<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>eBay v. MercExchange</td>
<td>Should an injunction automatically issue upon a finding of infringement of a valid patent? [35 USC § 283]</td>
<td>Court imposes “four-factor test” to determine eligibility for injunctive relief in patent infringement cases</td>
<td>case restricts remedy to promote patent’s exclusive right, with effect of compulsory license</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Medimmune v. Genentech</td>
<td>Does an alleged infringer have a priority right to challenge the validity of a patent upon acceptance of a letter alleging patent infringement? [28 USC § 151]</td>
<td>Defendant has right to challenge a patent’s validity by seeking a declarative judgment (DJ) at any time in the patent’s life</td>
<td>case severely restricts voluntary licensing market by exposing patent holder to validity challenge upon sending infringement letter to company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>KSR v. Teleflex</td>
<td>Is the TSM test inflexible in assessing patent obviousness [35 USC § 103]</td>
<td>Overturning the “teaching-suggestion-motivation” test as the exclusive test to establish patent obviousness</td>
<td>Decision enables lowering of bar to challenge patents as obvious principally by delinking field of patent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Quanta Computer v. LG Electronics</td>
<td>What are the boundaries of doctrine of patent exhaustion?</td>
<td>Patent exhaustion limits a patent holder’s rights for downstream users</td>
<td>Case enables downstream users to get free ride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Global-Tech Appliances Inc. v. SEB</td>
<td>What is the intent requirement for induced infringement? [35 USC § 271]</td>
<td>Willful ignorance is not a defense against patent infringement</td>
<td>Infringer cannot ignore patent without willful infringement risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>i4i v. Microsoft</td>
<td>What are the boundaries for the presumption of patent validity? [35 USC § 282]</td>
<td>Patent are presumed to be valid. Case overturned by AIA and institution of second window of patent review in IPRs/PGRs/CBMs</td>
<td>150 years of patent validity presumption support view of strong validity test to challenge patent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.</td>
<td>Are naturally occurring DNA patent eligible when applied in novel medical diagnostics? [35 USC § 101]</td>
<td>Naturally occurring DNA are not patent eligible</td>
<td>Case overturns Diamond v. Chakrabarty enabling emergence of biotech industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Case Name</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Octane Fitness v. Icon Health</td>
<td>What are the conditions for fee shifting in patent infringement cases? [35 USC § 285]</td>
<td>Judges have discretion in awarding attorney fees to opposing party</td>
<td>Case intended to constrain alleged frivolous patent infringement litigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2012-2014</td>
<td>Bilski v. Kappos; Mayo v. Prometheus; Alice v. CLS</td>
<td>What are the limits of an “abstract idea” for patentability? [35 USC § 101]</td>
<td>Addressing the abstract ideas exception to patentability, Court creates two-part test of patentability to link eligibility to machine</td>
<td>Cases narrow eligibility for patent, particularly in software and medical device industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Commil v. Cisco</td>
<td>Is a defendant’s good faith belief in a patent’s invalidity a defense of induced infringement?</td>
<td>Defendant belief in patent validity is not a defense of induced infringement</td>
<td>Simply challenging validity of patent is not legitimate defense of patent infringement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Cuozzo Speed Technologies v. Lee</td>
<td>Does the PTO’s Inter Partes Review broadest reasonable interpretation standard conform to the America Invents Act?</td>
<td>Administrative agencies have a right to interpret rules in the absence of clear congressional specificity</td>
<td>Court imposes Chevron (1984) again as most cited case to ignore substantive issues in critical case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Sequenom Laboratories v. Ariosa Diagnostics</td>
<td>Do the PTO’s IPR procedures deny patent applicants due process?</td>
<td>Court refuses to accept case</td>
<td>Court continues to ignore critical issue of patent validity challenges in PTO in contradiction to i4i v. MS decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Halo Electronics v. Pulse Electronics</td>
<td>Is the CAFC’s two-part test in Seagate determining eligibility for willful infringement damages unduly inflexible? (35 USC § 284)</td>
<td>Court overturns inflexible two-part test in Seagate for eligibility for willful damages in patent infringement cases</td>
<td>Court lowers bar for enhanced damages eligibility in willful infringement cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Samsung v. Apple</td>
<td>Are lost profits in design patent infringement applicable to entire device?</td>
<td>Lost profits in design patent infringement are applied to an article of a device and not necessarily to the whole device</td>
<td>Court imposes apportionment of damages to a part of a larger device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>TC Heartland v. Kraft Foods Group</td>
<td>What are the limits of venue selection in patent infringement cases?</td>
<td>Court accepts case for review of patent venue statute [28 USC § 1400]</td>
<td>Court may apply higher standard for venue selection, with bias to defendant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>