

## Defendants' Obviousness Defense Objectively Reasonable, Despite PTAB's Denial of Institution of Inter Partes Review

Oct 19, 2015

Reading Time: 1 min

By: Rubén H. Muñoz

Apple's obviousness defense was based on the fact that all of the individual claim elements were known in the prior art. The only question left for resolution was whether one of ordinary skill would have combined the various elements. In its opinion, the court noted that "[t]he Federal Circuit routinely finds that the objective prong of the willful infringement claim is not met where the defendant's obviousness claim rests on the combination of known elements."

Prior to the jury trial, Apple had filed an *inter partes* review petition, arguing that the asserted claims were obvious. The PTAB, however, denied institution, holding that there was not a reasonable likelihood that Apple would prevail with respect to at least one of the challenged claims. Likewise, the jury rejected Apple's obviousness defense at trial.

During JMOL briefing, Plaintiff argued that the PTAB's denial precluded Apple from arguing that its obviousness defense was objectively reasonable, because the PTAB's "reasonable likelihood" standard is lower than the "clear and convincing evidence" standard to prove invalidity in district court. The court, however, rejected this argument, noting that the "PTAB did not consider whether this defense was objectively reasonable or raised a substantial question." Although Apple's defense was ultimately unsuccessful, the court, nonetheless, found that it raised a substantial question as to the validity of the asserted patent, and therefore foreclosed plaintiff's claim of willfulness.

Akin

Wisconsin Alumni Research Found. v. Apple Inc., No. 3-14-cv-00062 (W.D. Wis. October 15, 2015)

## **Categories**

Patent Trial & Appeal Board

**Inter Partes Review** 

© 2025 Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP. All rights reserved. Attorney advertising. This document is distributed for informational use only; it does not constitute legal advice and should not be used as such. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. Akin is the practicing name of Akin Gump LLP, a New York limited liability partnership authorized and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority under number 267321. A list of the partners is available for inspection at Eighth Floor, Ten Bishops Square, London El 6EG. For more information about Akin Gump LLP, Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP and other associated entities under which the Akin Gump network operates worldwide, please see our Legal Notices page.

Akin