

Literal Infringement Is Identical to Infringement Under DOE ... for Issue Preclusion

A photograph of a modern building's curved glass facade, showing multiple stories of windows with dark frames, set against a light blue sky.

2 MIN READ

August 29, 2024, 9:08 AM

By: Jeannine Yoo Sano, Eric Krause, Pan Lee, Ramya Auroprem

On August 28, 2024, the Federal Circuit issued a precedential decision regarding issue preclusion in *Wisc. Alumni Research Found. v. Apple Inc.*, Nos. 2022-1884, 2022-1886. For issue preclusion to apply, “the issue actually litigated in the first action must be identical to the issue in the second action,” see Op. at 26, but “the factors and tests [need not] be identical for issues to be identical.” See *id.* at 27.

In the first case, the plaintiff had abandoned its theory of infringement under the doctrine of equivalents before trial and proceeded only on literal infringement. See Op. at 7 n.2. The Federal Circuit affirmed the district court’s ruling that the plaintiff was precluded from retrying its claim for infringement under the doctrine of equivalents after an unsuccessful literal infringement claim. See Op. at 15 (“WARF was not foreclosed from raising the doctrine of equivalents at trial as an alternative to literal infringement”).

In the second case, the plaintiff asserted the same patent against later generations of the accused product. The Federal Circuit upheld the district court’s determination that issue preclusion barred the plaintiff from pursuing a doctrine of equivalents theory in the second case and that the *Kessler* doctrine barred the second case even though the accused next-generation products were made/sold before the final judgment of non-infringement in the first action. See Op. at 32-33 (prevailing non-infringer obtains the right to manufacture, use, and sell the accused product, which attaches to the product and “operates to grant a product

noninfringer status”). Claim preclusion, not the *Kessler* doctrine, is “temporally limited to acts occurring after final judgment was entered in the first suit.” See Op. at 36 n.18.

Reasoning that both literal infringement and infringement under the doctrine of equivalents share the same statutory basis, 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), see Op. at 27-28, and that the doctrine of equivalents is limited to covering products or processes that are at most insubstantially different from what would literally infringe, see *id.* at 29 n.13, the Federal Circuit determined that the different products accused in the second litigation were “essentially the same” as the accused products in the first litigation and that “literal infringement and the doctrine of equivalents are the same issue for issue-preclusion purposes.” See Op. at 22, 31.

The lengthy litigation history is scattered with strategic decisions that gave rise to the current appeal

🔗 files.passle.net/...



Related People

Eric Krause
Jeannine Yoo Sano
Pan Lee

Related Services

Intellectual Property

To subscribe to our publications, [click here](#).

News & Insights

- American Bar Association 2025 Asia-Pacific Conference
SPEAKING ENGAGEMENT ANTITRUST
- NBA Commercial Law Section 38th Annual Corporate Counsel Conference
SPONSORSHIP ANTITRUST
- GCR Live: Law Leaders Global 2025
SPEAKING ENGAGEMENT ANTITRUST
- SABA North America Corporate Counsel Retreat 2025
SPONSORSHIP ANTITRUST
- Forecasting Health Care Antitrust Under a Second Trump Administration
PODCAST ANTITRUST
- GCR 100 2025 Ranks Axinn Antitrust Group in Top Categories
AWARDS & RECOGNITIONS ANTITRUST
- What Trump's FTC Picks Mean for Bio-Pharma Dealmaking and PBMs
MEDIA MENTIONS ANTITRUST
- Capitol Forum Health Care Competition Conference 2024
SPEAKING ENGAGEMENT ANTITRUST
- Ethical Considerations for Cybersecurity, IP Transactions and Avoiding USPTO Sanctions

(EIP241212)

SPEAKING ENGAGEMENT INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

- Albertsons Ends Merger Deal, Accuses Kroger of 'Self-Serving Conduct'

MEDIA MENTIONS ANTITRUST

© 2024 Axinn, Veltrop & Harkrider LLP. All Rights Reserved