



UNCERTAIN TIMES: WHEN DOES IPR ESTOPPEL APPLY?

Paula D. Heyman


University of Texas Advanced Patent Law Institute
November 3, 2023

McDermott
Will & Emery

1

INTER PARTES REVIEW (IPR)

- 35 U.S.C. § 311(b)
 - “A petitioner in an inter partes review may request to cancel as unpatentable 1 or more claims of a patent only on **a ground** that could be raised **under section 102 or 103** and only on the basis of prior art consisting of **patents or printed publications.**”




2

2

IPR ESTOPPEL

- 35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(2)
 - “The petitioner in an inter partes review of a claim in a patent under this chapter that **results in a final written decision** under section 318(a) . . . may not assert either in a civil action . . . or in a proceeding before the International Trade Commission . . . that the claim is invalid on **any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised** during that inter partes review.”



3



3

IPR ESTOPPEL – WHERE ARE WE?

- Ground raised in Petition ✓
 - *Shaw Indus. Grp., Inc. v. Automated Creel Sys., Inc.*, 817 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2016)
 - PTAB instituted some grounds and declined to institute others
 - Estoppel limited to only instituted grounds
 - *SAS Inst. Inc. v. Iancu*, 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018)
 - PTAB must institute all grounds raised in petition or deny review
 - Result: no IPRs addressing only some grounds raised in petition
 - *Ironburg Inventions Ltd. v. Valve Corp.*, 64 F. 4th 1274 (Fed. Cir. 2023)
 - Estoppel applies to non-instituted grounds because raised in IPR petition and resulted in final written decision (pre-SAS IPRs)



4



4

IPR ESTOPPEL – WHERE ARE WE?

- Ground raised in Petition ✓
- Ground reasonably could have been raised in Petition
 - Known to petitioner prior to filing ✓
 - *California Inst. of Tech. v. Broadcom Ltd. et al.*, 25 F. 4th 976 (Fed. Cir. 2022)
 - District court barred defendants from raising invalidity grounds based on prior art aware of at time of IPR filing
 - Affirmed district court and overruled *Shaw* holding estoppel applies to grounds based on patents and printed publications petitioner reasonably “could have raised” in petition
 - Petition for cert to Supreme Court denied



IPR ESTOPPEL – WHERE ARE WE?

- Ground raised in Petition ✓
- Ground reasonably could have been raised in Petition
 - Known to petitioner prior to filing ✓
 - *Click-to-Call Techs. LP v. Ingenio, Inc.*, 45 F. 4th 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2022)
 - District court barred defendant from raising invalidity grounds based on prior art raised in IPR petition against invalidated claims but not surviving claim
 - Affirmed district court finding of estoppel because ground raised against invalidated claims in IPR petition could have been raised against surviving claim
 - Extension of *Cal Tech* recognizing that grounds in petition “define the scope of the IPR” and “thus the extent of the estoppel”



Find the full text of this and thousands of other resources from leading experts in dozens of legal practice areas in the [UT Law CLE eLibrary \(utcle.org/elibrary\)](http://utcle.org/elibrary)

Title search: Uncertain Times: When Does IPR Estoppel Apply?

Also available as part of the eCourse

[Uncertain Times: When Does IPR Estoppel Apply?](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the
28th Annual Advanced Patent Law Institute session

"Uncertain Times: When Does IPR Estoppel Apply?"