

THE STANFORD PROGRAM IN LAW, SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY BERKELEY CENTER FOR LAW & TECHNOLOGY AT BOALT HALL THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SCHOOL OF LAW



 $7^{\rm th} \ Annual$

ADVANCED PATENT LAW INSTITUTE

Earn up to 16.75 Hours of Credit Including 1.75 Hours of Ethics Credit



November 29*, 30-December 1, 2006 The Fairmont San Jose San Jose, California

*Evening Session on Effective Advocacy Techniques—Included in Registration Fee

Major Sponsorship Provided by



7th ANNUAL ADVANCED PATENT LAW INSTITUTE

November 29*, 30-December 1, 2006 • The Fairmont San Jose • San Jose, CA

Earn up to 16.75 Hours of Credit Including 1.75 Hours of Ethics Credit

WEDNESDAY EVENING-NOV. 29, 2006*

6:00 p.m. Registration Opens

6:30 p.m.

2.00 hrs

Effective Advocacy Techniques: Mock Trials, Witness Preparation, and Preparation of Experts

Beyond meritorious facts, winning patent litigation requires presenting complex technology and confusing patent law concepts to juries in compelling and comprehensible advocacy. This discussion will explore how to test themes, witnesses and experts in mock trials, and how to apply the results in preparing witnesses and experts to credibly deliver the themes, facts and opinions.

Moderator: Lynn H. Pasahow, Mountain View, CA William L. Anthony, Jr., Menlo Park, CA Juanita R. Brooks, San Diego, CA Daralyn J. Durie, San Francisco, CA David H. Weinberg, Greenbrae, CA

8:30 p.m.

THURSDAY MORNING—NOV. 30, 2006

Adjourn

Presiding Officer: Robert Barr, Berkeley, CA

8:00 a.m. Registration Opens

Includes continental breakfast.

8:50 a.m.	Welcoming Remarks

9:00 a.m.

.50 hr

.50 hr

Current Developments in Claim Construction The Federal Circuit is one year post-*Phillips v. AWH.* Where does the court appear to be on claim construction and what effect has it had?

Matthew D. Powers, Redwood Shores, CA

9:30 a.m.

Obviousness

A discussion of the current state of obviousness law, including the pending KSR Int'I Co. v. Teleflex, Inc. case before the Supreme Court.

Christopher A. Cotropia, Richmond, VA

10:00 a.m.

Reexaminations During the Course of Litigation: What Should You Do?

Parties, and in particular defendants, in patent cases are increasingly requesting reexaminations of patents during the course of litigation. This session considers empirical data and discusses factors to consider in seeking reexamination during litigation, including the impact and timing of reexamination.

Katherine Kelly Lutton, Redwood City, CA David L. McCombs, Dallas, TX

10:45 a.m. Break

11:00 a.m.

Strategic Patent Prosecution

This session will discuss filing and prosecution strategy from the perspective of the in-house counsel, including issues of prioritization, budgeting and outreach; prosecution strategy in reexamination proceedings, accelerated examination, and how to conduct effective personal interviews with patent examiners. Other topics include dealing with many-fold restriction issues and getting ready for the potential implications of the proposed PTO rule changes; and addressing obviousness and lack of utility rejections.

Ginger R. Dreger, Menlo Park, CA Michelle Lee, Mountain View, CA Lee Van Pelt, Cupertino, CA

12:00 p.m.

Lunch on Your Own

.75 hr including .25 hr ethics

THURSDAY AFTERNOON

Presiding Officer: Alan H. MacPherson, San Jose, CA

1:00 p.m.

Pre-Filing Considerations and Strategies in Patent Cases

Strategic and financial considerations about where to file a patent case. The discussion will include an analysis of how "conventional wisdom" about forum selection compares with actual data about the most popular fora. This session will also cover professional obligations lawyers must satisfy when filing patent suits.

Charles S. Crompton, San Francisco, CA Jonathan S. Kagan, Los Angeles, CA

```
.75 hr 1:45 p.m.
```

1.00 hr

Echoes from *EchoStar*: Waiver Issues in the Election to Rely on an Opinion of Counsel

Vernon M. Winters, Redwood Shores, CA

2:15 p.m.

.50 hr ethics

.50 hr ethics

Inequitable Conduct: Modern Trends

A review of recent cases from the Federal Circuit addressing issues such as the materiality standard for inequitable conduct, the duty of disclosure, and what rises to the level of intent. The program will also focus on proposed patent reform legislation and how it may alter the law regarding inequitable conduct.

Matthias A. Kamber, San Francisco, CA

2:45 p.m.

.50 hr

The Doctrine of Equivalents, Reverse Doctrine of Equivalents: Mythical Doctrines of Patent Law?

Much ink has been spilled in briefing, case law, and law review articles on the Doctrine of Equivalents (and related prosecution history estoppel), and Reverse Doctrine of Equivalents. But, as a practical matter, do these doctrines really exist? How often do they win the day? More importantly, when and how do they win the day? This talk will explore the historical and current importance of these doctrines, and may also highlight a few other mythical creatures of patent law.

Karen Boyd, Redwood City, CA

3:15 p.m. Brea	k
----------------	---

3:30 p.m.

.50 hr

Divided and Indirect Infringement

Distributed technologies, such as client server systems or other network-related technologies, increasingly entail the interactive functioning of more than one party. Such technologies are generating cases that are pressing the limits of the traditional patent law system which presumed a single actor practicing an invention that existed in a single place. This session will review the state of the law and consider where it might be going.

Robert D. Fram, San Francisco, CA

4:00 p.m.

Extraterritoriality

The Federal Circuit has recently expanded the ability of U.S. patent holders to redress infringement that occurs in whole or in part beyond U.S. borders, in some cases imposing liability for foreign companies, and in other cases dramatically increasing the damages exposure of domestic manufacturers. This session discusses the recent developments in this increasingly important topic and provides suggestions both for expanding the reach of your patent portfolio to cover competitors' activities, and for limiting your potential exposure.

Erik R. Puknys, Palo Alto, CA

4:30 p.m.

Inherency

A discussion and review of recent Federal Circuit decisions regarding the inherency doctrine.

Craig R. Kaufman, Menlo Park, CA

5:00 p.m.

Judicial Panel

Leading district court judges discuss effective litigation procedures and practices, and peeves (pet or otherwise) with IP cases and trial lawyers.

.75 hr including .25 hr ethics

Moderator: Kenneth R. Adamo, Dallas, TX Hon. Patti B. Saris, Boston, MA Hon. Ronald M. Whyte, San Jose CA

5:45 p.m.

Adjourn

FRIDAY MORNING-DEC. 1, 2006

Presiding Officer: Christopher J. Byrne, Santa Clara, CA

7:30 a.m.	1.25 hrs
Breakfast Discussion:	
International Patent Prosecution Issu	es,
Strategies and Tactics	

In an increasingly global economy, the issues, strategies and tactics for successful international patent prosecution are paramount. This is particularly true for ascendant economies and countries in the Asia/Pacific region, but continually important for Europe as well. This panel of seasoned patent professionals will discuss their approaches and experiences in an engaging and informative interactive format.

Moderator: Richard "Chip" J. Lutton, Jr., Cupertino, CA Philip McGarrigle, Santa Clara, CA Speaker TBD Speaker TBD

Break

8:45 a.m.

.50 hr 8:55 a.m.

Written Description May Have Some Bite

Decisions at the Federal Circuit signal an increasing willingness to apply the written description requirement, even in the predictable arts. This talk will review recent court decisions, offer some predictions for the future, and suggest both litigation and prosecution strategies in view of this developing defense.

Gary H. Loeb, San Francisco, CA Barton "Bart" E. Showalter, Dallas, TX

9:40 a.m.

50 hr

Patent Prosecution Procedure: New Rules, Continuations, and Regulations

As the USPTO moves forward with publishing the final rules on Continuing Prosecution, Claim Designation, and perhaps Information Disclosure Statements, practitioners are preparing for the implementation of the rules. This talk provides a brief summary of the rules but focuses on implementation strategy.

Jean Burke Fordis, Palo Alto, CA William Leschensky, Palo Alto, CA

10:25 a.m.

Declaratory Judgment Jurisdiction After MedImmune

The Supreme Court granted certiorari in *MedImmune v. Genentech* to address when a patent licensee in good standing can challenge the validity of a patent. This session reviews declaratory judgment jurisdiction in light of that case including the "actual controversy" requirement of the Declaratory Judgment Act, and the public policy regarding patent validity challenges as applied in the Supreme Court's 1969 decision in *Lear v. Adkins.*

Daniel M. Wall, San Francisco, CA

10:55 a.m.	Break

11:05 a.m.

Exhaustion and Implied License

A discussion of (i) how the doctrine of patent exhaustion and implied license affect vendors and customers, (ii) what parties to patent license agreements may do—or may not do—to limit those effects, and (iii) how courts have blurred the distinction between the two doctrines.

Rufus Pichler, San Francisco, CA William I. Schwartz, San Francisco, CA

11:35 a.m.

Injunctions and Damages After e-Bay

A discussion of the Supreme Court's *e-Bay* decision and its impact on patent litigation, as well as the problem of royalty stacking in damages cases.

Mark A. Lemley, Stanford, CA

.75 hr FRIDAY AFTERNOON

Presiding Officer: Jean Burke Fordis, Palo Alto, CA

LUNCHEON PRESENTATION

12:20 p.m. Pick Up Box Lunch

Included in conference registration fee.

12:35 p.m.

.75 hr

.50 hr

.50 hr

.75 hr

David Nelson Memorial Keynote Address

sponsored by Morrison & Foerster LLP

The USPTO Strategic Plan

The USPTO is in the process of developing its strategic plan for the next five years. This session will discuss what the Office is anticipating in terms of possible changes in the agency and patent law into the next decade.

James A. Toupin, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria, VA

1:30 p.m.

.50 hr

.75 hr

.75 hr

Create Act and Joint Ownership

Sec. 103(c) of the patent statute provides that the work of joint development partners may not be cited as prior art against patent applications arising from the joint development. This session will review the history of that legislation and the requirements under PTO practice for taking advantage of its protection.

Robert J. Goldman, Palo Alto, CA

2:00 p.m.

Antitrust, Patents, and Standard-Setting

Recent cases brought by the Federal Trade Commission and other enforcement agencies have highlighted the risks associated with enforcing patents covered products developed through industry standard-setting efforts. The recent *In re Rambus* decision is reviving interest in antitrust remedies in patent cases. Increased attention in the European Union to standards issues also has raised the international implications of standard-setting. This session covers the implications of increased antitrust enforcement and litigation in this area, which lies at the crossroads of patent and antitrust law.

M. Sean Royall, Dallas, TX and Washington, DC

Online Courses from UT Law www.utcle.org

2:45 p.m.

.50 hr

Investing in IP

The speakers will discuss two models for investment in IP. The first uses a valuation model that is based upon the utility of the IP, based upon the potential to receive royalties from assertion or from the value to a buyer seeking improved freedom of action. The second views IP as the core element of a more broadly defined "Technology Asset," where value is derived from the demand-market value of products, or product improvements that are enabled by the asset. Mr. Kramer will present a brief history of IP investing, why Altitude Capital Partners is drawn to IP as an asset class, what it invests in, and why. Mr. Pellegrini will discuss the factors that determine the "transaction readiness" and valuation of the more broadly defined Technology Asset and how investment and sponsorship can improve those factors.

Robert Kramer, New York, NY Joseph C. Pellegrini, Boston, MA

3:15 p.m.

.50 hr including .25 hr ethics

Electronic Discovery Landmines to Avoid

The new electronic discovery rules take effect December 1, 2006: this session covers key issues under the new rules and key case law developments of interest to patent practitioners.

Michelle Greer Galloway, Palo Alto, CA

3:45 p.m.

Adjourn

COMMENTS FROM ADVANCED PATENT LAW INSTITUTES

Appreciate the seasoned and experienced speakers.

Outstanding program!

Thank you for providing both substantive papers and PowerPoint printouts.

Insightful, intellectual, and experienced speakers throughout.

Effective program with a good mix of topics.

CONFERENCE FACULTY

MATTHIAS A KAMBER

Keker & Van Nest, LLP

CRAIG R. KAUFMAN

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP

San Francisco, CA

Menlo Park, ČA

New York NV

Google Inc.

Stanford, CA

Palo Alto, CA

GARY H. LOEB

Genentech, Inc.

San Francisco, CA

Fish & Richardson P.C.

Apple Computer, Inc.

DAVID L. MCCOMBS

Haynes and Boone, LLP

PHILIP MCGARRIGLE

LYNN H. PASAHOW

JOSEPH C. PELLEGRINI

Analytic Capital LLC

Morrison & Foerster LLP

RUFUS PICHLER

San Francisco, CA

Boston, MA

Fenwick & West LLP Mountain View, CA

Cupertino, CA

Dallas TX

Affymetrix

Santa Clara, CA

Redwood City, CA

MICHELLE LEE

Mountain View, CA

MARK A. LEMLEY

Stanford Law School

WILLIAM LESCHENSKY

Alexza Pharmaceuticals

KATHERINE KELLY LUTTON

RICHARD "CHIP" J. LUTTON, JR.

Of Counsel, Keker & Van Nest, LLP

ROBERT KRAMER

Altitude Capital Partners

KENNETH R. ADAMO Jones Dav Dallas, TX

WILLIAM L. ANTHONY, JR. Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP Menlo Park, CA

KAREN BOYD Fish & Richardson P.C. Redwood City, CA

JUANITA R. BROOKS Fish & Richardson P.C. San Diego, CA

CHRISTOPHER A. COTROPIA Intellectual Property Institute University of Richmond School of Law Richmond, VA

CHARLES S. CROMPTON Latham & Watkins LLP San Francisco, CA

GINGER R. DREGER Heller Ehrman LLP Menlo Park, CA

DARALYN J. DURIE Keker & Van Nest, LLP San Francisco, CA

JEAN BURKE FORDIS Palo Alto Office Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP Palo Alto, CA

ROBERT D. FRAM Heller Ehrman LLP San Francisco, CA

MICHELLE GREER GALLOWAY Cooley Godward, LLP Palo Alto, CA

ROBERT J. GOLDMAN Fish & Neave Intellectual Property Group Ropes & Gray, LLP Palo Alto, CA

PLANNING COMMITTEE

JONATHAN S. KAGAN Irell & Manella LLP Los Angeles, CA

ROBERT BARR — Co-Chair

MARK A. LEMLEY - Co-Chair

Berkeley, CA

Stanford, CA

KAREN BOYD

Redwood City, CA

San Francisco, CA

Austin, TX

CHRISTOPHER J. BYRNE Santa Clara, CA

CHARLES S. CROMPTON

MICHAEL J. ESPOSITO

THOMAS J. FRIEL, JR.

MARILYN GLAUBENSKLEE

San Francisco, CA

Menlo Park, CA

JONATHAN S. KAGAN

RONALD S. LAURIE Palo Alto, CA

Los Angeles, CA

MICHELLE LEE Mountain View, CA

KATHERINE KELLY LUTTON Redwood City, CA

HUGH H. MATSUBAYASHI San Jose, CA

DAVID L. MCCOMBS Dallas TX

JAMES PAMPINELLA San Francisco, CA

MATTHEW D. POWERS Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP Silicon Valley Office Redwood Shores, CA

ERIK R. PUKNYS Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP Palo Alto, CA

M. SEAN ROYALL Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP Dallas, TX and Washington, DC

HON. PATTI B. SARIS United States District Court, Massachusetts Boston MA

WILLIAM I. SCHWARTZ Morrison & Foerster LLP San Francisco, CA

BARTON "BART" E. SHOWALTER Baker Botts L.L.P. Dallas, TX

JAMES A. TOUPIN United States Patent and Trademark Office Office of the General Counsel Alexandria, VA

LEE VAN PELT Van Pelt, Yi and James Cupertino, CA

DANIEL M. WALL Latham & Watkins San Francisco, CA

DAVID H. WEINBERG Juryscope, Inc. Greenbrae, CA

HON. RONALD M. WHYTE U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California San Jose, CA

VERNON M. WINTERS Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP Redwood Shores, CA

JAMES POOLEY Palo Alto, CA

FRIK R PUKNYS Palo Alto, CA

ALFRED C. SERVER, M.D., PH.D. Boston, MA

M. PATRICIA THAYER San Francisco, CA

LEE VAN PELT Cupertino, CA

VERNON M. WINTERS Redwood Shores, CA

MALLUN YEN San Jose, CA

Course Binders

The Advanced Patent Law Institute generates a definitive IP resource guide. Don't miss updated case law, current developments, articles and planning strategies over 500 pages of practical materials.

Audio CD Set

The Advanced Patent Law Institute presentations are available on CD. Listen to the entire conference or individual sessions at your convenience.

eBinder on CD

Get the entire conference Binder on CD, in electronic PDF format. Only \$50 if added to a registration or purchase of Course Binder or Audio CD Set. \$200 purchased alone.

In-House CLE

Would your firm like to run an in-house version of this conference, with full participatory credit? Order In-House CLE and we'll also provide an Audio CD Set for the group and a Course Binder for each participant.



"Abstract Yellow 1," acrylic on canvas, is by Julie Freedman. For more information, visit www.juliefreedmanart.com or email jlfreed_brazil@yahoo.com

REGISTRATION FOR PJ06

Mail this registration form to:

The University of Texas Sch P.O. Box 7759, Austin, TX 78	ool of Law, Attn. PJ06 8713-7759 or fax a copy to: (512) 475-6876	
PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY		
Bar Card#	IX Other State: I	N/A
Name [Mr. / Ms.]		
Firm		
Address		
City	State Zip	
Telephone	Fax	
Registrant's Email (required) _		
	onfirmations and receipts are emailed to these addres	ses.
REGISTRATION: Includes Course Binder, Wednesday	y Evening Session, and Friday Box Lunch Presentation	
Early Registration Fee c	lue by Wednesday, Nov. 22, 2006	5.00
Registration Fee after	Wednesday, Nov. 22, 2006 \$793	5.00
CONFERENCE PUBLICATIONS Allow 2–4 weeks from the conference		
Course Binder Without Note: Conference registratio	Conference Registration\$200 In includes Course Binder.).00
Audio CD Set		5.00
•	mat)\$200.00/\$50 with registration or purchase of Course Binder or Audio CD	
IN-HOUSE CLE: Bring the confe Allow 2–4 weeks from the conference	erence in-house and learn at your convenience. se date for delivery.	
	ludes Audio CD Set and Course Binder	
Add participants (in	cludes Course Binder) for \$200 each\$ TOTAL ENCLOSED\$	
METHOD OF PAYMENT		
Check (make checks payable to:	The University of Texas at Austin)	
VISA or N	Nastercard (sorry, no AMEX or Discover)	
Card #		
x		
Authorized Signature	Exp. Date (mm	/yy)

SAN JOSE

Nov. 29*, 30-Dec. 1, 2006 CONFERENCE LOCATION



The Fairmont San Jose 170 South Market Street San Jose, CA 95113 (408) 998-1900

SPECIAL RATE \$165 (subject to availability) good through Oct. 30, 2006

Parking: \$24 day/overnight

KEY DATES Registration & Cancellation

November 22, 2006—5 p.m. last day for early registration add \$50 for registrations received after this time

November 27, 2006—5 p.m. *last day for full refund*

November 28, 2006—5 p.m. *last day for partial refunds* \$50 processing fee applied

November 29, 2006—6:30 p.m. Wednesday evening session begins

November 30, 2006—9 a.m. conference begins

Advanced Patent Law Institutes

Each program uniquely tailored to its locale



PATENT LAW IN AUSTIN, TX

Oct. 25, 26-27, 2006 • Four Seasons Hotel

Join leading practitioners, academics and in-house counsel from the Southwest and Silicon Valley in Austin, Texas for two days of presentations on a rich array of prosecution and litigation topics. Cool weather, great city, music and food—at the Four Seasons Austin.



PATENT LAW IN ALEXANDRIA, VA

Nov. 16-17, 2006 • USPTO-Main Auditorium

This conference—offered at the USPTO—provides unique insights into claim construction; standard-setting and pooling; avoiding patent infringement; remedies and injunctions; the

search process; patent reform and USPTO patent quality initiatives. Join USPTO senior staff, leading practitioners, academics and members of the federal judiciary from a variety of courts and forums in the Washington DC area, for two days at the USPTO. The conference is jointly sponsored with the George Mason University School of Law.



PATENT LAW IN SAN JOSE, CA

Nov. 29, Nov. 30-Dec.1, 2006 • The Fairmont San Jose Come to the heart of Silicon Valley, and join leading judges, practitioners and in-house counsel from Apple, Google, and National Semiconductor at the Fairmont San Jose. This confer-

ence is jointly sponsored by the Berkeley Center for Law and Technology at Boalt Hall School of Law and Stanford Law School.



THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SCHOOL OF LAW P.O. Box 7759 • Austin, TX 78713-7759

This program is not printed or mailed at state expense.

Μ	This course has been approved for Minimum Continuing Legal Educa-
	tion credit by the State Bar of Texas
С	Committee on MCLE in the amount
	of 16.75 hours, of which 1.75 credit
	hour will apply to legal ethics/pro-
	fessional responsibility credit. The
	University of Texas School of Law is
	a State Bar of California approved
	MCLE provider.

E-mail us at utcle@law.utexas.edu or call us at 512-475-6700 for more information 7th ANNUAL ADVANCED PATENT LAW INSTITUTE

ov. 29*, 30 Dec. 1, 2006 • The Fairmont San Jose • San Jose, CA

FIRST-CLASS MAIL Postage Paid The University of Texas School of Law

FIRST CLASS MAIL