Self-Regulatory Council (ASRC) have seen an increase in the false advertising cases they handle, as endorsers and marketers struggle to balance the casual inspiration modern advertising is all about and the disclosures that are required by law and contract.

Writing these contracts correctly is another important piece of the puzzle, because it’s better to clarify terms up front than deal with messy clean-up when influencers don’t handle disclosures correctly. For example, DJ Khaled came under fire from the FTC when he praised CÎROC vodka on Snapchat without mentioning his relationship with the brand. Similarly, Kim Kardashian posted a selfie on Instagram with the drug Diclegis without any indication that it was sponsored.

Millones of Newman’s Own, says private citizens with false advertising claims tend to go to the ASRC over federal court, “primarily because they have the expertise, it’s less expensive, and usually faster.” The ASRC can make a determination whether the claim is false and misleading, but at the end of the day cooperation with the organization is voluntary. When parties do not comply with the ASRC’s recommendation, it can refer cases to the FTC.

While the Lanham Act is generally known as a trademark statute, Section 43(a) can help protect businesses from their competitors’ false advertisements; relief can include injunctions and damages. Keith Harrison, partner at Crowell & Moring, will discuss damages trends in false advertising cases. The panel will also consider how the Lanham Act may be a stronger defense than some may think.

Millones concludes: “Ours is going to be the best session at the Annual Meeting! You’ll have to attend to determine if that’s false advertising.”

The session “The Lanham Act’s Protection Against False Advertising: It’s More Powerful Than You Might Think” takes place in Track 3: Trademark between 2:00-3:30pm today.
Mitigating risk arising from employee-created IP assets

Ilya Goryachev and Sergey Medvedev of Gorodissky & Partners examine the law in Russia on employee-created copyrighted work and employee-created patentable inventions, providing advice on how to minimize the risk arising from such IP

Employee-created copyrighted works

Employee-created copyrighted works are intangible assets created by employees during the course of their employment duties.

The main rule is that the exclusive rights to an employee-created copyrighted work belong to the employer, unless otherwise provided in the employment agreement or another contract. In circumstances where the exclusive rights belong to the employee, the employer has a right to a non-exclusive and royalty-based license.

The above default provision of the law does not mean that the underlying agreements should not contain any terms and conditions regarding ownership of IP rights. Exact wording and conditions relating to IP ownership are highly recommended.

Article 1295(2) of the Russian Civil Code provides that the exclusive rights to copyrighted works may return to the respective employees. This is the case when, within three years from the date when the employee has submitted the copyrighted work to the employer, the employer fails:

- to start using the copyrighted work;
- to assign the exclusive rights to the copyrighted work to another person;
- to inform the employee about keeping the copyrighted work secret.

In circumstances where the employer does one of the above within the said term, the employee has the right to claim compensation. The amount, conditions and payment procedure concerning such compensation will be agreed between the employer and the employee by way of a contract. In circumstances where there is no agreement, the matter will be resolved by the court.

It is therefore advisable, in order to avoid disputes, to enter immediately into the relevant agreement with the employee regarding the issue of compensation. It should be noted, that under Russian law, compensation for the employee-created copyrighted work shall not be a part of the employee’s salary and should be provided in addition to it.

Employee-created patented subject matter

Employee-created patented subject matter encompasses inventions, utility models or industrial designs developed by employees during the course of their employment duties or under assignments (instructions) issued by their employers.

By default provision of the law, the exclusive rights to employee-created patented subject matter belong to the employer, unless otherwise provided in the employment agreement or other contract.

The employee is obliged to notify the employer in writing of the developed patentable invention, utility model or industrial design, and then the employer has four months to make one of the following decisions:

- to file for a patent application at the Russian PTO;
- to assign the right to file a patent application to another person;
- to inform the employee about keeping the patentable solution secret.

In case of failure to comply with the mentioned term, the right to file a patent application is returned to the employee. In this case, the employer has a right to a non-exclusive and royalty-based license to use the patented subject matter for its own production facilities.

Furthermore, Russian law provides that:

- an employee has the right to compensation from the employer:
  - obtains a patent;
  - makes a decision to keep the invention, utility model and industrial design secret and informs the employee accordingly;
  - assigns the right to file a patent application to another person;
  - fails to obtain a patent due to reasons contingent on the employee.

In circumstances where the employer and employee do not have a compensation agreement, the matter will be resolved by the court.

Importantly, if the employee creates an invention, utility model or industrial design while using financial, technical or other material means supplied by the employer, but not in connection with employment duties or the employer’s specific instructions, the right to file a patent application belongs to the employee. In this case, the employer is allowed at its own discretion to claim:

- a non-exclusive and royalty-free license for its own purposes; or
- a reimbursement of expenses incurred due to the development of such patentable subject matter.

Case law and court practice

Federal state enterprise SHCHELKOVOS BIOCOMBINAT (SCHKB) is the largest domestic enterprise specializing in the production and supply of biotechnologies and veterinary drugs. SCHKB also carries out scientific research and development activities in the fields of veterinary science, medicine and biotechnology.

In 2007-2012, SCHKB entered into several license agreements with the Institute of Biotechnology of Veterinary Medicine, JSC (IBVM) for the use of inventions under RU patents nos. 2300562, 2300563, 2332233, which were issued in the name of the IBVM. Subsequently, the Russian IP Court (IPC) found that when entering into license agreements and then extending their term, the former SCHKB general director acted “contrary to the interests of the enterprise and at his own discretion”. In this regard, SCHKB was forced to pay the contracted license fees to the IBVM for a long period of time.

After the dismissal of the former general director, an internal audit was carried out at the enterprise, and it was established that many employees of SCHKB had taken part in the creation of technical solutions forming patented inventions constituting the subject matter of the concluded license agreements. Based on these facts, the new corporate management of SCHKB decided to stop immediately any payment of license fees to the IBVM under license agreements by-plan ning their subsequent termination. At the same time, at the end of 2015 and beginning of 2016, the IBVM filed a number of claims against SCHKB (case refs: A40-222303/2015, A40-18984/2016) for the collection of debts, i.e. non-paid license fees, contractual penalties, as well as default interest coming to a total amount of RUR 520,000,000.

Since the second lawsuit filed by the IBVM against SCHKB in Moscow Commercial Court (case ref: A40-18984/2016) was identical in terms of its subject matter and legal grounds, and was de facto aimed at putting some additional pressure on the state enterprise, the case was dismissed by the court. The proceedings in the Court of Appeals regarding the first lawsuit (case ref: A40-222303/2015) filed by the
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IBVM against SCHBK for the debt amounting to about RUR 180 million (and contractual penalty amounting to about RUR 80 million) were suspended due to filing and consideration of a series of claims in front of the IPC (case refs: IPC-219/2016, IPC-289/2016, IPC-292/2016) for invalidation of patents that were the subject matter of litigious license agreements and for establishment of SCHBK as the legal patent owner (co-patent owner).

SCHBK’s position in these particular three court actions was based on the fact that all patented and subsequently licensed inventions were created:
• by the employees of SCHBK as part of their direct employment duties;
• at the facilities of SCHBK; and
• with the use of material and technical resources as well as the equipment of SCHBK.

This meant that the patented inventions should have been considered as employee inventions under the applicable law; and, therefore, patents for inventions had to be initially issued with the indication of SCHBK as the valid patent owner (co-patent owner).

Importantly, as factual circumstances later demonstrated, the respective authors-employees of SCHBK did not properly notify their corporate management (employer) about the facts of creation of patentable subject matter.

As a result of the proceedings (case refs: IPC-219/2016, IPC-289/2016, IPC-292/2016) aimed at the invalidation of litigious patents, the IPC satisfied the claims of SCHBK in full scope. Subsequently, the IPC Presidium dismissed the statements of appeals filed by the IBVM. This scenario, in turn, allowed SCHBK to prevail in the major (commercial) dispute over the recovery of funds under the corresponding patent license agreements, as the invalidation of the licensed patents had automatically terminated the litigious license agreements and released the licensee (SCHBK) from the obligation to pay license fees to the licensor (IBVM).

At the end of the day, SCHBK was recognized as the legal owner (co-owner) of the litigious patent rights, and the claims of IBVM brought against SCHBK – for more than RUR 300,000,000 – were finally and fully rejected.

Practical tips and recommendations
From a practical perspective, first of all, it is advisable to conduct IP due diligence to ensure compliance with the above-described regulations. In addition, it is recommended that businesses develop and effectuate an internal IP policy – along with the provisions covering the aspects of employee-created IP – in order to level out or mitigate the associated risks. Also, it would be wise and efficient to have the proper and valid documents (templates) in place to be generated in the course of employee-created IP workflow (e.g., employment agreements with special IP ownership provisions, employee-notification on employee-created IP, employee-compensation agreements). Finally, it is essential to monitor the situation from time to time and be ready to enforce exclusive IP rights, if necessary.
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