

2002—Third par. Pub. L. 107-273, §13206(b)(4), made technical correction to directory language of Pub. L. 106-113, §1000(a)(9) [title IV, §4402(b)(1)]. See 1999 Amendment note below.

Pub. L. 107-273, §13206(b)(1)(B), made technical correction to directory language of Pub. L. 106-113, §1000(a)(9) [title IV, §4732(a)(10)(A)]. See 1999 Amendment note below.

1999—Third par. Pub. L. 106-113, §1000(a)(9) [title IV, §4732(a)(10)(A)], as amended by Pub. L. 107-273, §13206(b)(1)(B), substituted “(2) by the Director,” for “(2) by the Commissioner.”

Pub. L. 106-113, §1000(a)(9) [title IV, §4402(b)(1)], as amended by Pub. L. 107-273, §13206(b)(4), substituted “154(b) or 156 of this title” for “156 of this title”.

1995—First par. Pub. L. 104-41 inserted after second sentence “Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, if a claim to a composition of matter is held invalid and that claim was the basis of a determination of non-obviousness under section 103(b)(1), the process shall no longer be considered nonobvious solely on the basis of section 103(b)(1).”

1984—Pub. L. 98-417 inserted provision at end that the invalidity of the extension of a patent term or any portion thereof under section 156 of this title because of the material failure by the applicant for the extension, or by the Commissioner, to comply with the requirements of such section shall be a defense in any action involving the infringement of a patent during the period of the extension of its term and shall be pleaded, and that a due diligence determination under section 156(d)(2) is not subject to review in such an action.

1982—Third par. Pub. L. 97-164 substituted “Claims Court” for “Court of Claims”.

1975—First par. Pub. L. 94-131 made presumption of validity applicable to claim of a patent in multiple dependent form and multiple dependent claims and substituted “asserting such invalidity” for “asserting it”.

1965—Pub. L. 89-83 required each claim of a patent (whether in independent or dependent form) to be presumed valid independently of the validity of other claims and required dependent claims to be presumed valid even though dependent upon an invalid claim.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 2011 AMENDMENT

Amendment by section 15(a) of Pub. L. 112-29 effective on Sept. 16, 2011, and applicable to proceedings commenced on or after that date, see section 15(c) of Pub. L. 112-29, set out as a note under section 119 of this title.

Amendment by section 20(g), (j) of Pub. L. 112-29 effective upon the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on Sept. 16, 2011, and applicable to proceedings commenced on or after that effective date, see section 20(l) of Pub. L. 112-29, set out as a note under section 2 of this title.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1999 AMENDMENT

Amendment by section 1000(a)(9) [title IV, §4402(b)(1)] of Pub. L. 106-113 effective on date that is 6 months after Nov. 29, 1999, and, except for design patent application filed under chapter 16 of this title, applicable to any application filed on or after such date, see section 1000(a)(9) [title IV, §4405(a)] of Pub. L. 106-113, set out as a note under section 154 of this title.

Amendment by section 1000(a)(9) [title IV, §4732(a)(10)(A)] of Pub. L. 106-113 effective 4 months after Nov. 29, 1999, see section 1000(a)(9) [title IV, §4731] of Pub. L. 106-113, set out as a note under section 1 of this title.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1982 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 97-164 effective Oct. 1, 1982, see section 402 of Pub. L. 97-164, set out as a note under section 171 of Title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1975 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 94-131 effective Jan. 24, 1978, and applicable on and after that date to patent applica-

tions filed in the United States and to international applications, where applicable, see section 11 of Pub. L. 94-131, set out as an Effective Date note under section 351 of this title.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1965 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 89-83 effective 3 months after July 24, 1965, see section 7(a) of Pub. L. 89-83, set out as a note under section 41 of this title.

### § 283. Injunction

The several courts having jurisdiction of cases under this title may grant injunctions in accordance with the principles of equity to prevent the violation of any right secured by patent, on such terms as the court deems reasonable.

(July 19, 1952, ch. 950, 66 Stat. 812.)

#### HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on Title 35, U.S.C., 1946 ed., §70, part (R.S. 4921, amended (1) Mar. 3, 1897, ch. 391, §6, 29 Stat. 694, (2) Feb. 18, 1922, ch. 58, §8, 42 Stat. 392, (3) Aug. 1, 1946, ch. 726, §1, 60 Stat. 778).

This section is the same as the provision which opens R.S. 4921 with minor changes in language.

### § 284. Damages

Upon finding for the claimant the court shall award the claimant damages adequate to compensate for the infringement, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty for the use made of the invention by the infringer, together with interest and costs as fixed by the court.

When the damages are not found by a jury, the court shall assess them. In either event the court may increase the damages up to three times the amount found or assessed. Increased damages under this paragraph shall not apply to provisional rights under section 154(d).

The court may receive expert testimony as an aid to the determination of damages or of what royalty would be reasonable under the circumstances.

(July 19, 1952, ch. 950, 66 Stat. 813; Pub. L. 106-113, div. B, §1000(a)(9) [title IV, §4507(9)], Nov. 29, 1999, 113 Stat. 1536, 1501A-566; Pub. L. 112-29, §20(j), Sept. 16, 2011, 125 Stat. 335.)

#### HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on Title 35, U.S.C., 1946 ed., §§67 and 70, part (R.S. 4919; R.S. 4921, amended (1) Mar. 3, 1897, ch. 391, §6, 29 Stat. 694, (2) Feb. 18, 1922, ch. 58, §8, 42 Stat. 392, (3) Aug. 1, 1946, ch. 726, §1, 60 Stat. 778).

This section consolidates the provisions relating to damages in R.S. 4919 and 4921, with some changes in language.

#### AMENDMENTS

2011—Second par. Pub. L. 112-29 struck out “of this title” after “154(d)”.

1999—Second par. Pub. L. 106-113 inserted at end “Increased damages under this paragraph shall not apply to provisional rights under section 154(d) of this title.”

#### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 2011 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 112-29 effective upon the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on Sept. 16, 2011, and applicable to proceedings commenced on or after that effective date, see section 20(l) of Pub. L. 112-29, set out as a note under section 2 of this title.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1999 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 106-113 effective Nov. 29, 2000, and applicable only to applications (including inter-

national applications designating the United States) filed on or after that date, see section 1000(a)(9) [title IV, § 4508] of Pub. L. 106-113, as amended, set out as a note under section 10 of this title.

### § 285. Attorney fees

The court in exceptional cases may award reasonable attorney fees to the prevailing party.

(July 19, 1952, ch. 950, 66 Stat. 813.)

#### HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on Title 35, U.S.C., 1946 ed., § 70, part (R.S. 4921, amended (1) Mar. 3, 1897, ch. 391, § 6, 29 Stat. 694, (2) Feb. 18, 1922, ch. 58, § 8, 42 Stat. 392, (3) Aug. 1, 1946, ch. 726, § 1, 60 Stat. 778).

This section is substantially the same as the corresponding provision in R.S. 4921; “in exceptional cases” has been added as expressing the intention of the present statute as shown by its legislative history and as interpreted by the courts.

### § 286. Time limitation on damages

Except as otherwise provided by law, no recovery shall be had for any infringement committed more than six years prior to the filing of the complaint or counterclaim for infringement in the action.

In the case of claims against the United States Government for use of a patented invention, the period before bringing suit, up to six years, between the date of receipt of a written claim for compensation by the department or agency of the Government having authority to settle such claim, and the date of mailing by the Government of a notice to the claimant that his claim has been denied shall not be counted as part of the period referred to in the preceding paragraph.

(July 19, 1952, ch. 950, 66 Stat. 813.)

#### HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on Title 35, U.S.C., 1946 ed., § 70, part (R.S. 4921, amended (1) Mar. 3, 1897, ch. 391, § 6, 29 Stat. 694, (2) Feb. 18, 1922, ch. 58, § 8, 42 Stat. 392, (3) Aug. 1, 1946, ch. 726, § 1, 60 Stat. 778).

The first paragraph is the same as the provision in R.S. 4921 with minor changes in language, with the added provision relating to the date for counterclaims for infringement.

The second paragraph is new and relates to extending the period of limitations with respect to suits in the Court of Claims in certain instances when administrative consideration is pending.

### § 287. Limitation on damages and other remedies; marking and notice

(a) Patentees, and persons making, offering for sale, or selling within the United States any patented article for or under them, or importing any patented article into the United States, may give notice to the public that the same is patented, either by fixing thereon the word “patent” or the abbreviation “pat.,” together with the number of the patent, or by fixing thereon the word “patent” or the abbreviation “pat.” together with an address of a posting on the Internet, accessible to the public without charge for accessing the address, that associates the patented article with the number of the patent, or when, from the character of the article, this can not be done, by fixing to it, or to the package wherein one or more of them is con-

tained, a label containing a like notice. In the event of failure so to mark, no damages shall be recovered by the patentee in any action for infringement, except on proof that the infringer was notified of the infringement and continued to infringe thereafter, in which event damages may be recovered only for infringement occurring after such notice. Filing of an action for infringement shall constitute such notice.

(b)(1) An infringer under section 271(g) shall be subject to all the provisions of this title relating to damages and injunctions except to the extent those remedies are modified by this subsection or section 9006 of the Process Patent Amendments Act of 1988. The modifications of remedies provided in this subsection shall not be available to any person who—

(A) practiced the patented process;

(B) owns or controls, or is owned or controlled by, the person who practiced the patented process; or

(C) had knowledge before the infringement that a patented process was used to make the product the importation, use, offer for sale, or sale of which constitutes the infringement.

(2) No remedies for infringement under section 271(g) shall be available with respect to any product in the possession of, or in transit to, the person subject to liability under such section before that person had notice of infringement with respect to that product. The person subject to liability shall bear the burden of proving any such possession or transit.

(3)(A) In making a determination with respect to the remedy in an action brought for infringement under section 271(g), the court shall consider—

(i) the good faith demonstrated by the defendant with respect to a request for disclosure,

(ii) the good faith demonstrated by the plaintiff with respect to a request for disclosure, and

(iii) the need to restore the exclusive rights secured by the patent.

(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the following are evidence of good faith:

(i) a request for disclosure made by the defendant;

(ii) a response within a reasonable time by the person receiving the request for disclosure; and

(iii) the submission of the response by the defendant to the manufacturer, or if the manufacturer is not known, to the supplier, of the product to be purchased by the defendant, together with a request for a written statement that the process claimed in any patent disclosed in the response is not used to produce such product.

The failure to perform any acts described in the preceding sentence is evidence of absence of good faith unless there are mitigating circumstances. Mitigating circumstances include the case in which, due to the nature of the product, the number of sources for the product, or like commercial circumstances, a request for disclosure is not necessary or practicable to avoid infringement.

(4)(A) For purposes of this subsection, a “request for disclosure” means a written request