

Index

- Abuse of Superior Bargaining Position (ASBP) guidelines, 173–174
- aggregation, of patents
 under antitrust law, 25
 Cournot complements problem, 20–21
 intellectual property and, 2
 mass aggregators, 4
 PAEs as, 2
 by patent trolls, 18–21
 by PEs, 18–21
 technological costs of, 20
 transaction cost reduction through, 20
- Allison, Lemley & Walker (ALW) taxonomy, 55
- Antimonopoly Act (Japan), 164–166
 ASBP guidelines, 173–174
 competition requirements under, 166–167
 excessive pricing and, 173–174
 exemptions under, 164–166
 private monopolization restrictions, 167–168
 refusal of license under, 167–171
 unfair trade practices under, 167–168
- Anti-Monopoly Law (AML) (China), 154, 159–160
- antitrust law. *See also* patent litigation
 aggregation of patents under, 25
 in Asian region, 77–78
 in Europe, 77–78
 FRAND royalties under, 81–82
 hybrid PAEs and, 73–74
 IP law and, 130
 in Korea, 132–133
 patent privateering and, 80
 in U.S., 77–78
- Anti-Unfair Competition Law (China), 157–159
- Apple v. Samsung*, 142–144
- ASBP guidelines. *See* Abuse of Superior Bargaining Position guidelines
- Asia. *See also* China; Japan; Korea; Taiwan
 antitrust law in, 78–82
 hybrid PAEs in, 78–83
- bartering, PEs and, 12
- bottom-feeder patent trolls, 11, 21–22, 25, 85
 demand letters by, 86
 MPJH Technology, 87–88, 93–94
 under patent law, 87–88
- cash-targeting strategies, 39–40
- Chien, Colleen, 107, 182
- China
 AML in, 154, 159–160
 hybrid PAE claims in, 78–82
 FRAND royalty commitments, 78–79
 MOFCOM and, 78–79, 150–152
 Nokia in, 150–152
 PAEs in, 150–154, 160–161
 under AML, 159–160
 under Anti-Unfair Competition Law, 157–159
 formal adoption of, 152–153
 government regulation of, 150–152
 improper conduct of, 155–160
 as insignificant legal problem, 154–155
 international cases, 150
 legal regulation of, 153–160
 MOFCOM and, 150–152
 negative functions of, 153–154
 Patent Law of, 154–157
 patent trolls in, 152–153
 Clayton Act (U.S.), 75–76

- Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial
Research Organisation (CSIRO), 52
competition law, in Japan, 164–166
Constitution, U.S.
 under First Amendment, 92, 94–95
 Supremacy Clause, 92
contract law, FRAND royalty commitments
 and, 80–81
Cournot complements problem, 20–21
cross-licensing, of patents, 13
CSIRO. *See* Commonwealth Scientific and
 Industrial Research Organisation
- damage awards
 assessment of, for PEs, 14–16
 for patent litigation
 in Europe, 123
 in U.S., 114
demand letters, 33
 by bottom-feeder patent trolls, 86
 under Korean IPR guidelines, 146
 under patent law, 86
 at federal level, 90–91
 at state level, 88–90
 under TROL Act, 91, 99–101
- England. *See* United Kingdom
Europe. *See also* Germany; United Kingdom
 antitrust law in, 77–78
 hybrid PAE claims in, 77–78
 NPEs in, 106–107
 patent litigation and, 108–109
 PAEs in, 104, 107–114
 lack of activity for, 115–124
 patent litigation in, 105–106
 costs of, 123
 damage awards for, 123
 fee-shifting in, 123
 by NPE type, 108–109
 for software-based patents, 115–116
 unitary patent system in, 117, 124
European Patent Convention, 115–116
ex post licensing, for NPEs, 29
- “fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory”
 (FRAND) royalties
 under antitrust law, 81–82
 contract law and, 80–81
 in hybrid PAE claims, 79
 in China, 78–79
 in Korea, 141–142
 PAEs and, 193–195
 hybrid, 78–79
 in Korea, 141–142
 SEPs and, 50, 54
 property law and, 80–81
 SEPs and, 50, 54
 for SSOs, 50, 54, 194
Farris v. Glen Alden Corporation, 82
Federal Trade Commission (FTC), 90–91
fee-shifting, in patent litigation, 123
First Amendment, immunity doctrine under,
 92, 94–95
forum shopping, for NPE litigation, 36–38
FRAND royalties. *See* “fair, reasonable and
 non-discriminatory” royalties
FTC. *See* Federal Trade Commission
- Germany
 NPEs in, 107–110
 patent litigation in, 105–106, 119–122
 case settlement rates, 114
 by case type, 112
 case value of, 114
 costs of, 116–117
 damage awards for, 117–118
 injunctions in, 118
 invalidation of patents and, 118
 IPCs and, 110
 non-monetary remedies and, 118
 PAEs and, 110–112
 U.S. standards for, 114
 win rates for, 110, 114
GSK/Dong-A Reverse Payment case,
 136–139
- Holmes v. Lerner*, 81–82
Hovenkamp, Areeda, 75
hybrid PAEs, 6
 antitrust law and, 73–74
 in Asian region, 78–83
 in China, claims for, 78–82
 FRAND royalty commitments, 78–79
 MOFCOM, 78–79
 under Clayton Act, 75–76
 in Europe, 77–78
 FRAND royalties, 78–79
 incentives of, 73–77
 in Korea, 79
 NPEs and, 73
 RRC strategy and, 75
 SSOs and, 81

- in Taiwan, claims for, 78–82
- in U.S., 77–78, 82–83
- immunity doctrine, for regulation of patent assertions, 86, 92–96
 - Federal Circuit Court development of, 92–94, 99
 - under First Amendment, 92, 94–95
 - as matter of preemption, 92
 - MPJH and, 93–94
 - re-assessment of, 94–97
 - under Supremacy Clause, 92
- information technology (IT) industry
 - patent trolls and, 9, 24
 - PEs and, 16–18
- injunctions
 - in German patent litigation cases, 118
 - against patent trolls, 24
 - for PEs, 15
 - in U.S. patent litigation cases, 118
- Innovatio IP Ventures, 51, 87–88
- innovation
 - NPE patent litigation as influence on, 31–32, 42–43
 - PAEs and, 5
- intellectual property (IP)
 - antitrust law and, 130
 - JFTC guidelines, 170–171
 - in Korea, guidelines for, 131–147
 - deceptive demand letters, 146
 - FRAND royalty terms, 141–142
 - imposition of unreasonable royalties, 140–141
 - KFTC amending of, 139
 - PAEs under, 131–133, 140–147
 - third-party patents and, 141–142
 - PAEs as aggregation of, 2
 - privateering, 184–185
- Intellectual Property and Enterprise Court (IPEC), 105–106
- Intellectual Property Basic Act (Japan), 163
- International Patents Classifications (IPCs), 110
- invalidation of patents, 118
- inventors, NPEs patent litigation and, 44–46
- IP. *See* intellectual property
- IPCs. *See* International Patents Classifications
- IPEC. *See* Intellectual Property and Enterprise Court
- IT industry. *See* information technology industry
- Japan
 - Antimonopoly Act, 164–166
 - ASBP guidelines, 173–174
 - competition requirements under, 166–167
 - excessive pricing and, 173–174
 - exemptions to, 164–166
 - private monopolization restrictions, 167–168
 - refusal of license under, 167–171
 - unfair trade practices under, 167–168
 - Civil Procedure Code in, 162
 - competition law in, 164–166
 - PAEs in, 162
 - competition requirements for, 166–167
 - excessive pricing restrictions, 173–174
 - under Intellectual Property Basic Act, 163
 - legal foundations for, 162–163
 - mergers restrictions for, 174
 - under Patent Act, 164–166
 - refusal of license provisions, 167–171
 - patent law in, 164–166
 - UCPA, 163
 - false announcement provisions, 171–173
 - Imation v. One Blue*, 172–173
- Japan Fair Trade Commission (JFTC), 167–171
 - IP guidelines, 170–171
 - Pachinko* case, 168–169
 - Roppo v. Hinode*, 169
- KFTC. *See* Korea Free Trade Commission
- Korea
 - Apple v. Samsung* in, 142–144
 - hybrid PAE claims in, 79
 - IPR in, guidelines for, 131–147
 - deceptive demand letters, 146
 - FRAND royalty terms, 141–142
 - imposition of unreasonable royalties, 140–141
 - KFTC amending of, 139
 - PAEs under, 131–133, 140–147
 - third-party patents and, 141–142
 - MRFTA and, 133–139
 - abuse of market dominant position, 134–136
 - Article 59, 136
 - GSK/Dong-A Reverse Payment case, 136–139
 - unfair collaborative acts under, 134
 - PAEs in, 131, 148
 - under antitrust law, 132–133
 - formation of consortiums among, 145

- Korea (cont.)
 FRAND royalty terms, 141–142
 imposition of unreasonable royalties,
 140–141
 under IPR guidelines, 131–133, 140–147
 patent litigation, 131
 patent privateering and, 146–147
 third-party patents and, 141–142
 patent litigation systems in, 147
 Qualcomm case in, 144–145
 SEPs in, 141–142
- Korea Free Trade Commission (KFTC),
 131–133. *See also* Monopoly Regulation
 and Fair Trade Act
 IPR guidelines amended by, 139
- lawsuits, PAEs and, 1, 5
 legal activity. *See* antitrust law; injunctions;
 lawsuits
- licensing, of patents
 cross-licensing, 13
ex post, for NPEs, 29
 in Japan, refusal of license provisions,
 167–171
 PAEs and, 2, 186
 strategies for, 29
 “lottery ticket trolls,” 4. *See also* patent
 assertion entities
- MAD. *See* mutually assured destruction
- mass aggregators, 4
- McMillan, Robert, 76
- mergers
 in Japan, for PAEs, 174
 patent privateering and, 75–76
 antitrust law and, 80
 defined, 72
 functions of, 72
- Microsoft, as hybrid PAE, 77–82
- Ministry of Commerce of the People’s
 Republic of China (MOFCOM),
 78–79, 150–152
- Monopoly Regulation and Fair Trade Act
 (MRFTA) (Korea), 133–139
 abuse of market dominant position, 134–136
 exclusionary abuse, 134–135
 exploitative abuse, 135
 unfair trade practices as, 135–136
 Article 59, 136
 GSK/Dong-A Reverse Payment case,
 136–139
 unfair collaborative acts under, 134
- MOSAID, 76–77
- MPJH Technology, 87–88, 93–94
- MRFTA. *See* Monopoly Regulation and Fair
 Trade Act
- mutually assured destruction (MAD), of patent
 firms
 defined, 73
 PAEs and, 3
- N-Data*, 51
- Nokia
 in China, 150–152
 as hybrid PAE, 77–82
- Nokia v. TTFC*, 178–185
 characterization of legal issues in, 181–182
 decision appeals, 180–181
 privateering PAEs and, 184–185
 problems with decision, 186–187
 TTFC decision, 179–180
- non-monetary remedies, in patent litigation,
 118
- non-practicing entities (NPEs). *See also* patent
 assertion entities
 classification system for, 55
 ALW taxonomy, 55
 defined, 106–107
 demand letters, 33
 in Europe, 106–107
 patent litigation by type, 108–109
ex post licensing for, 29
 hybrid PAEs and, 73
 licensing strategies, 29
 PAEs compared to, 130–131
 under patent law and regulation, 87–88
 patent litigation and, 27–28
 aggregate trends, 32–34
 cash-targeting strategies in, 39–40
 costs to targeted firms, 43–44
 cross-country evidence for, 33–34
 in Europe, 108–109
 forum shopping for, 36–38
 innovation reduction as result of, 31–32,
 42–43
 large sample evidence for, 31–41
 patent quality as factor in, 32, 34–41
 PE litigation compared to, 39–41
 plaintiff classification and, 32–33
 survey evidence for, 29–31
 transfers to inventors and, 44–46
 pro-competitive aspects of, 2

- publicly-traded, 45
- SEPs and
 - limitations of, 63–64
 - litigation outcomes, 61–62, 68, 71
 - long-term implications of, 64–65
 - methodology for, 52–55
 - plaintiff characteristics, 58–61, 69–70
 - study design for, 52–55, 63–64
 - types of, 106
- non-standard setting organizations (non-SSOs), 81
- NPEs. *See* non-practicing entities
- PACS. *See* picture archival and communications systems
- PAEs. *See* patent assertion entities
- PATENT Act. *See* Protecting American Talent and Entrepreneurship Act
- Patent Act (Japan), 164–166
- patent assertion entities (PAEs). *See also* non-practicing entities
 - anti-competitive aspects of, 3, 74–75
 - in China, 150–154, 160–161
 - under AML, 159–160
 - under Anti-Unfair Competition Law, 157–159
 - formal adoption of, 152–153
 - government regulation of, 150–152
 - improper conduct of, 155–160
 - as insignificant legal problem, 154–155
 - international cases for, 150
 - legal regulation of, 153–160
 - MOFCOM and, 150–152
 - negative functions of, 153–154
- CSIRO, 52
- defined, 107, 182–184
- in Europe, 104, 107–124
 - lack of activity for, 115–124
- FRAND royalties, 193–195
 - for hybrid PAEs, 78–79
 - in Korea, 141–142
 - SEPs and, 50, 54
- hybrid, 6
 - antitrust law and, 73–74
 - in Asian region, 78–83
 - in China, 78–82
 - under Clayton Act, 75–76
 - in Europe, 77–78
 - FRAND royalties, 78–79
 - incentives of, 73–77
 - in Korea, 79
 - NPEs and, 73
 - RRC strategy and, 75
 - SSOs and, 81
 - in Taiwan, 78–82
 - in U.S., 77–78, 82–83
- increased activity for, 1
- Innovatio, 51
- intellectual property and, aggregation of, 2
- in Japan, 162
 - competition requirements for, 166–167
 - excessive pricing and, 173–174
 - excessive pricing restrictions, 173–174
 - under Intellectual Property Basic Act, 163
 - legal foundations for, 162–163
 - mergers restrictions for, 174
 - under Patent Act, 164–166
 - refusal of license provisions, 167–171
- in Korea, 131, 148
 - under antitrust law, 132–133
 - formation of consortiums and, 145
 - FRAND royalty terms, 141–142
 - imposition of unreasonable royalties, 140–141
 - under IPR guidelines, 131–133, 140–147
 - KFTC and, 131–132
 - MRFTA and, 133
 - patent litigation, 131
 - patent privateering and, 146–147
 - third-party patents and, 141–142
- lawsuits and, 1, 5
- licensing of patents, 2, 186
- litigation strategies, 186
- MAD and, 3
- Microsoft, 77–78
- N-Data*, 51
- Nokia, 77–78
- NPEs compared to, 130–131
- patent litigation and, 27. *See also* *Nokia v. TFTC*
- predatory pricing models and, 2
- price-fixing and, 189
- privateering, 184–185
- qualitative approach to, 188–193
 - disaggregators in, 189–190
 - economic rationality in, 191–193
 - government agencies and, 190–191
 - industry stakeholders in, 190–191
 - SEPs in, 192–193
- quantitative approach, 187–188
- Rembrandt, 52

- patent assertion entities (PAEs). (cont.)
- rent seeking and, 5
 - risk asymmetry of, 3
 - Rockstar, 51
 - RRC theory and, 177, 183
 - SEPs and, 50–51
 - assertion landscape, 56–58
 - FRAND royalties, 50, 54
 - methodology for, 52–55
 - in qualitative approach, 192–193
 - standards analysis, 53
 - study design for, 52–55
 - as tax on innovation, 5
 - types of, 4
 - in U.S., 1
 - damage awards for, 114
 - patent law and regulation, in U.S.
 - bottom-feeder patent trolls under, 87–88
 - constitutional limits of, 85, 91–96
 - under First Amendment, 92, 94–95
 - under Supremacy Clause, 92
 - demand letter regulations, 86
 - at federal level, 90–91
 - at state level, 88–90
 - under TROL Act, 91, 99–101
 - federal protections
 - demand letter regulations, 90–91
 - state cooperation and, 97–101
 - FTC and, 90–91
 - future applications of, 96–101
 - immunity doctrine for, 86, 92–96
 - Federal Circuit Court development of, 92–94, 99
 - under First Amendment, 92, 94–95
 - as matter of preemption, 92
 - MPJH and, 93–94
 - re-assessment of, 94–97
 - under Supremacy Clause, 92
 - under PATENT Act, 91
 - for software-based patents, 116
 - under state statutes, 88–90
 - federal cooperation and, 97–101
 - under TROL Act, 91, 99–101
 - uniformity of, benefits of, 98
 - Patent Law of China, 154–157
 - patent litigation. *See also* Germany, patent litigation in; patent law and regulation, in U.S.; United Kingdom, patent litigation in; United States, patent litigation in
 - Apple v. Samsung*, 142–144
 - damage awards for
 - in Europe, 123
 - in U.S., 114
 - in Europe, 105–106
 - costs of, 123
 - damage awards for, 123
 - fee-shifting in, 123
 - by NPE type, 108–109
 - for software-based patents, 115–116
 - in Korea, 147
 - non-monetary remedies in, 118
 - for NPEs, 27–28
 - aggregate trends, 32–34
 - cash-targeting strategies for, 39–40
 - costs to targeted firms, 43–44
 - cross-country evidence for, 33–34
 - damages from, 14–16
 - forum shopping for, 36–38
 - innovation reduction as result of, 31–32, 42–43
 - large sample evidence for, 31–41
 - outcomes, with SEPs, 61–62, 68, 71
 - patent quality and, 32, 34–41
 - PE litigation compared to, 39–41
 - plaintiff classification in, 32–33
 - survey evidence for, 29–31
 - transfers to inventors and, 44–46
 - PAEs and, 27
 - PEs and
 - costs of, 21
 - damages awards, 14–16
 - NPE litigation compared to, 39–41
 - Qualcomm case, 144–145
 - reverse payment in, 137
 - for SEPs, litigation outcomes with NPEs, 61–62, 68, 71
 - in U.K., 105
 - in U.S., 110
 - patent privateering. *See also* hybrid PAEs
 - as consumer welfare reducing tool, 82
 - defined, 72
 - functions of, 72
 - in Korea, 146–147
 - MOSAID, 76–77
 - Rockstar, 51, 76
 - patent quality, 30
 - NPE litigation and, 32, 34–41
 - USTPO and, 1–2
 - patent systems

- patent trolls and, aggregation of patents by, 18–21
- PEs and, aggregation of patents by, 18–21
- weakness of, 5
- patent trolls. *See also* non-practicing entities; patent assertion entities
 - acquisition and aggregation of patents by, 18–21
 - assertion tactics of, 21–22
 - bottom-feeder, 11, 21–22, 25, 85
 - in China, 152–153
 - costs of, 12–16
 - benefits in comparison to, 22–23
 - as excessive, 10
 - myths about, 13–14
 - PE costs compared to, 14–16
 - defined, 9
 - injunctions against, 24
 - in IT industry, 9, 24
 - long-term assessment of, 23–25
 - PEs and, 9–11
 - aggregation of patents by, 18–21
 - assertion tactics of, 21–22
 - bartering and, 12
 - benefits in comparison to costs, 22–23
 - costs of, 14–16
 - cross-licensing and, 13
 - injunctions for, 15
 - IT industry and, 16–18
 - litigation costs of, 21
 - patent damages for, 14–16
 - royalties and, 16–18
 - types of, 11
- patented drugs, 138
- PEs. *See* practicing entities
- picture archival and communications systems (PACS), 42–43
- practicing entities (PEs), 9–11
 - aggregation of patents by, 18–21
 - assertion tactics of, 21–22
 - bartering and, 12
 - costs of, 14–16
 - benefits in comparison to, 22–23
 - cross-licensing and, 13
 - injunctions for, 15
 - IT industry and, 16
 - patent damages for, 14–16
 - patent litigation and
 - costs of, 21
 - damages awards, 14–16
 - NPE litigation compared to, 39–41
 - royalties and, 16
 - stacking of, 17–18
- predatory pricing models, PAEs and, 2
- price-fixing, 189
- privateering. *See* patent privateering
- privateering PAEs, 184–185
- property law, FRAND royalty commitments and, 80–81
- Protecting American Talent and Entrepreneurship (PATENT) Act (U.S.), 91
- publicly-traded NPEs, 45
- Qualcomm case, in Korea, 144–145
- raising rivals cost (RRC) theory, 75, 177, 183
- Rembrandt, 52
- rent seeking, PAEs and, 5
- reverse payment, defined, 137
- risk asymmetry, of PAEs, 3
- Rockstar, 51
 - patent privateering and, 76
- Roppo v. Hinode*, 169
- royalties
 - FRAND
 - under antitrust law, 81–82
 - contract law and, 80–81
 - in hybrid PAE claims, 78–79
 - in Korea, 141–142
 - property law and, 80–81
 - SEPs and, 50, 54
 - for SSOs, 50, 54
 - under Korean IPR guidelines, 140–141
 - PEs and, 16
- RRC theory. *See* raising rivals cost theory
- SEPs. *See* standards-essential patents
- Shapiro, Carl, 182
- signaling theory, in predatory pricing models, 2
- software-based patents
 - defined, 116
 - in Europe, 115–116
 - in U.S., 116
- standard setting organizations (SSOs)
 - hybrid PAEs and, 81
 - SEPs and, 50, 64–65
 - FRAND royalties for, 50, 54, 194
- standards-essential patents (SEPs)
 - in Korea, 141–142
 - NPEs and
 - limitations of studies on, 63–64

- standards-essential patents (SEPs) (cont.)
 litigation outcomes, 61–62, 68, 71
 long-term implications of, 64–65
 methodology for, 52–55
 plaintiff characteristics, 58–61, 69–70
 study design for, 52–55, 63–64
- PAEs and, 50–51
 assertion landscape, 56–58
 FRAND royalties, 50, 54
 limitations of, 63–64
 litigation outcomes, 61–62, 68, 71
 long-term implications of, 64–65
 methodology for, 52–55
 plaintiff characteristics, 58–61, 69–70
 in qualitative approach to, 192–193
 standards analysis, 53
 study design for, 52–55, 63–64
- patent litigation and, with NPEs, 61–62
- SSOs and, 50, 64–65
 FRAND royalties for, 50, 54, 194
- Supremacy Clause, U.S. Constitution, 92
- Supreme Court, U.S., 123
- Taiwan
 hybrid PAE claims in, 78–82
Nokia v. TFTC, 178–185
 decision appeals, 180–181
 legal issues in, 181–182
 privateering PAEs and, 184–185
 problems with decision, 186–187
 TFTC decision, 179–180
- Taiwan Fair Trade Commission (TFTC),
 177–178, 195
Nokia v. TFTC decision, 179–180
 appeals process, 180–181
 legal issues in, 181–182
- Targeting Rogue and Opaque Letters (TROL)
 Act (U.S.), 91, 99–101
- TFEU. *See* Treaty on the Functioning of the
 European Union
- TFTC. *See* Taiwan Fair Trade Commission
- third-party patents, 141–142
- Treaty on the Functioning of the European
 Union (TFEU), 168
- TROL Act. *See* Targeting Rogue and Opaque
 Letters Act
- UCPA. *See* Unfair Competition Prevention
 Act
- U.K. *See* United Kingdom
- Unfair Competition Prevention Act (UCPA)
 (Japan), 163
 false announcement provisions,
 171–173
Imation v. One Blue, 172–173
- unitary patent system, 117,
 124
- United Kingdom (U.K.)
 NPEs in, 107–110
 patent litigation in, 105, 119–122
 case settlement rates, 114
 by case type, 112
 costs of, 116–117, 123
 damage awards for, 117–118
 IPCs and, 110
 IPEC and, 105–106
 non-monetary remedies and, 118
 PAEs and, 110–112
 U.S. standards for, 114
 win rates for, 110, 114
- United States (U.S.). *See also* patent law and
 regulation, in U.S.
 antitrust law in, 77–78
 hybrid PAE claims in, 77–78, 82–83
 PAEs in, 1
 damage awards for, 114, 117–118
 patent litigation in, 110, 119–122
 costs of, 116–117, 147
 damage awards for, 114, 117–118
 injunctions in, 118
 invalidation of patents and, 118
 Supreme Court and, 123
 software-based patents in, 116
 USPTO, patent quality and, 1–2