Chambers USA writes that Duane Morris’ Intellectual Property Practice Group is “recognized for its experience acting for technology companies in contentious proceedings, including patent infringement disputes.” The group “also advises on portfolio management matters including licensing negotiations … [and] represents both defendants and plaintiffs in IP litigation concerning patent and copyright infringement as well as trade secret and noncompete disputes. One client appreciates that ‘the team has clearly defined responsibilities and harmonizes well,’ adding: ‘You know that matters entrusted to them will be handled well.’”


Duane Morris has the highest IPR institution percentage of any of the nation’s Top 15 most active petitioner law firms. (According to Patentia’s analysis of cases over five years.)

Ranked the Top Firm representing petitioners before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB), according to Unified Patents’ institutional success index (2018-19).


Duane Morris patent litigators combine mastery in trial advocacy, an in-depth knowledge of patent law, an aptitude for science and technology, and a focus on our clients’ business objectives. We represent clients in defending against claims of patent infringement, enforcing their patents, and handling disputes concerning inventorship and ownership of patents.

We present complex technologies and concepts to judges and juries in a simple and persuasive way. In patent cases, our litigators either have the necessary technical knowledge or work closely with patent specialists. Several dozen Duane Morris attorneys practice before the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). Our attorneys and patent agents hold technical or scientific degrees—and in some cases Ph.D.s—in fields such as computer science; electrical, mechanical, nuclear and chemical engineering; physics; microbiology; molecular biophysics; and biochemistry. We have litigated cases across the United States, and we have won trials in every key jurisdiction for patent litigation, including the District of Delaware, Eastern District of Texas, District of New Jersey and all of the districts in California.

Duane Morris attorneys’ combination of extensive trial experience as lead counsel in litigation before state and federal courts, along with unique trial experience within the USPTO, can help clients take advantage of, and respond to, inter partes review (IPR). Duane Morris has quickly become a go-to firm for IPR proceedings.

We understand that our job is to get clients out of litigation and back to business as quickly as possible. Our focus is on our clients’ objectives and the most cost-effective means of achieving them. If a creative business resolution is in order, we will litigate the case in a manner that will drive the case toward such a resolution.
REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS

• Wawrzynski v. H.J. Heinz Co., et al. (W.D. Pa. 2015). Defense verdict of the largest indirect-profits copyright award of $30.4 million in a jury trial, in which plaintiff claimed Heinz used his ideas in Heinz’s Dip and Squeeze ketchup package.


• MyMail v. EarthLink, AOL, SBC, AT&T, and Verizon (E.D. Tex.). Obtained what was reported as the first-ever grant of summary judgment of non-infringement in the Eastern District of Texas. In the final hearing after the district court granted summary judgment of non-infringement, the court stated on the record: “This is a very close call on this claim construction and on the summary judgment. Mr. Jameson [chair of Duane Morris’ IP Practice Group] and his co-counsel made an outstanding presentation during the summary judgment, [and] it was a close call and I called it.” We also won the appeal, obtaining an affirmance by the Federal Circuit. MyMail, Ltd. v. America Online, Inc., 476 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

• Crossroads Systems v. Cisco Systems and NetApp (W.D. Tex.). Obtained an order staying the case against our clients, Cisco and NetApp, pending the IPR proceedings on the patents-in-suit, and then won the IPR proceedings and invalidated all claims of all patents.

• CBT Flint Partners, LLC v. Return Path, Inc. and Cisco IronPort Systems, LLC (N.D. Ga.). Obtained multiple summary judgment orders for Cisco resolving all merits issues, and won affirmances of summary judgments on appeal before the Federal Circuit. Also won discovery sanctions against plaintiff and its Am Law 50 law firm, requiring them to reimburse substantial attorneys’ fees relating to a discovery dispute. Additionally, the district court ordered the defendant to pay all of Cisco’s e-discovery costs (approximately $250,000) as part of the costs taxable against the plaintiff when the defendant is the prevailing party. CBT filed a separate appeal against that order, which resulted in a precedent-setting decision regarding the recoverability of e-discovery costs to the winning party in patent cases. CBT Flint Partners, LLC v. Return Path, Inc. and Cisco IronPort Systems, LLC, 737 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2013).

• Eon v. AT&T (D. Del.). Obtained summary judgment of invalidity for indefiniteness for AT&T against patents covering wireless modem technology. Won affirmance on appeal before the Federal Circuit.

• Affinity Labs v. Volkswagen and Hyundai (E.D. Tex.). Won jury verdict of infringement in the Eastern District of Texas for a patent holder against two major automobile manufacturers, resulting in a $15 million judgment and a multimillion-dollar annual ongoing royalty.

• Inline v. EarthLink (D. Del.). Won jury verdict in the District of Delaware for EarthLink regarding three patents relating to ADSL technology, in which the jury found the patents were not infringed and invalid on numerous grounds.

• BAE v. Aeroflex (D. Del.). Obtained summary judgment in the District of Delaware against all claims in patent and trade secret litigation between major military contractors relating to technology to protect low-flying aircraft from heat-seeking missiles.

• Howmedica v. Wright Medical (D. N.J.). After taking over a 7-year-old case from former counsel, obtained summary judgment in the District of New Jersey for Wright Medical that a key competitor’s patent relating to prosthetic knees is invalid, leaving only our fee claims for inequitable conduct pending.

• UAT v. CenturyLink (D. Del.). Obtained judgment on the pleadings for CenturyLink in the District of Delaware based on collateral estoppel for a major telecommunications company in patent litigation relating to ADSL technology.

• Won a complete defense verdict on all four patents-at-issue for a major manufacturer of cable set-top boxes in what was then the largest Section 337 proceeding ever tried before the International Trade Commission.

• PersonalWeb v. NetApp (E.D. Tex. and N.D. Cal. 2013). Obtained on behalf of NetApp, Inc. an order staying a suit against it until the USPTO reviewed the validity of patents owned by PersonalWeb Technologies LLC. The review resulted in the invalidation of all asserted claims.

ABOUT DUANE MORRIS

Duane Morris LLP, a law firm with more than 800 attorneys in offices across the United States and internationally, is asked by a broad array of clients to provide innovative solutions to today’s legal and business challenges.
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This publication is for general information and does not include full legal analysis of the matters presented. It should not be construed or relied upon as legal advice or legal opinion on any specific facts or circumstances. The invitation to contact the attorneys in our firm is not a solicitation to provide professional services and should not be construed as a statement as to any availability to perform legal services in any jurisdiction in which such attorney is not permitted to practice.
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