View in browser



The PTAB Strategies and Insights newsletter provides quarterly updates and insights into how best to handle PTAB trial proceedings at the USPTO. It is designed to increase return on investment for all stakeholders looking at the entire patent life cycle in a global portfolio.

In this issue, we address collateral estoppel, expert qualifications, and provide some case highlights of recent PTAB precedential and Director review decisions. In This Issue:

> Beware of Collateral Estoppel at the PTAB

*Kyocera* and the
Brewing Debate Over
Expert Qualifications at
the PTAB

> Case Highlights

We welcome feedback and suggestions about this newsletter to ensure we are meeting the needs and expectations of our readers. So if you have topics you wish to see explored within an issue of the newsletter, please reach out to us.

Finally, we want to thank outgoing Editor <u>Jason D. Eisenberg</u> for his service as editor of this newsletter for the past several years.

Kind Regards,

Jennifer M Chagnon

Kiehund M. Bunh

Richard M. Bemben Co-Editor

#### Jennifer Meyer Chagnon

Co-Editor

# Beware of Collateral Estoppel at the PTAB

By: Ivy Attenborough and Jason A. Fitzsimmons

When thinking about estoppel and the PTAB, the § 315(e) estoppels—relating to grounds a petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised—are likely the first to come to mind. However, other types of estoppel, such as collateral estoppel, also can apply to IPR proceedings.[1] The Federal Circuit recently issued a precedential opinion holding that collateral estoppel may apply to unpatentability findings for claims in different, related patents, when they share identical issue(s) of patentability and the other requirements for collateral estoppel are present.[2]



Read More



## *Kyocera* and the Brewing Debate Over Expert Qualifications at the PTAB

By: David Haars and Dan Block

Technical experts play a key role in patent litigation, including in PTAB litigation. Indeed, experts are often the only witnesses to provide testimony in PTAB proceedings, and final written decisions often hinge on which party's expert the PTAB panel finds more credible. This article explores recent developments in the required qualifications of a technical expert and an important, unresolved question: to qualify as a technical expert and provide opinions from the perspective of a skilled artisan, is the expert required to have possessed ordinary skill *at the time of the invention*?

### **CASE HIGHLIGHTS**

#### **PTAB Precedential and Informative Decisions, Director Review Decisions, and Precedential Opinion Panel Decisions**

By: Jennifer Meyer Chagnon

This recurring feature highlights any new PTAB precedential and/or informative decisions, any new substantive Director review decisions, and any new substantive decisions issued by the Precedential Opinion Panel (POP). The current issue includes decisions entered (or designated as precedential) between January 1, 2023 and March 31, 2023.





### **Editors & Authors**



Richard M. Bemben Director & Co-Editor rbemben@sternekessler.com



Dan Block Director dblock@sternekessler.com



Jennifer Meyer Chagnon Counsel & Co-Editor jchagnon@sternekessler.com



Jason A. Fitzsimmons Director jfitzsimmons@sternekessler.com



David Haars Associate dhaars@sternekessler.com



Ivy Attenborough Law Clerk iattenborough@sternekessler.com

The information contained in this message is intended to convey general information only, and should not be construed as a legal opinion or as legal advice. Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox PLLC disclaims liability for any errors or omissions, and information in this message is not guaranteed to be complete, accurate, and updated. Please consult your own lawyer regarding any specific legal questions.

© 2023 Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox PLLC | Privacy Policy

Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox PLLC, 1100 New York Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20005

Manage preferences