







In re Silver (Tex. Ct. App.) (Pet. Pending)

- Facts unclear, but plaintiff sued for breach of contract, contending he owned patent.
- Defendant moved to compel production of emails between defendant and patent agent who had prosecuted application.
- Holds Queen's U inapplicable because state law claim.
- Because no state privilege, no privilege over 300 emails.

Isn't Relevancy Irrelevant?

- Why does privilege turn on (a) whether communication is relevant to later litigation, or (b) whether state law creates that claim?
- My amicus: Parties didn't address choice of law, but Texas law says don't admit evidence privileged somewhere else, if there's good reason not to.





Find the full text of this and thousands of other resources from leading experts in dozens of legal practice areas in the <u>UT Law CLE eLibrary (utcle.org/elibrary)</u>

Title search: Privilege in Patent Cases: What's New?

Also available as part of the eCourse 2017 Advanced Patent Law (USPTO) eConference

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the 12th Annual Advanced Patent Law Institute session "Privilege in Patent Cases: What's New?"