

We use cookies on this site to enhance your user experience.

OK

No Thanks

Volume 11, Number 247

THE NATIONAL LAW REVIEW

Login

35

Advertisement



NEW ARTICLES

-
-
-
-

IPR Estoppel's Evolving Landscape

by: Dana Nguyen of Winstead - *News Alert*

Posted On Monday, February 10, 2025



RELATED PRACTICES & JURISDICTIONS

Intellectual Property

Administrative Regulatory

All Federal

The America Invents Act (“AIA”) provided an accused infringer sued for patent infringement (“Patent Challenger”) with a new, alternative forum to challenge the patents asserted against them: *inter partes* review (“IPR”). In exchange—and to avoid duplicative parallel district court and Patent Office proceedings—the AIA provided upon a final written decision, the Patent Challenger would be estopped from asserting against any surviving claim an invalidity theory based “on any

We use cookies on this site to
enhance your user experience.



35

NEW ARTICLES



In 2022, the Patent Office provided guidance encouraging Patent Challengers to embrace the AIA's estoppel provision *upon institution* of an IPR, through use of a so-called *Sotera* stipulations.[2] *Sotera*[3] stipulations are used to influence the PTAB's weighing of *Fintiv* factors—which take into account the timing of a parallel court action and potential for duplication as part of the PTAB's analysis of whether to institute an IPR[4] Specifically, a *Sotera* stipulation is intended to address the *Fintiv* factor concerning the “overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding.”[5] In effect, *Sotera* stipulations serve to assure the PTAB that where parallel litigation is likely to be resolved before a final written decision on the IPR would be due, if the PTAB institutes the IPRs, the Patent Challenger will not pursue estopped invalidity theories in the district court as the parallel litigation proceeds. If a *Sotera* stipulation is filed, the PTAB stated that it will not deny institution of an IPR under *Fintiv*. [6] Since then, *Sotera* stipulations have become increasingly commonplace.

As an example, in *Sotera*, the Patent Challenger's stipulation stated:

[I]f the [PTAB] institutes IPR . . . Defendants will not pursue in [the District Court] the specific grounds [asserted in the *inter partes* review] in connection with the referenced patent(s) and claim(s) as originally issued on the instituted [IPR] petition, or on any other ground for a given patent for which the [PTAB] institutes, that was raised or could have been reasonably raised in an IPR. (i.e., any ground that could be raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of prior art patent or printed publications).”[7]

Sotera stipulations may vary in form to some extent, but inclusion of the statutory “or could have been reasonably raised” language distinguishes a *Sotera* stipulation from other stipulations that the PTAB has accorded less weight.[8]

The scope of “or could have been raised” was subject to much dispute, but the Federal Circuit has clarified that IPR estoppel applies to any grounds a petitioner reasonably could have brought in an IPR.[9] This conclusion was further confirmed in response to a petition for certiorari Apple filed with the Supreme Court, where the Solicitor General took the position that the Federal Circuit's interpretation is correct: [10]

The court of appeals correctly held that 35 U.S.C. 315(e)(2) bars petitioners from advancing invalidity grounds they knew or should have known about at the time they filed their petitions for *inter partes* review, yet omitted from their petitions.

Thereafter, in apparent agreement, the Supreme Court declined to grant certiorari to review the Federal Circuit's interpretation.

On its face, the AIA's estoppel provision—and *Sotera* stipulations—may seem to provide a broad benefit to a Patent Owner. In practice, however, determining the

We use cookies on this site to
enhance your user experience.



35

NEW ARTICLES



- **Burden of Proving IPR Estoppel.** The Federal Circuit has held the burden to show IPR estoppel is on the Patent Owner, as the party asserting the estoppel.[11]
- **Standard.** The Patent Owner must show, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the Patent Challenger actually knew of the reference or if a skilled searcher conducting a diligent search reasonably could have been expected to discover the reference.[12] At least one district court has denied a summary judgment motion to enforce IPR estoppel because questions of fact remained as to whether the printed publication at issue could have been found by a skilled searcher.[13]
- **Application of IPR Estoppel to Non-Instituted Claims.** IPR estoppel can apply to claims that were not raised in the IPR.[14]
- **Discovery of Privileged Materials.** Whether a printed publication “could have been raised” may implicate privileged or work product materials. For example, written discovery requests seeking the date when counsel learned of each reference may be within the fair scope of discovery.[15]
- **Patent Challenger Searches.** Patent Challengers should maintain careful documentation of their searches before and after filing an IPR. Pre-IPR searches can be used to demonstrate that a skilled and diligent searcher would not have found the later-identified prior art. Post-IPR searches should use new information or circumstances to identify prior art. Third parties, such as Unified Patents, may also have documents relevant to identifying prior art known to a Patent Challenger.[16]
- **Patent Owner and Public Searches.** Under some circumstances a Patent Owner may want to consider having their own searches conducted and documented in order to establish what a skilled and diligent searcher would have uncovered[17] or identify other earlier patent searches where the prior art was uncovered (e.g., public patent searches completed as part of patent prosecution or prior art identified in other IPR proceedings).
- **Use of System Art.** IPR grounds are statutorily limited to prior art in the form of printed publications.[18] Patent Challengers filing a *Sotera* stipulation often rely on prior devices or prior systems as prior art to avoid application of IPR estoppel. The line between what constitutes printed art and what is system art becomes blurred when the evidence of a prior system includes documents to which IPR estoppel applies. Some courts have held that estoppel does not apply to any invalidity theory that relies (in any part) on a system art. [19] Other courts have excluded system art where the argument amounts to a disguised prior publication theory, the system art is coextensive with—or materially identical to—the printed art to which IPR estoppel applies.[20]

[1] 35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(2).

We use cookies on this site to
enhance your user experience.
[20220621_.par](#)



35

NEW ARTICLES



[3] Sotera Wireless, Inc. v. Masimo Corporation, IPR2020-01019 (Paper 12) at 17 (precedential).

[4] *Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (Mar. 20, 2020) (“Fintiv”).

[5] Sotera Wireless, Inc. v. Masimo Corporation, IPR2020-01019 (Paper 12) at 12 (precedential).

[6] USPTO Director’s June 21, 2022, memorandum available at [interim_proc_discretionary_denials_aia_parallel_district_court_litigation_memo_20220621_.pdf](#) at 9.

[7] Sotera Wireless, Inc. v. Masimo Corporation, IPR2020-01019 (Exhibit 1038).

[8] See, e.g., *Apple Inc. v. Koss*, IPR2021-00255, Paper 22 at 18-19 (PTAB June 3, 2021).

[9] *Cal. Inst. of Tech. v. Broadcom, Ltd.*, 25 F.4th 976, 991 (Fed. Cir. 2022).

[10] *Apple, Inc. v. California Institute of Technology*, Br. of U.S., 22-203 (2022), available at https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/22/22-203/267527/20230523143157264_22-203%20Apple%20v.%20CalTech.pdf

[11] *Ironburg Inventions Ltd. v. Valve Corp.*, 64 F.4th 1274, 1297–1299 (Fed. Cir. 2023).

[12] *Id.* at 1299.

[13] *EIS, Inc. v. IntiHealth Ger GmbH*, 2023 WL 6797905 at *2-*5 (Del. 2023).

[14] *Click-to-Call Technologies LP v. Ingenio, Inc.*, 45 4th 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2022) (evaluating unique facts—unlikely to reoccur under current law—in which a Patent Challenger was estopped from asserting the same invalidity theory against a claim on which the PTAB denied had institution, despite the PTAB finding other instituted claims unpatentable under said theory, because the Challenger “reasonably could have raised” the argument in IPR).

[15] *Promptu Systems Corporation v. Comcast Corporation et al*, 2-16-cv-06516 (Dkt. 390) at n.2 (Oct. 25, 2024) (EDPA).

[16] *Textile Computer Systems, Inc. v. Broadway National Bank d/b/a Broadway Bank*, No. 6-21-cv-01050 (Dkt. 109) (Nov. 9, 2022) (WDTX).

[17] See, e.g., *SiOnyx, LLC v. Hamamatsu Photonics K.K.*, 330 F. Supp. 3d 574 (D. Mass. 2018) (the Court refused application of IPR estoppel because Patent Owner could not provide the Court with the “search string and search source that would

We use cookies on this site to
enhance your user experience.



[18] 35 U.S.C. § 311(b).

[19] See, for example, the following cases: *IPA Techs. v. Microsoft Corp.*, No. 18-1, 2024 WL 1797394, at *6-7 (D. Del. Apr. 25, 2024) (allowing documents to prove up system art); *Prolitec Inc. v. ScentAir Techs., LLC*, 2023 WL 8697973, at *22-23 (D. Del. Dec. 13, 2023); *EIS, Inc. v. IntiHealth Ger GmbH*, No. 19-1227, 2023 WL 6797905, at *5–6 (D. Del. Aug. 30, 2023) (holding IPR estoppel does not apply to system art); *Cellwitch Inc. v. Tile, Inc.*, 2023 WL 8813524 at *3 (N.D. Cal. 2023); *Willis Elec. Co. v. Polygroup Macau Ltd.*, 649 F. Supp. 3d 780, 813–15 (D. Minn. 2023) (same); *Singular Computing LLC v. Google LLC*, No. 19-12551, 2023 WL 2839282 (D. Mass. Apr. 6, 2023) (same); *Chemours Co. FC, LLC v. Daikin Indus., Ltd.*, No. 17-1612, 2022 WL 2643517, at *2 (D. Del. July 8, 2022) (same); *Medline Indus., Inc. v. C.R. Bard, Inc.*, No. 17 C 7216, 2020 WL 5512132, at *3-4 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 14, 2020); *Microchip Tech. Inc. v. Aptiv Servs. US LLC*, No. 1:17-CV-01194, 2020 WL 4335519, at *4 (D. Del. July 28, 2020) (applying IPR estoppel to publications but not to device art used in combination with those publications); *SPEX Techs. Inc v. Kingston Tech. Corp.*, No. SACV 16-01790, 2020 WL 4342254 (C.D. Cal. June 16, 2020) (“The Court finds that the reliance on some printed publications in an overall collection of documents being used to describe a system invalidity theory should not lead to estoppel of the overall system invalidity theory itself, nor piecemeal exclusion of the printed publications underlying that system invalidity theory, absent a showing that the system invalidity theory is a patent or printed publication theory in disguise.”); *Polaris Indus., Inc. v. Arctic Cat Inc.*, No. CV 15-4475 (JRT/TNL), 2019 WL 3824255, at *3 (D. Minn. Aug. 15, 2019); *Zitovault, LLC v. Int’l Bus. Machines Corp.*, No. 3:16- CV-0962-M, 2018 WL 2971178, at *4 (N.D. Tex. Apr. 4, 2018).

[20] The following cases either apply this principle directly or discuss circumstances where the use of system art should be limited: *Wirtgen America, Inc. v. Caterpillar, Inc.*, No. 1:17-cv-00770, 2024 WL 51010, at *9 (D. Del. January 4, 2024) (cumulative prior art excluded regardless of whether it could have been raised); *Hafeman v. LG Elecs., Inc. et al.*, No. 6-21-cv-00696, 2023 WL 4362863, at *1 (W.D. Tex. Apr. 14, 2023) (for an “invalidity argument that could not be raised before the PTAB, estoppel still applies when the allegedly new references have ‘materially identical’ disclosures as the IPR art.”); *IOENGINE, LLC v. PayPal Holdings, Inc.*, 607 F. Supp. 3d 464, 512–13 (D. Del. 2022) (noting estoppel did not apply “if, as it appears here, that device is not simply a printed publication invalidity theory in disguise.”); *Wasica Fin. GmbH v. Schrader Int’l, Inc.*, 432 F. Supp. 3d 448, 454–55 (D. Del. 2020) (holding IPR estoppel applies to system art cumulative of printed publications); *Boston Sci. Corp. v. Cook Grp. Inc.*, 653 F. Supp. 3d 541, 593–94 (S.D. Ind. 2023); *In re Koninklijke Philips Pat. Litig.*, No. 18-CV-01885-HSG, 2020 WL 7392868, at *27 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 13, 2020) (noting that if the same printed references were used in an IPR, that evidence would have been unavailable to support system art theories); *Cal. Inst. of Tech. v. Broadcom Ltd.*,

35

NEW ARTICLES



We use cookies on this site to enhance your user experience.



1067, 2019 WL 801394, at *10 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 22, 2019); *Biscotti Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*, No. 2:13-CV-01015, 2017 WL 2526231, at *8 (E.D. Tex. May 11, 2017).

© 2025 Winstead PC.

35

NEW ARTICLES



Dana Nguyen
Email
 512.370.2821
 Bio and Articles

Find Your Next Job !

Experienced Family Law Attorney
Specialist: Legal Information Center Research
LEGAL ASSISTANT II

Explore More Job Openings

CURRENT PUBLIC NOTICES

Post Your Public Notice Today!

PUBLIC NOTICE OF AUCTION OF ASSETS: Local Marketing Solutions Group, Inc

Published: 3 September, 2025

PUBLIC NOTICE OF RECIEVERSHIP SALE: Bison Hardwood, LLC

Published: 28 August, 2025

PUBLIC NOTICE OF UCC ARTICLE 9 SALE: Canary, LCC and it's subsidiaries

Published: 25 August, 2025

We use cookies on this site to enhance your user experience.



Published: 25 August, 2025

PUBLIC NOTICE OF TRUSTEE-ASSIGNEE SALE: Elorac, Inc

Published: 25 August, 2025

PUBLIC NOTICE OF UCC SALE: Shoreview Holding LLC

Published: 25 August, 2025

PUBLIC NOTIC OF AUCTION OF ASSETS: BolderPlay

Published: 22 August, 2025

PUBLIC NOTICE OF DISPOSITION OF COLLATERAL: Verify, Inc

Published: 20 August, 2025

PUBLIC NOTICE OF UCC ARTICLE 9 SALE: News Direct Corp.

Published: 20 August, 2025

PUBLIC NOTICE OF UCC ARTICLE 9 SALE: Phillips Amsterdam II LLC

Published: 18 August, 2025

PUBLIC NOTICE OF UCC SALE: BMD-III CHT Mezz, LLC

Published: 18 August, 2025

PUBLIC NOTICE OF UCC ARTICLE 9 SALE: Pulse Partners LLC

Published: 14 August, 2025

PUBLIC NOTICE OF UCC ARTICLE 9 SALE: Membership Interests in RINO 17 LLC

Published: 11 August, 2025

PUBLIC NOTICE OF UCC ARTICLE 9 SALE: LCP Hollywood Lender LLC

Published: 8 August, 2025

PUBLIC NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT: Common Cents Distributors, LLC

Published: 26 June, 2025

Discover More Public Notices

Advertisement

35

NEW ARTICLES



We use cookies on this site to enhance your user experience.



ty Agencies

by: *TSCA at Keller and Heckman*

Federal Court Vacates US Department of Education Guidance on Title VI

by: *Amy Fabiano , Brigid Harrington*

Court of Appeals Rules That President Lacks Authority for Broad Tariffs

by: *Joanne E. Osendarp , Anthony Rapa*

Court Holds Text Messages Do Not Violate TCPA Do Not Call Regulation

by: *Richard B. Newman*

Walking Off the Job in Construction's Economic Downturn

by: *Chad V. Theriot*

Advertisement

35

NEW ARTICLES



MORE FROM WINSTEAD

Court Holds That Stepchildren Did Not Owe Informal Fiduciary Duties To Their Step Father And There Was No Formal Fiduciary Relationship

by: *David Fowler Johnson*

Court Reversed Judgment Against A Trustee Due To Jury Instruction Errors And Also Held That A Party Is Not Entitled To A Jury Trial In Trustee Removal Actions

by: *David Fowler Johnson*

We use cookies on this site to enhance your user experience.

by: [David Fowler Johnson](#)

Court Affirmed An Order Removing A Trustee

by: [David Fowler Johnson](#)

Court Affirmed A Probate Court’s Granting Of Plea To The Jurisdiction Based On The Estate Beneficiaries’ Lack Of Standing

by: [David Fowler Johnson](#)

Structuring Co-Tenancy Clauses: A Collaborative Approach to Risk and Remedy

by: [Ashley Cline](#)

Texas Supreme Court Addresses Informal Fiduciary Relationships and The Fiduciary Duties Owed By Accountants

by: [David Fowler Johnson](#)

Driving an Optimal Outcome When Selling a Business

by: [Manny Clark](#)

“Death Star Bill” Survives Legal Challenge, Leaving Enforcement to Private Parties

by: [Jordan Rodriguez](#)

Court Reversed Judgment Against a Financial Advisor Due To a Lack of Evidence of Damages

by: [David Fowler Johnson](#)

Court Affirms Order Holding That There Was an Informal Marriage

by: [David Fowler Johnson](#)

Incorporating Flag Standards in Hotel Construction Agreements

by: [Keith Randall](#)

SEC Adopts Amendments to Beneficial Ownership Reporting Rules for Schedules 13D and 13G

by: [Jarrod Azopardi](#) , [Jacob Spicer](#)

35

NEW ARTICLES



We use cookies on this site to enhance your user experience.

by: [Ryan Goins](#) , [Andrew Rosell](#)

Texas Supreme Court Holds That Executor Who Is Also The Sole Beneficiary Of The Estate Can Represent The Estate Pro Se

by: [David Fowler Johnson](#)

35

NEW ARTICLES



Advertisement

Get NFL Sunday Ticket

Ad by NFL Sunday Ticket

Try it free

UPCOMING EVENTS



SEP
15-16
2025

US General Counsel Summit



SEP
15-16
2025

Chief Litigation Officer Summit

We use cookies on this site to enhance your user experience.



35

SEP
29-30
2025

Intellectual Property Law Institute 2025 - New York

NEW ARTICLES



OCT
20-21
2025

Intellectual Property Law Institute 2025 - California



THE NATIONAL LAW REVIEW

Artificial Intelligence

Antitrust Law

Bankruptcy & Restructuring

Biotech, Food, & Drug

Business of Law

Construction & Real Estate

Cybersecurity Media & FCC

We use cookies on this site to enhance your user experience.

Environmental & Energy

Family, Estates & Trusts

Financial, Securities & Banking

Global

Health Care Law

Immigration

Insurance

Intellectual Property Law

Labor & Employment

Litigation

Public Services, Infrastructure, Transportation

Tax

White Collar Crime & Consumer Rights

35

NEW ARTICLES



LEGAL DISCLAIMER

You are responsible for reading, understanding, and agreeing to the National Law Review's (NLR's) and the National Law Forum LLC's [Terms of Use](#) and [Privacy Policy](#) before using the National Law Review website. The National Law Review is a free-to-use, no-log-in [database](#) of legal and business articles. The content and links on www.NatLawReview.com are intended for general information purposes only. Any legal analysis, legislative updates, or other content and links should not be construed as legal or professional advice or a substitute for such advice. No attorney-client or confidential relationship is formed by the transmission of information between you and the National Law Review website or any of the law firms, attorneys, or other professionals or organizations who include content on the National Law Review website. If you require legal or professional advice, kindly contact an attorney or other suitable professional advisor.

Some states have laws and ethical rules regarding solicitation and advertisement practices by attorneys and/or other professionals. The National Law Review is not a law firm nor is www.NatLawReview.com intended to be a referral service for attorneys and/or other professionals. The NLR does not wish, nor does it intend, to solicit the business of anyone or

We use cookies on this site to enhance your user experience.



Under certain state laws, the following statements may be required on this website and we have included them in order to be in full compliance with these rules. The choice of a lawyer or other professional is an important decision and should not be based solely upon advertisements. Attorney Advertising Notice: Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. Statement in compliance with Texas Rules of Professional Conduct. Unless otherwise noted, attorneys are not certified by the Texas Board of Legal Specialization, nor can NLR attest to the accuracy of any notation of Legal Specialization or other Professional Credentials.

The National Law Review - National Law Forum LLC 2070 Green Bay Rd., Suite 178, Highland Park, IL 60035 Telephone (708) 357-3317 or toll-free (877) 357-3317. If you would like to contact us via email please [click here](#).

35

NEW ARTICLES



TERMS OF USE | PRIVACY POLICY

Copyright ©2025 National Law Forum, LLC

"We use cookies and other data collection technologies to provide the best experience for our customers. You may request that your data not be shared with third parties here: "[Do Not Sell My Data](#)"