

## ANNOTATED PATENT DIGEST

by Robert A. Matthews, Jr.

© 2005-07 Thomson-West, All Rights Reserved

# CHAPTER 37

## DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS

### I. GENERAL ASPECTS OF DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS

- § 37:1 The Authorizing Statutes
- § 37:2 Purposes of Permitting Declaratory Judgments
- § 37:3 Declaratory Judgments in Patent Cases
- § 37:4 Federal Circuit Law Controls
- § 37:5 Relief is Discretionary
- § 37:6 Right to Jury Trial on Merits of a Declaratory Judgment Claim
- § 37:6.50 Order of Presentation at Trial

### II. PERSONAL JURISDICTION IN DECLARATORY JUDGMENT ACTIONS

- § 37:7 Exercising Personal Jurisdiction Over Patentees in Declaratory Judgment Actions
- § 37:7.50 Patentees or Licensees as Indispensable Parties in Declaratory Judgment Actions

### III. SUBJECT-MATTER JURISDICTION OF DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS

#### A. Establishing Subject-Matter Jurisdiction for a Patent-Related Declaratory Judgment Claim

- § 37:8 Declaratory Judgment Act Does not Provide Subject-Matter Jurisdiction
- § 37:9 The “Well-Pleaded” Hypothetical Complaint
- § 37:10 Actual Case or Controversy Requirement
- § 37:11 Some Flexibility Exists in Applying Standards

**B. Showing an Actual Case or Controversy in Patent-Related Actions**

- § 37:12 Pre-*MedImmune* Two-Part Test of Reasonable Apprehension and Present Activity
- § 37:12.50 Post-*MedImmune* Standard for Showing Actual Controversy

**1. General Aspects of Determining if Apprehension is Reasonable**

- § 37:13 Reasonable Apprehension Based on an Objective Standard
- § 37:14 Reasonable Apprehension Must Exist Throughout Suit
- § 37:15 Post-Filing Facts Cannot Make Up for Lack of Jurisdiction at Time of Filing

**2. Public Policy Concerns Regarding Patentees**

- § 37:16 Non-threatening Patentees Should Not be Hauled Into Court
- § 37:17 Validity Concerns do Not Trump Necessity for a Reasonable Apprehension

**3. Mechanical Requirements in Applying Test**

- § 37:18 Test Applied Separately to Each Count of Complaint
- § 37:19 Evaluated on a Product-by-Product Basis if Products Not the Same
- § 37:20 Evaluated on a Patent Claim-By-Claim Basis
- § 37:21 Issued Patent Claims are a Prerequisite

**4. General Aspects Regarding Infringement Claims**

- § 37:22 Mere Existence of Patent Does Not Create Necessary Apprehension
- § 37:23 No Requirement that Accused Infringer “Admit” Infringement
- § 37:24 Express Enforcement Threats Not Required
- § 37:25 Consider Totality of the Circumstances in the Absence of Express Threats
- § 37:26 “Jawboning” or Vague Statements of Infringement
- § 37:26.50 Authority to Make Infringement Charge
- § 37:27 Alleged Right to Copy Does Not Meet Reasonable Apprehension
- § 37:28 Future Contemplated Activity Without Present Concrete Steps
- § 37:28.50 Impact of Future Patents on Reasonable Apprehension

**C. Requirement of Present Accused Activity**

- § 37:29 Requirement of “Immediacy and Reality”
- § 37:30 Accused Infringers Actual Accused Activity or Concrete Steps to Engage in Such Activity
- § 37:31 “Immediacy” and “Reality” Applied to Developing Products

# LATIMER, MAYBERRY & MATTHEWS

*Intellectual Property Law, LLP*

**ROBERT A. MATTHEWS, JR.**  
Direct Dial: 434-525-1141  
e-mail: robert.matthews@latimerIP.com

- § 37:32 Declaratory Plaintiff Does Not Have to Admit or Show it Infringes
- § 37:33 Activities Done Before Filing Complaint
- § 37:34 Accused Acts Amounting to *De Minimus* Infringement
- § 37:35 Abandoned Development Efforts

## **D. Reasonable Apprehension in View of Specific Patent-Related Conduct**

### **1. Cease and Desist Letters**

- § 37:36 Determining Whether Cease and Desist Letter Creates a Reasonable Apprehension
- § 37:37 Alleging Willful Infringement may Create Apprehension
- § 37:38 Letters Sufficient to Create Apprehension
- § 37:39 Letters Insufficient to Create Apprehension
- § 37:40 Patentee's Refusal to Give Clearance Letter

### **2. Effect of Licensing Aspects**

- § 37:41 Licensing Negotiations
- § 37:42 Declaratory-Judgment Plaintiff Holds a License Under the Patent

### **3. Effect of Related Litigation**

- § 37:43 Related Litigation Between Same Parties
- § 37:44 Related Foreign Litigation Between Same Parties on Same Subject Matter
- § 37:45 Earlier Suits Against Unrelated Parties
- § 37:46 Existence of Other Litigation is Not a Requirement

### **4. Apprehension from Obligations Owed to Third-Parties**

- § 37:47 Customers
- § 37:48 Indemnification Obligations

### **5. Other Conduct that May or May Not Create Apprehension**

- § 37:49 Demand or Obligation to Pay Royalties
- § 37:50 Patentee's Refusal to Give Assurances that it Won't Sue
- § 37:51 Patentee's Stated Policy of Suing All Infringers
- § 37:52 Patentee's Refusal to License
- § 37:53 Listing Patent on Orange Book

**E. Case Examples Regarding Reasonable Apprehension**

- § 37:54 Reasonable Apprehension Shown
- § 37:55 Reasonable Apprehension Not Shown

**F. Mooting Apprehension by Subsequent Acts**

**1. Patentee Takes Acts Surrendering its Right to Pursue Infringement Claim for that Accused Product**

- § 37:56 Patentee Can Moot Apprehension
- § 37:57 Act Must Estopp Patentee from Future Suits on that Product
- § 37:58 Act Need Not Necessarily Estopp Future Suits on *Future* Products
- § 37:59 Act Need Not Prohibit Suit on Not Yet Issued Reissued Claims
- § 37:60 Reserving Right to Sue Customers of Accused Infringer

**2. Accused Infringer's Acts that May Moot Suit**

- § 37:61 Accused Infringer Ceases Activities
- § 37:62 Accused Infringer Delays in Filing Suit and Patentee Does Not Sue in Interim

**3. Expiration of the Patent**

- § 37:63 Expiration of Patent Does Not Necessarily Moot Apprehension
- § 37:64 Cases Dismissing DJ Claims Because Patent Expired or was Dedicated to the Public
- § 37:65 Cases Adjudicating DJ Claims Despite Patent Expiration or Dedication

**IV. PROCEDURAL ASPECTS OF MOTIONS TO DISMISS DECLARATORY JUDGMENT CLAIMS FOR LACK OF SUBJECT-MATTER JURISDICTION**

**A. Procedural Aspects to Determining Whether to Dismiss**

- § 37:66 Burden of Proof
- § 37:66.50 Jurisdictional Discovery
- § 37:67 Question of Law
- § 37:68 Inferences and Fact Findings
- § 37:69 Pending Motion for Leave to Amend

**B. Procedural Aspects to Dismissal of Declaratory Judgment Claim**

- § 37:70 Generally Dismissal is Without Prejudice
- § 37:71 — Cases Dismissing Without Prejudice
- § 37:72 — Cases Dismissing With Prejudice
- § 37:73 — Cases Not Specifying Whether Dismissal was or was not with Prejudice
- § 37:74 Court Retains Jurisdiction to Decide Issues of Attorney’s Fees
- § 37:75 Survival of Other Claims Implicating Infringement, Invalidity, or Unenforceability
- § 37:75.50 Appealability of a Denial of a Motion to Dismiss DJ Claims for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction

**C. Compulsory Counterclaims**

- § 37:76 Infringement Claim Compulsory to Declaratory Judgment Action
- § 37:77 Invalidity or Unenforceability Declaratory-Judgment Claim Compulsory to Infringement Claim
- § 37:78 Wavier Not Saved by “Further Relief” Provision of 28 U.S.C. § 2202

**D. Impact of a Finding of Noninfringement, Invalidity or Unenforceability, on Remaining Declaratory Judgment Claims**

- § 37:79 Dismissal of Invalidity or Inequitable Conduct Claims when Noninfringement Found
- § 37:80 Finding of Claim Invalidity Permits Vacating a Noninfringement Determination
- § 37:81 Dismissal of Unenforceability Claims
- § 37:82 Finding of Unenforceability for Inequitable Conduct

**V. FIRST-TO-FILE RULE**

**A. Substantive Aspects of the First-to-File Rule**

- § 37:83 In General
- § 37:84 Federal Circuit Law Controls
- § 37:85 Subsequent Change of Parties
- § 37:86 Exceptions to First-to-File Rule
- § 37:87 Customer-Suit Exception

# LATIMER, MAYBERRY & MATTHEWS

*Intellectual Property Law, LLP*

---

**ROBERT A. MATTHEWS, JR.**  
Direct Dial: 434-525-1141  
e-mail: robert.matthews@latimerIP.com

## **B. Cases on First-to-File Rule**

- § 37:88 Allowing Accused Infringer's Declaratory-Judgment Action to go Forward as First-Filed Action
- § 37:89 Allowing Accused Infringer's Declaratory-Judgment Action to go Forward as an Exception to the First-to-File Rule
- § 37:90 Allowing Patentee's Infringement Action to go Forward as First-Filed Action
- § 37:91 Allowing Patentee's Infringement Action to go Forward as an Exception to the First-to-File Rule

## **VI. DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS BY PATENTEE**

- § 37:92 Seeking Declaration of Future Infringement

## **VII. DECLARATORY JUDGMENT BY ALLEGED INVENTORS**

- § 37:93 Correction of Inventorship in an Issued Patent
- § 37:94 Correction of Inventorship in a Pending Patent Application
- § 37:95 Seeking Determination of True Inventor for Patent Application
- § 37:96 § 291 Action as Alternative to a Declaratory Judgment Claim on Priority of Invention