

Hughes Hubbard & Reed
Patent Litigation

Unexpected
approaches.

Real results.



Meet our Team Leaders



Andrew Kopsidas focuses on IP litigation and strategic counseling for companies in a range of industries including internet, telecommunications, and

aerospace & defense. He has experience in solving problems relating to issues with technology, trade secrets, and intellectual property disputes. Andrew is a lead trial lawyer recognized for producing positive results for his clients.

+1 (202) 721-4615 • andrew.kopsidas@hugheshubbard.com



Patrice P. Jean, Ph.D. focuses on patent litigation with emphasis on matters involving pharmaceutical, chemical, and biological technologies. She

has extensive experience representing innovator companies in asserting and defending patents protecting subject matter embodied in FDA-approved compositions, diagnostic methods, and medical devices.

+1 (212) 837-6264 • patrice.jean@hugheshubbard.com



James W. Dabney focuses on contentious matters involving patents in diverse technical fields. He was lead trial and appellate counsel for the prevailing parties

in *KSR* and *TC Heartland*. Jim is also adjunct Professor of Law at Cornell Law School and sole named inventor of two patents.

+1 (212) 837-6803 • james.dabney@hugheshubbard.com



James R. Klaiber offers particular education and experience in electrical and mechanical technologies. His cases have involved wireless and optical

fiber telecommunications, electronic securities exchanges and financial transaction software, semiconductor design and manufacture, medical electrodes and prosthetic devices, and plasma screen and cathode ray tube displays.

+1 (212) 837-6125 • james.klaiber@hugheshubbard.com



John F. Duffy is Of Counsel to Hughes Hubbard and the Samuel H. McCoy II Professor of Law at the University of Virginia. Professor Duffy is a former

law clerk to Justice Antonin Scalia, a registered patent attorney, co-author of a widely used patent law casebook, and author or co-author of numerous articles on intellectual property and administrative law.

+1 (202) 721-4652 • john.duffy@hugheshubbard.com

The whole is more than the sum of its parts.

Law Professor

Molecular Biologist

Casebook Co-author

Mechanical Engineer

Patent Holder

Named an **“Intellectual
Property Group
of the Year”** by Law360

Won landmark patent venue case

TC Heartland v. Kraft Foods, 137 S. Ct. 1514 (2017). Won unanimous decision holding patent infringement action subject to transfer for

improper venue; successfully urged Supreme Court to overturn lower court precedent interpreting 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b).

Already v. Nike, 568 U.S. 85 (2013). Won dismissal of claims for alleged infringement of patent-like rights claimed in athletic shoe configuration; successfully urged Court to overturn lower court precedent interpreting Article III mootness doctrine.

Won most cited patent case of all time

KSR v. Teleflex, 550 U.S. 398 (2007). Won dismissal of claims for alleged infringement of three patents claiming vehicle control pedal apparatus;

successfully urged Court to overturn lower court precedent interpreting 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Holmes v. Vornado, 535 U.S. 826 (2002). Won dismissal of claims for alleged infringement of patent claiming ducted fan apparatus; successfully urged Court to overturn lower court precedent interpreting 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a).

Won multiple honors at Managing IP's Americas awards including

“U.S. Appellate Law Firm of the Year”

Won summary judgment for Costco

Bosch v. Costco, 171 F. Supp. 3d 283 (D. Del. 2016). Won summary judgment dismissing claims that Costco's sale of “hybrid” wiper

products allegedly infringed four Bosch patents; also won six parallel IPR proceedings holding asserted claims invalid.

Pregis v. Kappos, No. 09-467 (E.D. Va. Aug. 10, 2010), *aff'd*, 700 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2012). Won jury trial and dismissal of claims for alleged infringement of four patents claiming air pillow packaging machinery and films; all 23 asserted claims held invalid for obviousness, not infringed, or both.

Won dismissal of \$225 million patent claim

BASF v. SNF Holding Co., 4:17-cv-00251 (S.D. Ga. 2018). Won dismissal in its entirety of claims for alleged infringement of a

patent claiming a process for preparing high molecular weight polymers. The court held all asserted BASF patent claims invalid.

Free-Flow Packaging International, Inc. v. Automated Packaging Systems, Inc., 5:17-cv-02318 (N.D. Ohio 2018). Won dismissal of all claims against Automated Packaging Systems, Inc. for alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 9,003,743 for apparatus for inflating and sealing pillows in packaging cushions.

Named to National Law Journal's

“Appellate Hot List”

Rosenruist-Gestao e Servicos LDA v. Virgin Enters. Ltd., 511 F.3d 437 (4th Cir. 2007), cert. denied, 553 U.S. 1065 (2008). Won decision reinterpreting 35 U.S.C. § 24 and requiring alien applicant to appear for in-person deposition in the United States.

AB Electrolux v. Bermil, 481 F. Supp. 2d 325 (S.D.N.Y. 2007). Won preliminary injunction against exclusive distributor making adverse claim of right to trademark used on professional laundry equipment supplied by Electrolux; case later settled.

Won patent jury trial and dismissal of claims

eSpeed, Inc. v. BrokerTec U.S.A, LLC, 404 F. Supp. 2d 575 (D. Del. 2005), *aff'd*, 480 F.3d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 2007). Won patent

jury trial and dismissal of claims for alleged infringement of patent claiming electronic trading methods; all four asserted claims held invalid for insufficient written description.

WE Media v. General Electric, 223 F. Supp. 3d 463 (S.D.N.Y. 2002), *aff'd*, 94 F. App'x 29 (2d Cir 2004). Won summary judgment dismissing claims for alleged trademark infringement arising from re-branding of pay television network.

Hughes Hubbard & Reed LLP
A New York Limited Liability Partnership
One Battery Park Plaza
New York, New York 10004-1482
+1 (212) 837-6000

Attorney advertising. This brochure is for informational purposes only and is not intended as legal advice.

Readers are advised that prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. No aspect of this advertisement has been approved by the Supreme Court of New Jersey. For information regarding the selection process of awards, please visit <https://www.hugheshubbard.com/legal-notices-methodologies>.