

Presented:

23rd Annual Conference on State and Federal Appeals

June 13-14, 2013
Austin, TX

Case Study: The Intersection of Legal Malpractice and Federal Jurisdiction

**Presented by:
Jane M. N. Webre**

Speaker Contact Information:
Jane M. N. Webre
Scott, Douglass & McConnico, L.L.P.
Austin, TX
512-495-6300
jwebre@scottdoug.com

**In The
Supreme Court of the United States**

◆

JERRY W. GUNN, INDIVIDUALLY;
WILLIAMS SQUIRES & WREN, L.L.P.;
JAMES E. WREN, INDIVIDUALLY; SLUSSER &
FROST, L.L.P.; WILLIAM C. SLUSSER, INDIVIDUALLY;
SLUSSER WILSON & PARTRIDGE, L.L.P.; AND
MICHAEL E. WILSON, INDIVIDUALLY,

Petitioners,

v.

VERNON F. MINTON,

Respondent.

◆

**On Writ Of Certiorari To The
Supreme Court Of Texas**

◆

PETITIONERS' BRIEF ON THE MERITS

◆

JANE M.N. WEBRE
*Counsel of Record
for Petitioners*
CYNTHIA S. CONNOLLY
SCOTT, DOUGLASS &
McCONNICO, L.L.P.
600 Congress Ave., Suite 1500
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 495-6300
jwebre@scottdoug.com

[Additional Counsel Listed On Inside Cover]

Additional Counsel for Petitioner Jerry W. Gunn

ROBERT S. HARRELL
CHARLES B. WALKER, JR.
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, L.L.P.
1301 McKinney, Suite 5100
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 651-5151

DAVID E. KELTNER
KELLY HART & HALLMAN, LLP
201 Main St., Suite 2500
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
(817) 332-2500

*Additional Counsel for Petitioners
Williams, Squires & Wren, L.L.P. and James E. Wren*

EDWARD J. MURPHY
BRUCE C. MORRIS
BEIRNE, MAYNARD
& PARSONS, L.L.P.
1300 Post Oak Blvd., 25th Floor
Houston, Texas 77056
(713) 623-0887

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Did the Federal Circuit depart from the standard this Court articulated in *Grable & Sons Metal Products Inc. v. Darue Engineering & Manufacturing*, 545 U.S. 308 (2005), for “arising under” jurisdiction of the federal courts under 28 U.S.C. § 1338, when it held that state law legal malpractice claims against trial lawyers for their handling of underlying patent matters come within the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal courts? Because the Federal Circuit has exclusive jurisdiction over appeals involving patents, are state courts and federal courts strictly following the Federal Circuit’s mistaken standard, thereby magnifying its jurisdictional error and sweeping broad swaths of state law claims – which involve no actual patents and have no impact on actual patent rights – into the federal courts?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

All parties to the proceeding are identified in the case caption.

RULE 29.6 STATEMENT

Pursuant to Rule 29.6 of the Supreme Court Rules, Petitioners make this Disclosure of Corporate Affiliations and Corporate Interest:

Petitioners have no parent corporation, and there are no publicly held corporations that own 10% or more of their stock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING	ii
RULE 29.6 STATEMENT	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	vii
OPINIONS BELOW	1
STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION	1
STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
A. The Underlying Patent Litigation	3
B. The Legal Malpractice Suit	5
C. Appeal in the Legal Malpractice Suit	6
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	10
ARGUMENT	14
I. The issue in this appeal is whether the “case within a case” causation element of legal malpractice claims can ever support “arising under” jurisdiction	14
II. The appropriate standard for “arising under” jurisdiction over state law claims has proved elusive over time, but this Court resolved much uncertainty in <i>Grable</i>	18
A. The Court articulated a variety of standards after adopting the rule that state law claims with embedded federal issues can “arise under” fed- eral law	18

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

	Page
B. The Court in <i>Grable</i> articulated a simpler and clearer standard that requires both substantiality of the federal issue and a meaningful balance of state and federal interests	23
1. The <i>Grable</i> standard confirms that the embedded federal issue must be substantial; the mere presence or necessity of a federal issue is not enough	24
2. <i>Grable</i> also confirmed that consideration of the federal-state balance is an independent element of the “arising under” standard	29
III. Under the <i>Grable</i> standard, legal malpractice claims do not come within “arising under” jurisdiction.....	32
A. The Federal Circuit standard disregards both the substantiality requirement and the proper balance of state and federal courts.....	33
1. The Federal Circuit standard conflates the requirement that the federal issue be substantial with the requirement that it be necessary	33
2. The Federal Circuit standard overstates the federal interest	38

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

	Page
3. The Federal Circuit standard ignores the substantial state interests at stake in legal malpractice suits	41
B. This Court should reconfirm the <i>Grable</i> standard and clarify the appropriate analysis of “arising under” jurisdiction for legal malpractice claims	45
C. A bright-line standard for state law legal malpractice claims is desirable for a number of reasons.....	47
1. Any “case within a case” patent issues are purely hypothetical	47
2. Clarity is important in this muddled area of law	48
3. Allowing state courts to decide hypothetical patent issues would not threaten the uniformity of patent law	51
IV. Congressional actions relating to the Federal Circuit and jurisdiction over patent issues do not change the analysis or result here	55
A. The Federal Courts Improvement Act of 1982 created the Federal Circuit for uniformity of patent law, but it did not change the existing scope of original “arising under” jurisdiction.....	55

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

	Page
B. The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act of 2011 extended federal jurisdiction to patent counterclaims, but it did not otherwise change the scope of original “arising under” jurisdiction.....	57
CONCLUSION.....	61

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

FEDERAL CASES

<i>Adventure Outdoors, Inc. v. Bloomberg</i> , 552 F.3d 1290 (11th Cir. 2008).....	48
<i>Air Measurement Techs., Inc. v. Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld, L.L.P.</i> , 504 F.3d 1262 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>American Well Works Co. v. Layne & Bowler Co.</i> , 241 U.S. 257 (1916).....	18
<i>Antiballistic Sec. and Protection, Inc. v. Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC</i> , 789 F. Supp. 2d 90 (D.D.C. 2011).....	50
<i>Byrne v. Wood, Herron & Evans, L.L.P.</i> , 676 F.3d 1024 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	50, 52
<i>Byrne v. Wood, Herron & Evans, L.L.P.</i> , 2008 WL 3833699 (E.D. Ky. Aug. 13, 2008)	49
<i>Carter v. ALK Holdings, Inc.</i> , 605 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	49
<i>Chopra v. Townsend, Townsend and Crew, L.L.P.</i> , 2008 WL 413944 (D. Colo. Feb. 13, 2008)	49
<i>Christianson v. Colt Indus. Operating Corp.</i> , 486 U.S. 800 (1988).....	15, 40, 57, 59
<i>Cohens v. Virginia</i> , 19 U.S. 264 (1821)	19
<i>Cold Spring Harbor Lab. v. Ropes & Gray, L.L.P.</i> , 762 F. Supp. 2d 543 (E.D.N.Y. 2011).....	49
<i>Danner, Inc. v. Foley & Lardner, L.L.P.</i> , 2010 WL 2608294 (D. Or. June 23, 2010)	42, 50

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
<i>Davis v. Brouse McDowell, L.P.A.</i> , 596 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2010), <i>cert. denied</i> , 131 S. Ct. 118 (2010).....	35, 49
<i>Eddings v. Glast, Phillips & Murray</i> , 2008 WL 2522544 (N.D. Tex. June 25, 2008).....	50
<i>Empire Healthchoice Assurance, Inc. v.</i> <i>McVeigh</i> , 547 U.S. 677 (2006).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Franchise Tax Bd. v. Constr. Laborers Vac-</i> <i>ation Trust for Southern Cal.</i> , 463 U.S. 1 (1983).....	16, 20, 22, 30
<i>Genelink Biosciences, Inc. v. Colby</i> , 722 F. Supp. 2d 592 (D. N.J. 2010), <i>appeal dismissed</i> , 423 Fed. App'x 977 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	50
<i>Goldfarb v. Va. State Bar</i> , 421 U.S. 773 (1975)	43
<i>Grable & Sons Metal Prods., Inc. v. Darue</i> <i>Eng'g & Mfg.</i> , 545 U.S. 308 (2005).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Gully v. First Nat'l Bank in Meridian</i> , 299 U.S. 109 (1936).....	20, 22, 25
<i>Haase v. Abraham, Watkins, Nichols, Sorrels,</i> <i>Agosto and Friend, L.L.P.</i> , 2010 WL 519747 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 9, 2010).....	50
<i>Holmes Group, Inc. v. Vornado Air Circulation</i> <i>Sys., Inc.</i> , 535 U.S. 826 (2002).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Immunocept, L.L.C. v. Fulbright & Jaworski,</i> <i>L.L.P.</i> , 504 F.3d 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Ins. Corp. of Ireland, Ltd. v. Compagnie des</i> <i>Bauxites de Guinee</i> , 456 U.S. 694 (1982)	29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
<i>James H. Anderson, Inc. v. Johnson</i> , 2009 WL 2244622 (N.D. Ill. June 27, 2009).....	50
<i>LaBelle v. McGonagle</i> , 2008 WL 3842998 (D. Mass. Aug. 15, 2008).....	49
<i>Lans v. Adducci Mastriani & Schaumberg, L.L.P.</i> , 786 F. Supp. 2d 316 (D.D.C. 2011).....	49
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995), <i>affirmed</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996).....	52, 53
<i>Max-Planck-Gesellschaft ZUR Foerderung Der Wissenschaften, E.V. v. Wolf Greenfield & Sacks, PC</i> , 661 F. Supp. 2d 125 (D. Mass. 2009)	49
<i>Merrell Dow Pharm. Inc. v. Thompson</i> , 478 U.S. 804 (1986).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Minton v. Nat’l Ass’n of Sec. Dealers, Inc.</i> , 226 F. Supp. 2d 845 (E.D. Tex. 2002), <i>affirmed</i> , 336 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	4
<i>Minton v. Nat’l Ass’n of Sec. Dealers, Inc.</i> , 336 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	5
<i>Osborn v. Bank of the United States</i> , 22 U.S. 738 (1824).....	19
<i>Parus Holdings, Inc. v. Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.</i> , 585 F. Supp. 2d 995 (N.D. Ill. 2008)	49
<i>Reserve Mgmt. Co., Inc. v. Willkie Farr & Gallagher L.L.P.</i> , 2012 WL 4378058 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 25, 2012)	49

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
<i>Rockwood Retaining Walls, Inc. v. Patterson, Thuente, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.</i> , 2009 WL 5185770 (D. Minn. Dec. 22, 2009)	49
<i>Romero v. Int’l Terminal Operating Co.</i> , 358 U.S. 354 (1959).....	22
<i>Shulthis v. McDougal</i> , 225 U.S. 561 (1912).....	22
<i>Singh v. Duane Morris L.L.P.</i> , 538 F.3d 334 (5th Cir. 2008)	42
<i>Skelly Oil Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.</i> , 339 U.S. 667 (1950).....	22
<i>Smith v. Kansas City Title & Trust</i> , 255 U.S. 180 (1921).....	18, 19, 25
<i>Stone & Webster Eng’g Corp. v. Ilsley</i> , 690 F.2d 323 (2d Cir. 1982), <i>judgment aff’d</i> , 463 U.S. 1220 (1983).....	21
<i>Taylor v. Kochanowski</i> , 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20430 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 14, 2008).....	50
<i>Textile Workers of Am. v. Lincoln Mills of Ala.</i> , 353 U.S. 448 (1957).....	21
<i>Tomar Elec., Inc. v. Watkins</i> , 2009 WL 2222707 (D. Ariz. July 23, 2009)	49
<i>USPPS, Ltd. v. Avery Dennison Corp.</i> , 647 F.3d 274 (5th Cir. 2011).....	35, 49
<i>Victory Carriers, Inc. v. Law</i> , 404 U.S. 202 (1971).....	29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

Warrior Sports, Inc. v. Dickinson Wright, P.L.L.C., 666 F.Supp.2d 749 (E.D. Mich. 2009), *vacated*, 631 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2011)42

Warrior Sports, Inc. v. Dickinson Wright, P.L.L.C., 631 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....35, 49

STATE CASES

Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld, L.L.P. v. Nat’l Dev. and Research Corp., 299 S.W.3d 106 (Tex. 2009)45

Alexander v. Turtur & Assocs., Inc., 146 S.W.3d 113 (Tex. 2004)15, 37, 43, 44, 52

Alpha Pay Phones, Ltd. III v. Mankoff, Hill, Held & Metzger, P.C., 2000 WL 688176 (Tex. App. – Dallas 2000, no pet.) (mem. op.)38

Barcelo v. Elliott, 923 S.W.2d 575 (Tex. 1996)44

Belt v. Oppenheimer, Blend, Harrison & Tate, Inc., 192 S.W.3d 780 (Tex. 2006).....44

Brents v. Haynes & Boone, L.L.P., 53 S.W.3d 911 (Tex. App. – Dallas 2001, pet. denied)38

Buffington v. Sharp, ___ S.W.3d ___, 2012 WL 3758098 (Tex. App. – Houston [14th Dist.] 2012, pet. filed).....36

Bullock v. McLean, 2008 WL 3867644 (Tex. App. – Corpus Christi Aug. 21, 2008, no pet.) (mem. op.).....37

Burrow v. Arce, 997 S.W.2d 229 (Tex. 1999)44, 45

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

<i>Bustos v. Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.</i> , 2008 WL 182932 (Tex. App. – San Antonio Jan. 23, 2008, pet. denied) (mem. op.), <i>cert.</i> <i>denied</i> , 129 S. Ct. 2835 (2009).....	36
<i>Butler v. Mason</i> , 2006 WL 3747181 (Tex. App. – Eastland Dec. 21, 2006, pet. denied) (mem. op.), <i>cert. denied</i> , 552 U.S. 1024 (2007)	37
<i>Chambers v. Levbarg</i> , 2000 WL 217879 (Tex. App. – Austin Feb. 25, 2000, no pet.) (mem. op.)	38
<i>Cosgrove v. Grimes</i> , 774 S.W.2d 662, 665 (Tex. 1989)	44
<i>Deutsch v. Hoover, Bax & Slovacek, L.L.P.</i> , 97 S.W.3d 179 (Tex. App. – Houston [14th Dist.] 2002, no pet.)	37
<i>Eiland v. Turpin, Smith, Dyer, Saxe & McDonald</i> , 64 S.W.3d 155 (Tex. App. – El Paso 2001, no pet.)	38
<i>E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. Moses & Singer, L.L.P.</i> , 117 Cal. Rptr. 3d 516, 189 Cal.App. 4th 1140 (Cal. Ct. App. 2010)	50
<i>Estate of Whitsett v. Junell</i> , 218 S.W.3d 765 (Tex. App. – Houston [1st Dist.] 2007, no pet.)	37
<i>Falby v. Percely</i> , 2005 WL 1038776 (Tex. App. – Beaumont May 5, 2005, no pet.) (mem. op.)	37
<i>Fields v. Gendry & Sprague, P.C.</i> , 2002 WL 1906374 (Tex. App. – San Antonio Aug. 21, 2002, pet. denied) (mem. op.)	37

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
<i>Fleming v. Ahumada</i> , 193 S.W.3d 704 (Tex. App. – Corpus Christi 2006, no pet.).....	37
<i>Geo-Chevron Ortiz Ranch #2 v. Woodworth</i> , 2007 WL 671340 (Tex. App. – San Antonio Mar. 7, 2007, pet. denied) (mem. op.).....	37
<i>Griggs v. Wood</i> , 2001 WL 987906 (Tex. App. – Houston [14th Dist.] Aug. 30, 2001, no pet.).....	37
<i>Grimes v. Reynolds</i> , 252 S.W.3d 554 (Tex. App. – Houston [14th Dist.] 2008, no pet.)	36
<i>Hoover v. Larkin</i> , 196 S.W.3d 227 (Tex. App. – Houston [1st Dist.] 2006, pet. denied).....	44
<i>In re Haynes & Boone, L.L.P.</i> , 376 S.W.3d 839 (Tex. App. – Houston [1st Dist.] 2012, orig. proceeding)	36, 50
<i>Indus. Clearinghouse, Inc. v. Jackson Walker, L.L.P.</i> , 162 S.W.3d 384 (Tex. App. – Dallas 2005, pet. denied).....	37
<i>Inliner Americas, Inc. v. MaComb Funding Group, L.L.C.</i> , 348 S.W.3d 1 (Tex. App. – Houston [14th Dist.] 2010, pet. denied).....	36
<i>Jackson v. Kincaid</i> , 122 S.W.3d 440 (Tex. App. – Corpus Christi 2003, pet. granted, judgment vacated, remanded by agreement).....	37
<i>Keck, Mahin & Cate v. Nat’l Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh</i> , 20 S.W.3d 692 (Tex. 2000).....	45
<i>Landmark Screens, L.L.C. v. Morgan, Lewis, Bockius, L.L.P.</i> , 107 Cal. Rptr. 3d 373, 183 Cal. App. 4th 238 (Cal. Ct. App. 2010), <i>cert. denied</i> , 131 S.Ct. 1472 (2011).....	49

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

<i>Lemkin v. Hahn, Loeser & Parks, L.L.P.</i> , 2010 WL 1881962 (Ohio Ct. App. May 11, 2010).....	49
<i>Lockwood v. Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton</i> , 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 220, 173 Cal. App. 4th 675 (Cal. Ct. App. 2009).....	49
<i>Magnetek, Inc. v. Kirkland and Ellis, L.L.P.</i> , 954 N.E.2d 803 (Ill. App. Ct. 2011).....	50
<i>Manderscheid v. Cogdell</i> , 2000 WL 233154 (Tex. App. – Houston [1st Dist.] Mar. 2, 2000, no pet.).....	38
<i>Manning v. Jenkins & Gilchrist, P.C.</i> , 2001 WL 925738 (Tex. App. – El Paso Aug. 16, 2001, no pet.) (mem. op.).....	38
<i>Miller v. Brewer</i> , 118 S.W.3d 896 (Tex. App. – Amarillo 2003, no pet.)	37
<i>Minton v. Gunn</i> , 301 S.W.3d 702 (Tex. App. – Fort Worth 2009), <i>reversed</i> , 355 S.W.3d 634 (Tex. 2011)	1
<i>Minton v. Gunn</i> , 355 S.W.3d 634 (Tex. 2011), <i>cert. granted</i> , ___ S. Ct. ___, 2012 WL 831493 (2012).....	1
<i>Muecke v. Hallstead</i> , 25 S.W.3d 221 (Tex. App. – San Antonio 2000, no pet.) (<i>en banc</i>).....	38
<i>Nabors v. McColl</i> , 2010 WL 255968 (Tex. App. – Dallas Jan. 25, 2010, pet. denied) (mem. op.).....	36
<i>New Tek Mfg., Inc. v. Beehner</i> , 702 N.W.2d 336 (Neb. 2005)	40, 52, 53

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

<i>New Tek Mfg., Inc. v. Beehner</i> , 751 N.W.2d 135 (Neb. 2008)	40, 50, 52, 53
<i>Premier Networks, Inc. v. Stadheim and Gear,</i> <i>Inc.</i> , 918 N.E.2d 1117 (Ill. Ct. App. 2009).....	49
<i>Red v. Doherty</i> , 2007 WL 2066182 (Tex. App. – Austin July 20, 2007, pet. denied) (mem. op.)	37
<i>Renteria v. Myers</i> , 2008 WL 2078617 (Tex. App. – Fort Worth May 15, 2008, no pet.) (mem. op.)	36
<i>Revolutionary Concepts, Inc. v. Clements Walker</i> <i>P.L.L.C.</i> , 2010 WL 877508 (N.C. Super. Mar. 9, 2010)	50
<i>Singh v. Duane Morris, L.L.P.</i> , 338 S.W.3d 176 (Tex. App. – Houston [14th Dist.] 2011, pet. denied)	36
<i>Smith v. O'Donnell</i> , 288 S.W.3d 417 (Tex. 2009)	44
<i>Sotelo v. Stewart</i> , 281 S.W.3d 76 (Tex. App. – El Paso 2008, pet. denied)	44
<i>Stangel v. Perkins</i> , 87 S.W.3d 706 (Tex. App. – Dallas 2002, no pet.)	37
<i>Stromberger v. Law Offices of Windle Turley,</i> <i>P.C.</i> , 2007 WL 2994643 (Tex. App. – Dallas Oct. 16, 2007, no pet.) (mem. op.)	37
<i>Swinehart v. Stubbeman, McRae, Sealy, Laughlin</i> <i>& Browder, Inc.</i> , 48 S.W.3d 865 (Tex. App – Houston [14th Dist.] 2001, pet. denied)	38

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

<i>Tanox, Inc. v. Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld, L.L.P.</i> , 105 S.W.3d 244 (Tex. App. – Houston [14th Dist.] 2003, pet. denied).....	44
<i>Vinson & Elkins v. Moran</i> , 946 S.W.2d 381 (Tex. App. – Houston [14th Dist.] 1997, writ diss’d)	44
<i>Wadhwa v. Goldsberry</i> , 2012 WL 682223 (Tex. App. – Houston [1st Dist.] Mar. 1, 2012, no pet.) (mem. op.)	36
<i>Wargo v. Cloutman</i> , 2001 WL 732003 (Tex. App. – Dallas June 29, 2001, no pet.)	37
<i>Webb v. Stockford</i> , 331 S.W.3d 169 (Tex. App. – Dallas 2011, pet. denied)	15
<i>Wright v. Verner, Liipfert, Bernhard, McPherson and Hand, Chartered</i> , 2005 WL 497264 (Tex. App. – Houston [1st Dist.] Mar. 3, 2005, no pet.) (mem. op.)	37
<i>Zenith Star Ins. Co. v. Wilkerson</i> , 150 S.W.3d 525 (Tex. App. – Austin 2004, no pet.).....	44, 52

STATUTES

28 U.S.C. § 1257(a)	1
28 U.S.C. § 1295	56, 60
28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(1).....	41
28 U.S.C. § 1331	<i>passim</i>
28 U.S.C. § 1338	<i>passim</i>
28 U.S.C. § 1338(a)	1, 15, 40, 41

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
28 U.S.C. § 1454	60
35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	4
 LEGISLATIVE MATERIAL	
H.R. Rep. No. 97-312 (1981)	40, 56
H.R. Rep. No. 109-407 (2006)	57, 59
H.R. Rep. No. 112-98 (2011), <i>reprinted in</i> 2011 U.S.C.C.A.N. 67	57, 58, 60
Act of Oct. 13, 1972, Pub. L. No. 92-489, 86 Stat. 807 (1972)	59
Federal Courts Improvement Act of 1982, Pub. L. No. 97-164, 96 Stat. 25	55
Leahy-Smith America Invents Act of 2011, Pub. L. No. 112-29, 125 Stat. 284	55, 57, 58
Comm’n on Revision of the Fed. Court Appel- late Sys., Structure and Internal Procedures: Recommendations for Change (1975), <i>re- printed in</i> 67 F.R.D. 195, 236-47 (1975)	59
<i>Holmes Group, the Federal Circuit, and the State of Patent Appeals: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Courts, the Internet, and Intel- lectual Prop. of the H. Comm. on the Judici- ary</i> , 109th Cong. (2005)	58, 59

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Am. Bar Ass’n Standing Comm. on Lawyers’ Prof’l Liab., <i>Profile of Legal Malpractice Claims 2004-2007</i> (2008)	50
Charles Alan Wright <i>et al.</i> , FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE § 3562 (3d ed. 2008)	23, 41
Christopher G. Wilson, <i>Embedded Federal Questions, Exclusive Jurisdiction, and Patent- Based Malpractice Claims</i> , 51 WM. & MARY L. REV. 1237 (2009)	50
Dreyfuss, <i>The Federal Circuit: A Case Study in Specialized Courts</i> , 64 N.Y.U. L. REV. 1 (1989)	54
Restatement (Third) of Torts § 14, Cmt. a (Tentative Draft No. 1, 2001)	32
W. Page Keeton, PROSSER AND KEETON ON LAW OF TORTS § 36 (5th ed. 1984)	32

OPINIONS BELOW

The majority and dissenting opinions of the Supreme Court of Texas (App. 1-26 and App. 27-45)¹ are reported at *Minton v. Gunn*, 355 S.W.3d 634 (Tex. 2011), *cert. granted*, ___ S. Ct. ___, 2012 WL 831493 (2012). The opinion of the Court of Appeals for the Second District of Texas (App. 46-94) is reported at *Minton v. Gunn*, 301 S.W.3d 702 (Tex. App. – Fort Worth 2009), *reversed*, 355 S.W.3d 634 (Tex. 2011). The Court of Appeals’ per curiam order denying rehearing en banc (App. 95-96) is not reported. The district court’s orders granting summary judgment and its final judgment (JA 208-19) are not reported.



STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

The petition for a writ of certiorari was filed on March 9, 2012, and was granted on October 5, 2012. The jurisdiction of this Court rests on 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).



¹ Citations to “App.” in this Brief will be to the Appendix to the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari. Citations to “JA” will be to the Joint Appendix.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

At issue in this appeal is the “arising under” jurisdiction of the federal courts pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1338. At the time this action was filed, that provision read:

(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, plant variety protection, copyrights and trademarks. Such jurisdiction shall be exclusive of the courts of the states in patent, plant variety protection and copyright cases.

(b) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action asserting a claim of unfair competition when joined with a substantial and related claim under the copyright, patent, plant variety protection or trademark laws.

(c) Subsections (a) and (b) apply to exclusive rights in mask works under chapter 9 of title 17, and to exclusive rights in designs under chapter 13 of title 17, to the same extent as such subsections apply to copyrights.

Effective September 16, 2011, 28 U.S.C. § 1338 was amended, and it now reads:

(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, plant variety protection, copyrights and trademarks. No State court shall have jurisdiction over any claim for relief arising under any

Act of Congress relating to patents, plant variety protection, or copyrights. For purposes of this subsection, the term “State” includes any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

(b) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action asserting a claim of unfair competition when joined with a substantial and related claim under the copyright, patent, plant variety protection or trademark laws.

(c) Subsections (a) and (b) apply to exclusive rights in mask works under chapter 9 of title 17, and to exclusive rights in designs under chapter 13 of title 17, to the same extent as such subsections apply to copyrights.



STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. The Underlying Patent Litigation

Petitioners Jerry W. Gunn *et al.* (the “Lawyer Defendants”) are attorneys who represented Respondent Vernon Minton in a federal patent infringement action against the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (the “NASD”) (the “Patent Litigation”). JA 17-22. In the Patent Litigation, Minton alleged that the NASD infringed Minton’s U.S. Patent No. 6,014,643 (the “’643 Patent”). JA 20-21.

Also available as part of the eCourse

[Appellate Ethics: Scope of Representation and Engagement; Attorney's Fees on Appeal; Limits of Advocacy; and The Intersection of Legal Malpractice and Federal Jurisdiction](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the
23rd Annual Conference on State and Federal Appeals session

"Case Study: The Intersection of Legal Malpractice and Federal Jurisdiction"