PATENT LITIGATION

DuaneMorris®

Duane Morris patent litigators combine mastery in trial advocacy, an in-depth knowledge of patent law, an aptitude for science and technology, and a focus on our clients' business objectives. We represent clients in defending against claims of patent infringement, enforcing their patents, and handling disputes concerning inventorship and ownership of patents.

We present complex technologies and concepts to judges and juries in a simple and persuasive way. In patent cases, our litigators either have the necessary technical knowledge or work closely with patent specialists. Several dozen Duane Morris attorneys practice before the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). Our attorneys and patent agents hold technical or scientific degrees—and in some cases Ph.D.s—in fields such as computer science; electrical, mechanical, nuclear and chemical engineering; physics; microbiology; molecular biophysics; and biochemistry. We have litigated cases across the United States, and we have won trials in every key jurisdiction for patent litigation, including the District of Delaware, Eastern District of Texas, District of New Jersey and all of the districts in California.

Duane Morris attorneys' combination of extensive trial experience as lead counsel in litigation before state and federal courts, along with unique trial experience within the USPTO, can help clients take advantage of, and respond to, inter partes review (IPR). Duane Morris has quickly become a go-to firm for IPR proceedings.

We understand that our job is to get clients out of litigation and back to business as quickly as possible. Our focus is on our clients' objectives and the most cost-effective means of achieving them. If a creative business resolution is in order, we will litigate the case in a manner that will drive the case toward such a resolution.

Named a *LAW360* 2024 Intellectual Property Practice Group of the Year.

CHAMBERS USA 2026 writes that Duane Morris' Intellectual Property Practice Group is "an experienced group with a breadth of highly effective practitioners capable of providing assistance on the full range of IP matters, including patents, trademarks, copyrights and licensing. The group acts for an impressive raft of clients, including market leaders in life sciences, consumer products, telecommunications and beverages. It represents both defendants and plaintiffs in IP litigation concerning patent and copyright infringement as well as trade secret and noncompete disputes. A source remarks: 'The team is very thoughtful in what will help resolve the case in the best way and has a great practical sense on what to focus on and what not to focus on.'"

Named an Awesome Opponent in BTI CONSULTING GROUP's Litigation Outlook 2026.

Ranked a Standout Firm in IP Litigation in BTI's Litigation Outlook 2026.

Ranked by *UNIFIED PATENTS* as a top firm representing petitioners before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB), according to their institutional success index from 2018-2026.

Recognized by *THE PATENT LAWYER* as a Top 10 Patent Firm (North America - Northeast) from 2022-2026.

REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS

- *Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Centripetal Networks, Inc.* (E.D. Va.) Lead counsel for petitioner **Cisco Systems** and won a complete defense verdict in the retrial of the $2.7 billion claim brought by plaintiff Centripetal Networks in the Eastern District of Virginia, resulting in a total victory against all 11 patents asserted in the case.
- *IOENGINE, LLC v. Roku, Inc.* (W.D. Tex.) Won a complete non-infringement jury verdict in Waco, Texas, before Judge Alan Albright, on behalf of **Roku**. Plaintiff IOENGINE, LLC was backed by litigation financiers. Plaintiff had won two previous jury verdicts against other defendants (represented by other law firms), and plaintiff sought $318 million in this trial. Instead, the jury found that Roku did not infringe any claim of any asserted patent.
- *Finjan LLC v. SonicWall, Inc .* (N.D. Cal.) Defended **SonicWall**, a cybersecurity company, in a patent infringement action in which the plaintiff sought over $100 million in damages. Resulted in an affirmance by the Federal Circuit in of a complete defense victory against plaintiff Finjan, defeating all 10 asserted patents in the Northern District of California through a combination of summary judgment and Daubert rulings.
- *Trojan Battery Company LLC v. Trojan EV LLC and Golf Carts of Cypress LLC* (C.D. Cal.) Represented **Trojan Battery Company LLC**, in a case against Trojan EV LLC and Golf Carts of Cypress LLC, for trademark infringement and unfair competition related to the defendants' sale of Trojan-EV branded golf carts. A permanent injunction was obtained and a profit of more than $4.7 million was awarded.
- *Electronic Arts Inc. v. White Knuckle Gaming, LLC*. (PTAB). Represented petitioner **Electronic Arts Inc.** in IPRs challenging the validity of two patents held by White Knuckle Gaming, LLC directed to updating video game parameters over a network. The PTAB found in favor of petitioner, holding all challenged claims unpatentable, and the Federal Circuit affirmed the PTAB's findings on appeal.
- *PeroxyChem LLC v. Innovative Environmental Technologies, Inc.* (PTAB). Represented petitioner **PeroxyChem LLC** in the second-ever-filed post-grant review (PGR) petition, which challenged the validity of a patent held by Innovative Environmental Technologies, Inc. directed to the oxidation and biological attenuation of organic compounds in soil and groundwater. The parties settled their disputes after the PTAB instituted the PGR.
- *Ruckus Wireless, Inc. and NETGEAR, Inc. v. ChriMar Systems, Inc.* (PTAB). Successfully represented petitioners **Ruckus Wireless, Inc.** and **NETGEAR, Inc.** in IPRs challenging the validity of four patents held by ChriMar Systems, Inc. directed to network management of ethernet equipment. The PTAB found in favor of petitioners, holding all challenged claims unpatentable, which was affirmed on appeal by the Federal Circuit. The Supreme Court denied the patent owner's petition for certiorari.
- *UCB, Inc., et al. v. Catalent Pharma Solutions Inc., et al.* (D. Del.) Co-lead counsel for **Catalent**, a leading contract development and manufacturing organization, in patent infringement litigation concerning a treatment for epilepsy. After we defeated the plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction, the plaintiff voluntarily dismissed its case with prejudice.
- *Droplets, Inc. v. Yahoo! Inc.* (N.D. Cal.) Represented **Yahoo, Inc.** in a suit brought by Droplets Inc., for alleged patent infringement, seeking $260 million and a finding of willful infringement. An Oakland federal jury found no infringement with respect to four Yahoo products and, on the one remaining product, awarded less than 7 percent of Droplets' damages demand. The jury also did not find any willful infringement.

OFFICE LOCATIONS & REACH



UNITED STATES

Atlanta
Austin
Baltimore
Boca Raton
Boston
Chicago
Dallas
Fort Worth
Houston
Las Vegas
Los Angeles
Miami
New Jersey North
New Jersey South
New York
Philadelphia
Pittsburgh
San Diego
San Francisco
Silicon Valley
Washington, D.C.
Wilmington

INTERNATIONAL

Hanoi
Ho Chi Minh City
London
Myanmar
Shanghai
Singapore
Sydney

> Also satellite offices, including Portland, Maine; Berwyn, Pennsylvania; and Seattle, Washington
> Alliances in Mexico and throughout Latin America
> Leadership position with international network of independent law firms

FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT:

LOUIS NORWOOD "WOODY" JAMESON, Partner
404.253.6915 | wjameson@duanemorris.com

MATTHEW C. GAUDET, Partner
404.253.6902 | mcgaudet@duanemorris.com

ANTHONY J. FITZPATRICK, Partner
857.488.4220 | ajfitzpatrick@duanemorris.com

This publication is for general information and does not include full legal analysis of the matters presented. It should not be construed or relied upon as legal advice or legal opinion on any specific facts or circumstances. The invitation to contact the attorneys in our firm is not a solicitation to provide professional services and should not be construed as a statement as to any availability to perform legal services in any jurisdiction in which such attorney is not permitted to practice.