

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LICENSING AND TRANSACTIONS

Intellectual property transactions underlie large segments of the global economy, from pharmaceuticals to computing, entertainment to digital content. This first-of-its-kind resource combines practical contract drafting and negotiation skills with substantive legal doctrine in the rapidly growing area of intellectual property transactions and licensing. Though primarily designed for classroom use, it is also a must-have legal reference work for every lawyer involved in the technology, biopharma, entertainment, media or financial services industries. It includes practical drafting models and explanations of key contractual provisions such as field of use, exclusivity, milestones, royalties, termination, indemnification and liability, and combines these with discussion of the latest cases interpreting these provisions. Numerous legal doctrines that affect the enforcement of IP agreements are also covered, including exhaustion, first sale, misuse, estoppel, antitrust and bankruptcy law, as well as chapters focusing on specialized fields such as trademark law, music licensing, technical standardization, and IP pooling. This book is also available as Open Access on Cambridge Core.

Jorge L. Contreras is Presidential Scholar and Professor of Law at the University of Utah S.J. Quinney College of Law. He has over thirty years of experience in intellectual property transactions and licensing, both as a practitioner at a large international law firm and as a leading legal academic.

Intellectual Property Licensing and Transactions
THEORY AND PRACTICE

JORGE L. CONTRERAS
University of Utah



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India
103 Penang Road, #05–06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781316518038
DOI: [10.1017/9781009049436](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009049436)

© Jorge L. Contreras 2022

This work is in copyright. It is subject to statutory exceptions and to the provisions of relevant licensing agreements; with the exception of the Creative Commons version the link for which is provided below, no reproduction of any part of this work may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

An online version of this work is published at doi.org/10.1017/9781009049436 under a Creative Commons Open Access license CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 which permits re-use, distribution and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial purposes providing appropriate credit to the original work is given. You may not distribute derivative works without permission. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>

All versions of this work may contain content reproduced under license from third parties.

Permission to reproduce this third-party content must be obtained from these third-parties directly.

When citing this work, please include a reference to the DOI [10.1017/9781009049436](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009049436)

First published 2022

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

NAMES: Contreras, Jorge L., author.

TITLE: Intellectual property licensing and transactions : theory and practice / Jorge L Contreras, University of Utah.

DESCRIPTION: Cambridge, United Kingdom ; New York, NY : Cambridge University Press, 2022. | Includes index.

IDENTIFIERS: LCCN 2021052130 (print) | LCCN 2021052131 (ebook) | ISBN 9781316518038 (hardback) | ISBN 9781009048804 (paperback) | ISBN 9781009049436 (ebook)

SUBJECTS: LCSH: Intellectual property. | License agreements. | Patent licenses.

CLASSIFICATION: LCC K1405 .C66 2022 (print) | LCC K1405 (ebook) | DDC 346.04/8—dc23/eng/20211223

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021052130>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021052131>

ISBN 978-1-316-51803-8 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-009-04880-4 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <i>List of Figures</i> | <i>page xv</i> |
| <i>List of Tables</i> | xxiii |
| <i>Acknowledgments</i> | xxiv |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Why Study IP Transactions? | 1 |
| Format of This Book | 1 |
| Organization and Topics | 3 |
| Limitations: What You Will Not Find in This Book | 4 |
| Careful Drafting Pays | 5 |
| PART I INTRODUCTION TO INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LICENSING | |
| 1 The Business of Licensing | 9 |
| 1.1 The Licensing Industry | 9 |
| 1.2 Why License? | 10 |
| 1.2.1 Market Expansion (Divide and Conquer) | 10 |
| 1.2.2 Geographic Expansion | 12 |
| 1.2.3 Capacity Expansion | 12 |
| 1.2.4 Modularization | 13 |
| 1.2.5 Monetization: Direct | 14 |
| 1.2.6 Monetization: Indirect | 15 |
| 1.2.7 Rights Aggregation | 16 |
| 1.2.8 Platform Leadership | 17 |
| 2 Ownership and Assignment of Intellectual Property | 19 |
| 2.1 Assignments of Intellectual Property, Generally | 19 |
| 2.2 Assignment of Copyrights and the Work Made for Hire Doctrine | 22 |
| 2.3 Assignment of Patent Rights | 27 |
| 2.4 Trademark Assignments and Goodwill | 37 |
| 2.5 Assignment of Trade Secrets | 41 |
| 2.6 Joint Ownership | 42 |
| 2.6.1 Patents | 42 |
| 2.6.2 Copyrights | 43 |

| | | |
|--|--|------------|
| 2.6.3 | Trade Secrets | 43 |
| 2.6.4 | Trademarks | 44 |
| 3 | The Nature of an Intellectual Property License | 47 |
| 3.1 | License versus Ownership of IP | 48 |
| 3.2 | Covenant Not to Sue | 49 |
| 3.3 | The Governing Law of IP Licenses | 51 |
| 3.3.1 | State Common Law of Contracts | 51 |
| 3.3.2 | State Common Law of Property | 52 |
| 3.3.3 | The Uniform Commercial Code | 52 |
| 3.3.4 | Federal Common Law | 53 |
| 3.4 | Obligation as Condition versus Covenant | 60 |
| 3.5 | Effect of IP Transfer on Licenses | 64 |
| 4 | Implied Licenses and Unwritten Transactions | 67 |
| 4.1 | Statutes of Frauds | 67 |
| 4.2 | Pitches and Idea Submissions | 68 |
| 4.3 | Implied Licenses and Commissioned Works | 81 |
| 4.4 | Implied Licenses in Law | 89 |
| 5 | Confidentiality and Pre-license Negotiations | 97 |
| 5.1 | Initial Overtures and Declaratory Judgments | 97 |
| 5.2 | Confidentiality and Nondisclosure Agreements | 107 |
| 5.3 | Preliminary Documents | 116 |
| PART II LICENSE BUILDING BLOCKS | | |
| 6 | License Grant and Scope | 129 |
| 6.1 | Licensed Rights | 129 |
| 6.1.1 | Enumerated Rights | 129 |
| 6.1.2 | Portfolio Rights | 135 |
| 6.1.3 | The Puzzle of “Know-How” Licensing | 138 |
| 6.1.4 | Product Rights | 140 |
| 6.1.5 | Future Rights | 142 |
| 6.2 | Scope of the License: Field of Use, Licensed Products, and Territory | 143 |
| 6.2.1 | Field of Use | 143 |
| 6.2.2 | Licensed Product | 146 |
| 6.2.3 | Territory | 147 |
| 6.3 | Grant Clause | 149 |
| 6.4 | Changes to License Scope | 158 |
| 6.5 | Sublicensing | 165 |
| 7 | Exclusive Licenses | 173 |
| 7.1 | Exclusivity: Rationales and Policy | 175 |
| 7.2 | Licensor’s Obligations | 176 |
| 7.2.1 | Granting Other Licenses in the Exclusive Field | 176 |
| 7.2.2 | Licensor’s Reserved Rights | 181 |
| 7.2.3 | Licensor’s Duties with Respect to the Licensed IP | 184 |

Contents

vii

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 7.3 | Licensee's Obligations: Duty to Exploit | 186 |
| 7.3.1 | Milestone and Diligence Requirements | 186 |
| 7.3.2 | Best Efforts | 187 |
| 8 | Financial Terms | 196 |
| 8.1 | Fixed Payments | 196 |
| 8.1.1 | Up-Front and Lump-Sum Payments | 197 |
| 8.1.2 | Option Fees | 197 |
| 8.1.3 | Nonrefundable Fees | 198 |
| 8.1.4 | Advances and Applicable Fees | 199 |
| 8.2 | Running Royalties: The Royalty Rate | 199 |
| 8.2.1 | Per-Unit Royalties | 200 |
| 8.2.1.1 | Flat-Rate Royalties | 200 |
| 8.2.1.2 | Tiered Royalty Schedules | 201 |
| 8.2.2 | Percentage Royalties: The Royalty Rate | 202 |
| 8.2.2.1 | The Basics | 202 |
| 8.2.2.2 | Tiered Royalties | 202 |
| 8.2.2.3 | Royalty Rate Levels | 203 |
| 8.2.2.4 | Hybrid Royalty Rates | 206 |
| 8.2.3 | Percentage Royalties: Royalty Base | 208 |
| 8.2.3.1 | Net Sales | 208 |
| 8.2.3.2 | Licensed Products | 209 |
| 8.2.3.3 | Exclusions from Net Sales | 216 |
| 8.3 | Running Royalties: Adjustments and Limitations | 217 |
| 8.3.1 | Minimum Royalties | 217 |
| 8.3.2 | Royalty Caps | 219 |
| 8.3.3 | Royalty Buyouts | 219 |
| 8.3.4 | Royalty Escalation Clauses | 220 |
| 8.3.5 | Royalty Stacking and Bundling | 224 |
| 8.3.5.1 | Royalty Stacking Clauses | 224 |
| 8.3.5.2 | Royalties for Bundled Rights | 225 |
| 8.4 | Sublicensing Income | 226 |
| 8.5 | Milestone Payments | 228 |
| 8.6 | Equity Compensation | 235 |
| 8.7 | Cost Reimbursement | 237 |
| 8.8 | Most-Favored Clauses | 238 |
| 8.9 | Audit Clauses | 245 |
| 9 | Development, Allocation and Management of IP | 248 |
| 9.1 | Licensee Developments: Derivatives, Improvements and Grantbacks | 248 |
| 9.1.1 | Derivative Works and Improvements | 248 |
| 9.1.2 | Grantbacks | 252 |
| 9.2 | Licensor Developments: Commissioned Works | 254 |
| 9.2.1 | Allocation of IP for Commissioned Works | 254 |
| 9.2.1.1 | Customizations | 255 |
| 9.2.1.2 | Third-Party Components | 256 |
| 9.2.1.3 | Customer Materials | 257 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|------------|
| 9.2.2 | Technology Development Obligations | 257 |
| 9.3 | Joint Developments: Foreground and Background IP | 262 |
| 9.3.1 | Foreground and Background IP | 263 |
| 9.3.2 | Joint and Reserved Fields | 263 |
| 9.3.3 | Payments | 263 |
| 9.4 | IP in Joint Ventures | 265 |
| 9.4.1 | IP Contributions | 265 |
| 9.4.2 | IP Allocations | 266 |
| 9.4.3 | Exit | 267 |
| 9.5 | IP Maintenance and Prosecution | 275 |
| 9.5.1 | Responsibility for Prosecution and Maintenance | 276 |
| 9.5.2 | IP Management | 277 |
| 10 | Representations, Warranties and Indemnification | 280 |
| 10.1 | Representations and Warranties | 280 |
| 10.1.1 | Warranty of Title | 281 |
| 10.1.2 | Corporate Warranties | 286 |
| 10.1.3 | Performance Warranties | 288 |
| 10.1.3.1 | Compliance with Specifications | 288 |
| 10.1.3.2 | Reliable Performance | 288 |
| 10.1.3.3 | Malicious Code | 289 |
| 10.1.3.4 | Exclusions | 290 |
| 10.1.3.5 | Service Warranties | 290 |
| 10.1.3.6 | Duration | 291 |
| 10.1.3.7 | Remedies | 291 |
| 10.1.3.8 | Maintenance in Lieu of Warranty | 292 |
| 10.2 | Disclaimers, Exclusions and Limitations of Liability | 293 |
| 10.2.1 | Implied Warranty of Merchantability | 294 |
| 10.2.2 | Implied Warranty of Fitness for a Particular Purpose | 294 |
| 10.2.3 | Implied Warranty of Title and Noninfringement | 294 |
| 10.2.4 | Course of Dealing | 294 |
| 10.2.5 | Disclaiming Implied Warranties under the UCC | 294 |
| 10.2.6 | Special Damages | 296 |
| 10.2.7 | Exceptions to Exclusions | 296 |
| 10.2.8 | How Much is Enough? | 297 |
| 10.2.9 | Exceptions to the Cap | 297 |
| 10.3 | Intellectual Property Indemnification | 299 |
| 10.4 | Insurance | 311 |
| 11 | Litigation-Related Clauses: Enforcement, Settlement and Dispute Resolution | 313 |
| 11.1 | Licensee Standing and Joinder | 313 |
| 11.1.1 | Copyright Licensee Standing | 314 |
| 11.1.2 | Patent Licensee Standing | 321 |
| 11.1.3 | Trademark Licensee Standing | 328 |
| 11.1.4 | Trade Secret Licensee Standing | 332 |
| 11.1.5 | Joinder | 332 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|------------|
| 11.2 | Agreements to Enforce | 336 |
| 11.3 | Contractual Choice of Law | 341 |
| 11.3.1 | Jurisdictional Requirements for Domestic (US) Choice of Law | 343 |
| 11.3.2 | International Choice of Law | 344 |
| 11.3.3 | International Contractual Conventions | 346 |
| 11.3.4 | Choice of Language | 347 |
| 11.4 | Forum Selection Clauses | 349 |
| 11.5 | Alternative Dispute Resolution | 351 |
| 11.5.1 | Escalation | 351 |
| 11.5.2 | Mediation | 351 |
| 11.5.3 | Arbitration | 352 |
| 11.5.3.1 | Speed | 352 |
| 11.5.3.2 | Institutional versus Ad Hoc Arbitration | 353 |
| 11.5.3.3 | Cost | 353 |
| 11.5.3.4 | Case or Controversy | 353 |
| 11.5.3.5 | Confidentiality | 353 |
| 11.5.3.6 | Enforceability | 354 |
| 11.6 | Fee Shifting | 357 |
| 11.7 | Settlement License Agreements | 358 |
| 11.7.1 | Dismissals | 358 |
| 11.7.2 | Release and Covenant | 358 |
| 11.7.3 | Licensed Rights | 360 |
| 11.7.4 | No Admissions | 360 |
| 11.7.5 | Warranty | 360 |
| 11.7.6 | No Challenge | 361 |
| 12 | Term, Termination and Breach | 362 |
| 12.1 | Term of Agreement | 362 |
| 12.1.1 | Beginning of the Term | 362 |
| 12.1.2 | End of the Term: Expiration | 363 |
| 12.1.3 | Renewals and Extensions | 363 |
| 12.2 | Duration of Licenses | 364 |
| 12.2.1 | Duration Coincident with Agreement Term | 365 |
| 12.2.2 | Duration When an Agreement States No Term | 365 |
| 12.2.3 | “Perpetual” and IP-Duration Licenses | 365 |
| 12.3 | Breach and Termination for Cause | 374 |
| 12.3.1 | Materiality | 375 |
| 12.3.2 | Notice | 376 |
| 12.3.3 | Cure | 378 |
| 12.3.4 | Excuse of Performance: Dependencies | 378 |
| 12.4 | Termination without Cause | 381 |
| 12.5 | Effects of Termination and Survival | 383 |
| 12.5.1 | Payments | 384 |
| 12.5.2 | Return of Materials | 384 |
| 12.5.3 | Transitional Licenses | 384 |
| 12.5.4 | Transition Assistance | 385 |
| 12.5.5 | Statutory Indemnities | 386 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 12.5.6 Effect on Sublicenses | 386 |
| 12.5.7 Termination of Less than the Full Agreement | 388 |
| 12.5.8 Sole Remedy | 388 |
| 12.5.9 Survival | 388 |
| 13 Other Licensing Terms: The “Boilerplate” | 390 |
| 13.1 Front Matter | 391 |
| 13.1.1 Title | 391 |
| 13.1.2 Parties | 391 |
| 13.1.3 Effective Date | 392 |
| 13.1.4 Recitals | 392 |
| 13.1.5 Acknowledgment of Consideration | 393 |
| 13.2 Definitions | 394 |
| 13.3 Assignment | 394 |
| 13.3.1 The Right to Assign, Generally | 395 |
| 13.3.2 The Right to Assign IP Licenses | 395 |
| 13.3.3 Assignment of Licenses in M&A Transactions | 396 |
| 13.3.4 Anti-Assignment Clauses | 398 |
| 13.3.5 Transfers of Rights | 400 |
| 13.4 Patent Marking | 406 |
| 13.5 Compliance with Laws | 408 |
| 13.6 Force Majeure | 409 |
| 13.7 Merger and Entire Agreement | 411 |
| 13.8 No Waiver | 412 |
| 13.9 Severability | 413 |
| 13.10 Order of Precedence and Amendment | 414 |
| 13.11 Mutual Negotiation | 416 |
| 13.12 Notices | 416 |
| 13.13 Interpretation | 418 |
| PART III INDUSTRY- AND CONTEXT-SPECIFIC LICENSING TOPICS | |
| 14 Academic Technology Transfer | 423 |
| 14.1 Academic Research and the Bayh–Dole Act | 424 |
| 14.1.1 Ownership of Federally Funded Intellectual Property | 425 |
| 14.1.2 Royalty Sharing with Researchers | 429 |
| 14.1.3 Preference for United States Industry | 430 |
| 14.2 March-In Rights under the Bayh–Dole Act | 432 |
| 14.3 Licensing University Technology | 440 |
| 14.3.1 The Role of the TTO | 440 |
| 14.3.2 Nine Points for University Licensing | 441 |
| 14.3.3 University Reserved Rights | 442 |
| 14.3.4 Publication Rights | 442 |
| 14.3.5 Limiting Exclusivity | 443 |
| 14.3.6 Socially Responsible Licensing | 444 |
| 14.3.7 Price Controls | 445 |
| 14.4 Sponsored Research: Dollars and Options | 448 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|------------|
| 14.5 | Material Transfer | 451 |
| 14.6 | Universities and Copyright | 456 |
| 15 | Trademark and Franchise Licensing | 462 |
| 15.1 | Brand and Character Licensing | 462 |
| 15.1.1 | Trade Dress | 462 |
| 15.1.2 | Character Copyrights and Trademarks | 463 |
| 15.1.3 | Design Patents | 464 |
| 15.2 | Naked Trademark Licensing and Abandonment | 466 |
| 15.3 | Quality Control | 469 |
| 15.3.1 | The Quality Control Requirement | 469 |
| 15.3.2 | Contractual Quality Control Requirements | 475 |
| 15.4 | Trademark Usage Guidelines: Trademarks, Certification Marks and Technical Standards | 479 |
| 15.5 | Franchising | 480 |
| 15.5.1 | The Business of Franchising | 480 |
| 15.5.2 | The Franchise Agreement | 485 |
| 16 | Music Licensing | 493 |
| 16.1 | The Legal Structure of Music Copyright in the United States | 493 |
| 16.2 | Licensing Musical Works and Compositions | 495 |
| 16.2.1 | The “Mechanical” Reproduction Right | 496 |
| 16.2.2 | The Compulsory License for Mechanical Reproductions under Section 115 | 496 |
| 16.2.3 | Public Performance Rights and Performing Rights Organizations (PROs) | 504 |
| 16.3 | Licensing Sound Recordings | 508 |
| 16.3.1 | Reproduction and Distribution Rights | 508 |
| 16.3.2 | Public Performance Rights: Nondigital | 508 |
| 16.3.3 | Public Performance Rights: Digital | 510 |
| 16.3.3.1 | Interactive and Noninteractive Services | 510 |
| 16.3.3.2 | The Statutory License for Noninteractive Services | 510 |
| 16.3.3.3 | Privately Negotiated Licenses for Interactive Services | 511 |
| 16.4 | Synchronization Rights | 518 |
| 16.5 | Music Sampling | 521 |
| 17 | Consumer and Online Licensing | 523 |
| 17.1 | Shrinkwrap Licenses | 524 |
| 17.2 | Clickwrap and Browsewrap Licenses | 540 |
| 17.3 | The (D)evolution of Consumer Licenses | 550 |
| 18 | Software, Data and the Cloud | 556 |
| 18.1 | Data and Databases | 556 |
| 18.1.1 | Protecting the Unprotectable | 556 |
| 18.1.2 | Licensing Data | 560 |
| 18.1.2.1 | Trade Secrets | 560 |
| 18.1.2.2 | Data Licensing as a Contractual Matter | 560 |
| 18.1.3 | Noncircumvention and Noncompetition in Data Licensing | 566 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 18.1.4 Data Privacy | 573 |
| 18.2 Proprietary Software Licensing | 575 |
| 18.2.1 Source Code and Object Code | 575 |
| 18.2.2 Legal Protection of Software | 577 |
| 18.2.2.1 Copyright | 577 |
| 18.2.2.2 Patents | 579 |
| 18.2.2.3 Trade Secrets | 580 |
| 18.2.3 Software Licensing | 581 |
| 18.2.3.1 Software Use Licenses | 581 |
| 18.2.3.2 Software Distribution Agreements | 581 |
| 18.2.3.3 Proprietary Source Code Licenses | 582 |
| 18.2.4 Maintenance, Support, Updates and Upgrades | 584 |
| 18.2.5 Reverse Engineering Restrictions | 585 |
| 18.3 Licensing in the Cloud | 586 |
| 19 Public Licenses: Open Source, Creative Commons and IP Pledges | 592 |
| 19.1 Creative Commons and Open Content Licensing | 592 |
| 19.2 The Open Source Phenomenon | 597 |
| 19.2.1 Origins: The Free Software Movement | 597 |
| 19.2.2 Defining Open Source Software | 601 |
| 19.2.3 The BSD Licenses | 605 |
| 19.2.4 The GNU General Public License | 608 |
| 19.2.4.1 Access to Source Code | 609 |
| 19.2.4.2 Copyleft: The “Viral” Nature of GPL | 609 |
| 19.2.4.3 Anti-Anti-Circumvention | 610 |
| 19.2.4.4 Anti-Tivoization | 610 |
| 19.2.4.5 Patentleft | 611 |
| 19.2.5 Enforcement of OSS Licenses | 616 |
| 19.3 Open Source in the Commercial Market | 622 |
| 19.3.1 Open Source as a Business Model | 623 |
| 19.3.2 Integrating OSS with Commercial Products | 628 |
| 19.3.2.1 Considerations for Using OSS in a Corporate Enterprise | 628 |
| 19.3.2.2 Considerations for Incorporating OSS into a Distributed Product | 629 |
| 19.3.2.3 Required Notices and Licensing Terms | 629 |
| 19.3.3 OSS Due Diligence | 631 |
| 19.4 Patent Pledges | 632 |
| 20 Technical Standards: Fair, Reasonable and Nondiscriminatory (FRAND) Licensing | 637 |
| 20.1 Standards, Standardization and Patents | 637 |
| 20.1.1 The SDO Ecosystem | 638 |
| 20.1.2 Patents and Standards | 638 |
| 20.1.3 SDO IP Policies | 640 |
| 20.1.4 The Challenge of Defining FRAND Royalty Rates | 641 |

Contents

xiii

| | |
|---|-----|
| 20.2 Patent Disclosure Policies | 644 |
| 20.3 FRAND Royalty Rates | 654 |
| 20.3.1 FRAND Royalties in the United States and the Georgia-Pacific Framework | 655 |
| 20.3.2 Bottom-Up versus Top-Down Royalty Determinations | 656 |
| 20.4 Nondiscrimination and FRAND Commitments | 659 |
| 20.4.1 Hard-Edged Nondiscrimination | 660 |
| 20.4.2 Level Discrimination | 660 |
| 20.5 Effect of a FRAND Commitment on Injunctive Relief | 662 |
| 20.6 The Transfer of FRAND Commitments | 668 |
| | |
| PART IV ADVANCED LICENSING TOPICS | |
| | |
| 21 Bankruptcy and Insolvency Issues | 673 |
| 21.1 Automatic Stay of Proceedings | 673 |
| 21.2 The Bankruptcy Estate | 677 |
| 21.3 Executory Contracts and Section 365(n) | 678 |
| 21.4 Assignment by Bankrupt Licensee | 684 |
| 21.5 <i>Ipsa Facto</i> Clauses | 685 |
| 21.6 Bankruptcy and Escrow | 687 |
| | |
| 22 Estoppel and No-Challenge Clauses | 691 |
| 22.1 Assignor Estoppel | 691 |
| 22.2 Licensee Estoppel | 699 |
| 22.3 Validity Challenges under the Declaratory Judgment Act | 709 |
| 22.4 No-Challenge Clauses | 712 |
| 22.4.1 Agreements Not to Challenge | 712 |
| 22.4.2 No-Challenge Clauses in Copyright and Trademark Licenses | 718 |
| 22.4.3 Other Penalties for Validity Challenges | 725 |
| | |
| 23 First Sale and Exhaustion | 731 |
| 23.1 Copyright First Sale | 731 |
| 23.2 Software Sale versus License | 736 |
| 23.3 Trademark Exhaustion and First Sale | 746 |
| 23.4 Patent Exhaustion | 752 |
| 23.5 Conditional Sales and Post-Sale Restrictions | 764 |
| 23.6 International First Sale, Exhaustion and Gray Markets | 771 |
| 23.6.1 International First Sale and Copyrights | 771 |
| 23.6.2 International Patent Exhaustion | 778 |
| 23.6.3 International Trademark Exhaustion and the Gray Market | 781 |
| | |
| 24 Intellectual Property Misuse | 790 |
| 24.1 The Origins of the Misuse Doctrine | 791 |
| 24.2 Misuse by Scope Expansion: Tying and Statutory Reform | 795 |
| 24.3 Misuse by Term Expansion: Post-Expiration Royalties | 798 |
| 24.3.1 The Long Shadow of <i>Brulotte</i> | 798 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 24.3.2 The Limits of <i>Brulotte</i> : <i>Aronson v. Quick Point</i> and Unpatented Articles | 805 |
| 24.4 Misuse by Bundling: Package Licensing | 808 |
| 24.5 Noncompetition and Copyright Misuse | 817 |
| 25 Antitrust and Competition Issues | 824 |
| 25.1 <i>Per Se</i> Illegality versus the Rule of Reason | 827 |
| 25.2 Price Fixing | 828 |
| 25.3 Market Allocation | 832 |
| 25.4 Vertical Restraints: Resale Price Maintenance | 840 |
| 25.5 Unilateral Conduct: Tying | 848 |
| 25.6 Monopolization and Market Power | 857 |
| 25.7 Refusals to Deal: Unilateral and Concerted | 866 |
| 25.8 Antitrust Issues and Due Process in Standard Setting | 871 |
| 25.9 Reverse Payment Settlements: “Pay for Delay” | 875 |
| 26 Intellectual Property Pools and Aggregation | 885 |
| 26.1 Theories of IP Pooling: Efficiency and Enablement | 887 |
| 26.2 Antitrust Analysis of Patent Pools | 891 |
| 26.3 Patent Pools for Standards | 898 |
| 26.4 Complementarity and Essentiality in Patent Pools | 911 |
| <i>Index</i> | 918 |

Figures

- | | | |
|-----|--|---------|
| 1.1 | Auto makers like Ferrari do not manufacture the merchandise that bears their famous logos. Source: eBay/WhyBee. | page 11 |
| 1.2 | Jonathan Barnett illustrates how licensing enables motion picture firms to divide distribution rights among multiple entities, each with a specific role in the supply chain. Source: Jonathan Barnett. | 13 |
| 1.3 | The debate over “patent trolls” has been raging for over a decade. Source: US Patent and Trademark Office. | 16 |
| 1.4 | Large information technology companies like IBM and Google embraced the open source Linux operating system to support the sale of associated hardware, services and advertising. Source: Linux Foundation. | 18 |
| 2.1 | Warren claimed that he created 1,914 musical works for the popular 1980s TV series <i>Remington Steele</i> . Source: NBC/MTM Enterprises. | 23 |
| 2.2 | The creators of the Superman character died in near poverty while the Man of Steel went on to form a multi-billion-dollar franchise. Source: Action Comics (public domain). | 27 |
| 2.3 | FilmTec reverse osmosis membrane filter. Source: DuPont Corp. | 29 |
| 2.4 | Schematic showing possible assignment pathways for Cadotte’s invention. Source: the author. | 30 |
| 2.5 | Richard Alleshouse was the product manager for Wave Loch’s FlowRider attraction, shown here as installed on the upper deck of a Royal Caribbean cruise ship. Source: Traveloscopy, CC BY-ND 2.0. | 35 |
| 2.6 | Though he was an original member of the musical group The Commodores, Thomas McClary did not retain rights to utilize the group’s name after he left the band in 1984. Source: The Commodores. | 45 |
| 3.1 | The Mashantucket Pequot Museum & Research Center in Ledyard, Connecticut, commissioned a film about the Pequot War of 1636–38. Source: Stilfehler, CC BY-SA 3.0. | 55 |
| 3.2 | Chief Judge Henry T. Friendly, the author of the opinion in <i>T.B. Harms</i> , served on the US Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit from 1959–1986. Source: US Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. | 56 |
| 4.1 | Tornado Taz. Source: Play-By-Play Toys & Novelties, Inc. | 70 |
| 4.2 | “Psycho Chihuahua” and the Taco Bell chihuahua. Source: (L) Joseph Shields, Thomas Rinks; (R) Taco Bell Corp. | 76 |

- 4.3 *I.A.E. v. Shaver* involved an architect's plans for an air cargo building at Gary Regional Airport (now Gary/Chicago International Airport (GYI)). Source: Gary/Chicago International Airport. 83
- 4.4 *Effects Associates* involved the development of a gruesome special effect for the horror film *The Stuff*. Source: New World Pictures. 85
- 4.5 NBA star LeBron James is reported to have twenty-four tattoos, many of which were created by LA-based artist gangatattoo. Source: Getty Images/Harry How. 89
- 4.6 The patented shrimp knife and deveiner at issue in *McCoy*. Source: (L) US Patent and Trademark Office; (R) Alex-Duncan Shrimp Chef, Inc. 91
- 4.7 The dispute in *TransCore v. Elec. Transaction Consultants* involved patents covering E-ZPass electronic tollbooth devices. Source: "Approaching NJ Turnpike northern barrier" by bobsled, CC BY-SA 2.0. 95
- 5.1 Figure from US Patent No. 5,073,816, "Packaging semiconductor chips," which ST claimed that SanDisk infringed. Source: US Patent and Trademark Office. 100
- 5.2 The dispute in *MedImmune v. Genentech* involved a Genentech patent claiming antibody technology. Source: MedImmune. 105
- 5.3 The formula for Coca-Cola, which is allegedly stored in this imposing vault in Atlanta, has been a trade secret since 1886. Source: Mx Granger, CC0. 113
- 5.4 A Rockwell 33.6 K analog modem, c.1990s. Source: Rockwell Elecs. 114
- 5.5 The record-breaking verdict in *Texaco v. Pennzoil* reinvigorated the popular notion that a handshake is a binding commitment. Source: Universal Pictures (Law and Order (1953)). 118
- 6.1 Graphical representation of a patent "family." Source: Jim Farrington. 131
- 6.2 Ownership and license of '011 and '946 patents in *Spindelfabrik*. Source: the author. 133
- 6.3 Affiliate relationships in a corporate "family." Source: the author. 137
- 6.4 In *General Talking Pictures*, the Supreme Court validated the division of patent license rights according to technical fields of use. Source: the author. 146
- 6.5 The territory of "North America" consists of about forty different countries. Source: "Central Americas (Feb 1960)" by davecito, CC BY 2.0. 148
- 6.6 The complex flow of license rights in *Cyrix v. Intel*. Source: the author. 152
- 6.7 The "have-made" arrangements in *du Pont v. Shell*. Source: the author. 155
- 6.8 Igor Stravinsky and Walt Disney. Source: public domain. 159
- 6.9 The 1991 VHS videotape version of Disney's *Fantasia* sparked a dispute with Igor Stravinsky's estate. Source: the author. 161
- 6.10 William Styron's *Sophie's Choice*, one of the titles at issue in *Random House v. Rosetta Books*. Source: (L) Random House; (R) Rosetta Books. 164
- 6.11 Graphical representation of license and sublicense rights. Source: the author. 165
- 7.1 The complex, multi-tiered exclusive and nonexclusive licensing structure for CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing technology as it existed in early 2017. Source: Jorge L. Contreras & Jacob S. Sherkow, *Science* 355: 698 (2017). 174
- 7.2 Illustration from one of Duncan's "Bandalore Toy" patents, U.S. Pat. No. D175,022 (June 28, 1955). Source: US Patent and Trademark Office. 180
- 7.3 Martha Stewart display inside a J.C. Penney's store. Source: J.C. Penney's. 185
- 7.4 Lucy Christiana Lady Duff Gordon (1863–1935). Source: public domain. 189

List of Figures

xvii

- | | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 8.1 | Spyglass, Inc. licensed its Mosaic web browser code to Microsoft for \$2 million. Source: Spyclass, Inc. | 198 |
| 8.2 | Former President Barack Obama received a \$20 million advance in 2017 for his memoir <i>Dreams from My Father</i> , the largest single-book advance on record, though some argue that Bill Clinton’s \$15 million advance for his 2001 memoir <i>My Life</i> was larger in inflation-adjusted dollars. Source: Times Books. | 200 |
| 8.3 | The Walt Disney Company owns some of the world’s most valuable brands and is reported to earn 15.5 percent of all IP licensing revenue in the United States. Source: The Walt Disney Co. | 204 |
| 8.4 | H.W. Allen (1909–1979) with a prototype of his compound bow invention. Source: unknown/public domain. | 210 |
| 8.5 | The court in <i>Allen Archery</i> held that a crossbow’s stock, overdraw mechanism and camouflage paint were not “accessories” excluded from the royalty calculation, even if they were not covered by the patent claims and could be purchased separately. Source: Getty Images. | 213 |
| 8.6 | Sales illustrating the importance of carefully allocating sublicensing income. Source: the author. | 227 |
| 8.7 | Stanford University is reported to have earned \$336 million by selling shares of Google stock in the company’s 2004 IPO and subsequent offerings. Source: Getty Images/Alan Perlman Foto Associates. | 235 |
| 8.8 | The SGK–Hercules agreement concerned patent rights in polypropylene, a plastic used to make a wide range of products from Tic-Tac containers to furniture. Source: Alex Rio Brazil, CC BY-SA 3.0. | 242 |
| 9.1 | To what degree might a software logistics system customized for the wine and spirits market be useful in the pharmaceuticals market? Source: the author (using free clipart). | 255 |
| 9.2 | The two principal JV structures. Source: the author. | 265 |
| 9.3 | U.S. Patent No. 3,377,933 was assigned to Pav-Saver Corp. and licensed exclusively to the PSMC joint venture. Source: US Patent and Trademark Office. | 268 |
| 9.4 | A Pav-Saver road-paving machine. Source: unknown. | 274 |
| 10.1 | After the Warhol estate granted rights in many of Andy Warhol’s works to SNC, other deals began to emerge, including an exclusive license of Warhol’s prints to a watchmaker. Source: unknown. | 285 |
| 10.2 | The 1993 film <i>Jurassic Park</i> introduced many viewers to the dangers of malicious computer code. Source: Universal Pictures. | 290 |
| 10.3 | Illustration of the basic structure for IP indemnification. Source: the author. | 299 |
| 10.4 | The parties and dispute in <i>SoCal Gas v. Syntellect</i> . Source: the author, using images of unknown origin. | 307 |
| 11.1 | The 2016 film <i>Fathers and Daughters</i> starring Russell Crowe and Amanda Seyfried was the subject of the copyright dispute in <i>Fathers & Daughters Nevada, LLC v. Zhang</i> . Source: Lakeshore Entertainment and Voltage Pictures. | 315 |
| 11.2 | A 1995 stainless steel Benrus “Men’s Modern” watch issued to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of D-Day. Source: unknown. | 329 |
| 11.3 | According to its website, the North Carolina Coalition for Global Competitiveness “wants people all around the world to recognize and know North Carolina as a great | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| place to invest, work, study, visit, partner, and live.” Source: https://goglobalinc.org/global-engagement/ . | 344 |
| 12.1 A 1915 advertisement for Listerine. Source: public domain. | 371 |
| 12.2 Operation of a nondisturbance agreement. Source: the author. | 387 |
| 13.1 Elihu Thomson, founder of the Thomson Electric Welding Co., was one of the late nineteenth century’s greatest inventors, with nearly 700 patents to his name. Source: public domain. | 393 |
| 13.2 The Supreme Court’s 1852 decision in <i>Troy Iron & Nail</i> first established that patent licensing agreements are not assignable. Source: public domain. | 396 |
| 13.3 Asset acquisitions, stock acquisitions and mergers. Source: the author. | 398 |
| 13.4 Guardian Glass got its start as a manufacturer of automotive windshields. Source: public domain. | 402 |
| 13.5 Historically, patented articles were marked with applicable patent numbers. Source: the author. | 407 |
| 13.6 Many older agreements still provide for official notice by Telex or teletype machine. Source: ArnoldReinhold, CC BY 2.0. | 418 |
| 14.1 Senators Birch Bayh and Bob Dole. Source: US Senate. | 425 |
| 14.2 Stanford University failed to acquire rights in one of its researchers’ inventions due to the future-looking language of its IP assignment policy. Source: “New stadium, wide-angle view” by maveric2003, CC BY 2.0. | 429 |
| 14.3 Genzyme’s Fabrazyme. Source: Genzyme. | 433 |
| 14.4 Federal laboratories like Sandia National Laboratory in New Mexico have active technology licensing and commercialization programs. Source: Sandia National Lab. | 440 |
| 14.5 Tobacco plants have been genetically modified to grow larger, faster and more efficiently. Source: public domain. | 448 |
| 15.1 In <i>Two Pesos v. Taco Cabana</i> , the Supreme Court recognized the protectable elements of Taco Cabana’s interior and exterior store design – features that are regularly licensed as part of fast-food franchises. Source: unknown. | 463 |
| 15.2 Apple’s 2013 registration for the Apple Store layout (No. 4,277,914). Source: US Patent and Trademark Office. | 464 |
| 15.3 In addition to the Star Wars® brand, the copyrighted Star Wars characters have been licensed for use in thousands of products from plush toys and action figures to knee socks and table lamps. Source: various online sources. | 465 |
| 15.4 1932 design patent for the “Betty Boop” character. Source: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. | 465 |
| 15.5 Denver Chemical sold its popular “Antiphlogistine” compound as a general topical analgesic. Source: public domain. | 468 |
| 15.6 Dawn Donut Co. licensed its trademark to bakeries and retailers who used its packaged mixes for doughnuts, coffee cakes, cinnamon rolls and oven goods. Source: unknown/public domain. | 469 |
| 15.7 Label from a bottle of DaVinci Chianti. Source: unknown. | 471 |
| 15.8 Competing “XX” marks used by Exxon Corp. and Oxxford Clothes. Source: unknown. | 476 |
| 15.9 Exxon’s XX trademark registration and other XX marks challenged by Exxon and subject to phrase-out agreements. Source: US Patent and Trademark Office. | 476 |

List of Figures

xix

- 15.10 Beginning in 1925, Howard Johnson used franchising to expand from a single soda fountain outside of Boston into a nationwide chain of more than 1,000 orange-roofed family restaurants. Source: public domain. 481
- 15.11 Subway's national \$4.99 Footlong promotion reportedly hurt franchisees. Source: Subway. 483
- 15.12 The cover of Dunkin' Donuts 2008 Franchise Disclosure Document (508 pages in total), which discloses that a total investment of \$240,250–1,699,850 is required to acquire and begin operations of a Dunkin' Donuts franchise Source: Dunkin Donuts. 484
- 15.13 The (now-closed) IHOP in Spanish Fort, Alabama. Source: unknown. 489
- 16.1 Prior to 1972, US copyright law did not protect sound recordings, leaving performances of public domain works (such as much of the classical repertoire) entirely without protection. Source: "Dublin Philharmonic Orchestra performing Tchaikovsky's Symphony No 4 in Charlotte, North Carolina.jpg" by Derek Gleeson, CC BY-SA 3.0. 495
- 16.2 Paper rolls used in player pianos were the first "mechanical" reproductions of music. Source: public domain. 496
- 16.3 In 2010, the Copyright Royalty Board determined compulsory licensing rates for ringtones. Source: unknown. 500
- 16.4 US music industry revenues, 2004 and 2013. Source: Recording Industry Association of America. 504
- 16.5 SoundExchange, BMI, ASCAP and SESAC logos. Source: logos are owned by their respective owners. 505
- 16.6 Recording artist Rihanna objected via Twitter to the Trump campaign's performance of her song "Don't Stop the Music." Source: Twitter/Rihanna. 510
- 16.7 John Williams, who composed the music for *Star Wars*, won the 1978 Oscar for Best Original Score. Source: Twentieth Century Fox. 520
- 17.1 ProCD's SelectPhone product (c.1994). Source: unknown. 525
- 17.2 Mortenson used Timberline's Precision Bid Analysis software to prepare a bid for a project at Harborview Medical Center in Seattle. Source: unknown. 535
- 17.3 A 1980s-era computer terminal of the type at issue in *Step-Saver*. Source: unknown. 538
- 17.4 Vendors have sought to control the use of products, including seedless grapes, through "shrinkwrap" agreements. Source: Twitter/TubeTime. 539
- 17.5 Netscape Navigator was the most popular early web browser. Source: Netscape Communications. 542
- 17.6 Number of terms changed, 2003 vs. 2010. Source: Florencia Marotta-Wurgler and Robert Taylor, 88 NYU L. Rev. 240 (2013). 551
- 17.7 Chief Justice Roberts admits that he doesn't read the fine print ... Source: United States Supreme Court. 553
- 18.1 In the 1980s, Xerox sold investment portfolios comprising revenue streams from hundreds of leased photocopier machines. Source: Xerox Corp. 569
- 18.2 Amazon makes a range of applications available on a service-basis through Amazon Web Services (AWS). Source: Amazon Web Services. 588
- 19.1 The Creative Commons suite of licenses. Source: Creative Commons 595
- 19.2 Richard Stallman, founder of the free software movement, speaking in Oslo as Saint IGNUcius in 2009. Source: Gisle Hannemyr, CC BY-SA 2.0. 600

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| 19.3 | Eric Raymond, one of the founders of OSI, in 2004. Source: Eric S. Raymond. | 604 |
| 19.4 | A “daemon” is a type of software agent. Source: BSD Project. | 606 |
| 19.5 | Graphical illustration of the perceived “viral effect” of GPL software combined with proprietary software. Source: the author. | 610 |
| 19.6 | In 1999 TiVo introduced the first successful mass-market DVR device. Source: TiVo. | 611 |
| 19.7 | Screenshot from the DecoderPro model railroad control software released by Jacobsen for the JMRI project. Source: DecoderPro. | 617 |
| 19.8 | <i>Jacobsen v. Katzer</i> concerned OSS used to control model trains. Source: MIKI Yoshihito, CC BY. | 621 |
| 19.9 | Major OSS successes include the Linux and Android operating systems, the Apache web server, the Firefox browser and Red Hat, which provides services related to Linux. Source: logos are owned by their respective owners. | 623 |
| 19.10 | Elon Musk, the flamboyant CEO of Tesla Motors, pledged all of the company’s patents in a 2014 blog post. Source: Maurizio Pesce, CC BY 2.0. | 635 |
| 20.1 | A lack of standardized fire hydrant couplings resulted in a tragic loss of life and property in the 1904 Baltimore fire. Source: public domain. | 638 |
| 20.2 | A 2017 meeting of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Source: the author. | 639 |
| 20.3 | (a) Contract paradigm – black to white: “I will grant you a license.” (b) Standards Paradigm – black to SDO: “I will grant implementers a license.” Source: the author. | 658 |
| 21.1 | Some technology escrow providers. Source: logos are owned by their respective owners. | 690 |
| 22.1 | The gyroscope invention in <i>Lear v. Adkins</i> . Source: US Patent and Trademark Office. | 701 |
| 22.2 | The Drackett Chemical Company of Cincinnati, Ohio, created many household cleaning products that are still in use, including Windex, Dawn and Drano. Source: Drackett Chem. Co. – public domain. | 707 |
| 22.3 | In <i>Troxel v. Schwinn</i> , Schwinn held a design patent for a bicycle seat issued in 1966. Source: US Patent and Trademark Office. | 708 |
| 22.4 | Flex-Foot’s patented “bladerunner” prosthesis design gained worldwide attention when used by South Africa’s Oscar Pistorius to run the 400 m sprint at the 2012 London Olympics. Source: (L) U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; (R) theglobalpanorama, CC BY-SA 2.0. | 714 |
| 22.5 | Porcelain figurine based on a Norman Rockwell illustration. Source: unknown. | 718 |
| 22.6 | One of the Idaho Potato Commission’s certification marks for Idaho-grown potatoes. Source: Idaho Potato Commission. | 720 |
| 23.1 | <i>The Castaway: Three Great Men Ruined in One Year – A King, A Cad and a Castaway</i> , by Hallie Ermine Rives (1904). Source: Library of Congress. | 732 |
| 23.2 | Autodesk’s AutoCAD 14 software. Source: unknown. | 739 |
| 23.3 | In <i>Enesco v. Price/Costco</i> , Costco repackaged porcelain angels manufactured by Enesco in allegedly inferior packaging. Source: (L) unknown; (R) Costco. | 749 |
| 23.4 | Figures from U.S. Patent No. 38,713 (May 26, 1863) “Improvement in Coffin Lids.” Source: US Patent and Trademark Office. | 754 |
| 23.5 | The parties in <i>Quanta v. LGE</i> . Source: logos are owned by their respective owners. | 757 |

List of Figures

xxi

- | | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| 23.6 | An Intel chip integrated into a computer board. Source: unknown. | 759 |
| 23.7 | A portion of the product information brochure for Mallinckrodt's UltraVent device. Source: Mallinckrodt, Inc. | 765 |
| 23.8 | J. Walker, <i>Fundamentals of Physics</i> (Wiley, 8th ed. (US), 2008) – one of the textbooks at issue in <i>Kirtsaeng v. Wiley</i> . Source: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. | 773 |
| 23.9 | Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg dissented in both <i>Kirtsaeng</i> and <i>Impression Products</i> . Source: U.S. Supreme Court. | 781 |
| 23.10 | Flow of goods in the “gray market.” Source: the Author; Nike, Inc. | 782 |
| 23.11 | Nestlé sought to prevent its former distributor from importing Venezuelan Perugina-branded chocolates into Puerto Rico. Source: Societe Des Produits Nestle, S.A. | 783 |
| 24.1 | G.S. Suppiger Co. leased its patented salt-depositing machines to canneries with a contractual requirement that they purchase unpatented salt tablets exclusively from Suppiger. Source: public domain. | 793 |
| 24.2 | The 1931 Minneapolis-Honeywell furnace control system patent and a Honeywell furnace switch (unpatented). Source: (L) US Patent and Trademark Office; (R) unknown. | 796 |
| 24.3 | Prior to the introduction of mechanical hop-picking equipment, the harvesting of hops was a labor-intensive manual process. Source: US Department of Agriculture. | 799 |
| 24.4 | <i>Kimble v. Marvel</i> involved a licensing agreement entered into to settle patent litigation over the popular “Web Blaster” toy. Source: ToyBiz. | 801 |
| 24.5 | Decided nearly two decades apart, <i>Automatic Radio</i> and <i>Zenith</i> both involved licenses by Hazeltine, an early electronics patent aggregator and licensing entity. Source: unknown. | 815 |
| 24.6 | Lasercomb's software related to the computer-aided design of steel rule dies for cutting cardboard. Source: Getty Images/Bloomberg. | 820 |
| 24.7 | Video Pipeline allegedly displayed short clips of more than sixty Disney films on its website without authorization. Source: Walt Disney Co. | 822 |
| 25.1 | The Sherman Act was enacted to combat the worst abuses of sprawling business “trusts.” Source: public domain. | 825 |
| 25.2 | Unlike most countries, the United States has two antitrust enforcement agencies with overlapping jurisdiction and sometimes conflicting policies. Source: U.S. government. | 827 |
| 25.3 | Some of the brands developed by Topco. Source: Topco Association. | 834 |
| 25.4 | Brighton handbag and belt by Leegin. Source: unknown. | 841 |
| 25.5 | With “block booking,” in order to show classic films like <i>Casablanca</i> , television stations and movie theaters were also required to license, and pay for, “B” movies like <i>The Gorilla Man</i> . Source: Warner Bros. | 856 |
| 25.6 | Häagen-Dazs successfully argued that inexpensive and expensive ice cream products compete in the same market. Source: unknown. | 858 |
| 25.7 | Microsoft's Windows operating system captured 95 percent of the relevant operating system market. Source: Microsoft Corp. | 865 |
| 25.8 | The Nickelodeon Theater in Santa Cruz, Cal. Source: “The Nick” by ESHELMS, CC BY 2.0. | 868 |
| 25.9 | The National Electrical Code is published by the National Fire Protection Association. Source: National Fire Protection Association. | 871 |

- | | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 26.1 | Basic structure of a patent pool with per-patent allocation of royalties and no pool administration charges. Source: the author. | 886 |
| 26.2 | In this iconic 1904 illustration from <i>Puck</i> , the Standard Oil Company is depicted as a malignant octopus wrapping its tentacles around state and federal legislatures, the White House and representatives of the steel, copper and shipping industries. Source: public domain. | 895 |
| 26.3 | The US Navy pressured feuding aircraft manufacturers Curtiss and Wright to form an early aviation patent pool prior to US entry into World War I. Source: US Patent and Trademark Office. | 896 |
| 26.4 | Patents covering many important standards today are licensed through patent pools. Source: logos are owned by their respective owners. | 902 |
| 26.5 | Two manufacturers of PRK equipment for laser eye surgery pooled their patents in an arrangement challenged by the FTC. Source: US Air Force. | 908 |
| 26.6 | Can patent pools promote the broad accessibility of CRISPR gene-editing technology? Source: National Institutes of Health. | 911 |
| 26.7 | Cellular communication protocols have evolved to enable better, faster and higher bandwidth connections and voice, data and video content transmission. Source: the author, photos from various unknown sources. | 915 |

Tables

| | | |
|------|---|----------------|
| 3.1 | Rights in an item of IP (X) after a transaction between A and B | <i>Page</i> 49 |
| 8.1 | A tiered royalty schedule | 201 |
| 8.2 | A volume-based tiered percentage royalty schedule | 202 |
| 9.1 | Sample allocation of joint development IP rights | 264 |
| 9.2 | Sample allocation of JV IP rights | 266 |
| 16.1 | Summary of music licensing provisions | 520 |
| 16.2 | Sampling costs | 521 |
| 20.1 | US-litigated FRAND royalty determinations for 802.11 (Wi-Fi) standard-essential patents | 657 |

Acknowledgments

This book represents the culmination of many years of counseling, drafting, negotiating and teaching in the area of IP transactions and licensing. I am indebted to those who took the time to train, educate and mentor me when I embarked on this little-known but rewarding practice more than thirty years ago. Professors Lloyd Weinreb, Michael Boudin, Stephen Breyer and William Alford at Harvard Law School inspired in me an early appreciation for the intricacies of intellectual property, international law and technology regulation. Ron Laurie, my first law firm mentor in this area, remains a leader in the field. I owe a significant debt of gratitude to those partners at Hale and Dorr in Boston (now WilmerHale) who spent countless hours teaching me the ropes of the corporate and transactional world, including the things that never appear in case books and law review articles: Mike Bevilacqua, John Burgess, Bill Benjamin, David Westenberg, and many others. I am also grateful to the many law firm colleagues, clients, co-counsel and academics with whom I have collaborated over the years, each of whom has added to my store of knowledge of the field, and especially Laura Blood, my colleague in post-firm law practice, whose skill and attention to detail are unmatched. My first experience teaching IP transactions and licensing was at Washington University in St. Louis, where I co-taught the course with Blythe Burkhardt, who, with great experience and good humor, helped me to translate years of esoteric knowledge into a format suitable for students.

Several people contributed to the planning and development of this book. The late Professor Ray Nimmer at University of Houston Law Center was the initial inspiration for this project, and I used his excellent 2007 case book for years as I developed my own approach to teaching the subject. Greg Vetter at University of Houston and Jennifer Carter-Johnson and Jeff Carter-Johnson at Michigan State University provided invaluable input and support in the planning of this book. Matt Gallaway at Cambridge University Press was strongly committed to the open access nature of this book and made its publication possible. Patti Beekhuizen and Matthew Whitehead at the University of Utah provided invaluable help in preparing the manuscript, and many of my students over the years suffered through half-written chapters and notes as the book coalesced into its final form.

The “beta” version of this book was used by several brave instructors during 2021 and 2022 and I am grateful for their feedback and suggestions regarding its usability and improvement. I am particularly grateful to Jacques de Werra, Louis Brucculeri and, most especially, Jim Farrington at University of Notre Dame for reviewing and commenting on the manuscript.

Finally, I must thank my wife, Kimberly Kaphingst, whose endless patience allowed me to miss far too many birthdays, anniversaries and holidays while I was negotiating IP transactions around the world and grappling with the issues that are now presented in this book.