

people move on to other topics; that we keep that straitjacket in place so we do those things that are, again, responsible not only to this generation but future generations.

Thirdly, I hope we figure out a way, through some type of amendment, to ensure that, on into the future, we have put something in place at the Federal level which causes us to be fiscally responsible in this country. All of us know what it means to have to make choices. All of us have households. Many of us have led cities and States. Many of us have had businesses. We all understand what happens in the real world, and it is something that certainly needs to happen here. That has been sorely lacking for a long time.

So I thank the Chair for the time on the floor today, and I hope to talk about this many more times. I have been doing it, I assure you, throughout the State of Tennessee and in multiple forums in the Senate.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I had the opportunity to speak with you in the last several moments, and you had a couple questions about the CAP Act that I was just discussing on the floor. The Presiding Officer had some great questions about what it takes to overcome the CAP Act, in the event we were able to pass it.

It is just a 10-page bill. It is very eloquent. It doesn't have a lot of "whereases." It is just a business document that takes us from where we are to where we need to be. But, in essence, to override it, it would take a two-thirds vote. It would take two-thirds of the House and the Senate to actually override or get out of the straitjacket, if you will. There were previous bills, such as Gramm-Rudman and other types of bills that tried to keep Washington fiscally focused, and those bills required 60 votes. So this would be a higher threshold.

So, yes, if there was some type of national emergency and we needed to move beyond this straitjacket for 1 year or 6 months or something like that, a two-thirds vote could do that. I mean, 67 votes is a pretty tough threshold, and hopefully it is the kind of threshold necessary to keep the kind of discipline in place that we need.

So it is a 10-page bill. Again, it is very eloquent. I think it lays out a solution for us that hopefully will be a part of anything we do over the next several months.

I understand, after talking with the Presiding Officer over the last several

days, while traveling to these various countries, that he, along with many of our other colleagues—I know I did myself—came here to solve problems, not to message. In a body such as this, it is tough to solve these kinds of problems, but the only way to do it is to offer a pragmatic solution.

I know there are some people who are interested, sometimes, in messaging. I have tried to offer something that I think will take us from a place that is very much out of line in spending to a place that is more appropriate.

I might also say I thought the President's deficit reduction commission had some very good points as it relates to tax reform. I think all of us are aware of the \$1.2 trillion in tax expenditures that exist.

I was doing an event over the last several days, and a gentleman raised his hand and asked me: What do you mean by tax expenditures? Isn't the money ours until we give it to the Federal Government? Why would you call it a tax expenditure?

I think people realize in our Tax Code there are all kinds of exclusions and subsidies and favored companies and favored this and favored that. If we did away with all of those, there would be \$1.2 trillion we could use to lower everybody's rate, and we could make our Tax Code much more simple. The deficit reduction commission says we could take our corporate rates from where they are down to a level of about 26 percent—somewhere between 23 and 29 percent—and lower everybody's rates individually. I think most Americans, instead of filling out all these forms to see if they benefit from these various subsidies and credits, would much rather know that everybody is on the same playing field; that some favored company is not in a situation where they are more favored than another; that everybody is on the same basis.

I think there has been some good work done there. I hope we are able to take votes on that over the next several months. But there is a very elegant, pragmatic solution that has been offered that would go hand in hand with these types of measures and would cause us, over the next 10 years, to exercise the kind of fiscal discipline this country needs to confront what I think threatens our national security, even more than the things we saw on the ground in the Middle East last week.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. VITTER. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

PATENT REFORM ACT OF 2011

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 23, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 23) to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments; as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italics.)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Patent Reform Act of 2011".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. First inventor to file.
- Sec. 3. Inventor's oath or declaration.
- Sec. 4. Damages.
- Sec. 5. Post-grant review proceedings.
- Sec. 6. Patent Trial and Appeal Board.
- Sec. 7. Preissuance submissions by third parties.
- Sec. 8. Venue.
- Sec. 9. Fee setting authority.
- Sec. 10. Supplemental examination.
- Sec. 11. Residency of Federal Circuit judges.
- Sec. 12. Micro entity defined.
- Sec. 13. Funding agreements.
- Sec. 14. Tax strategies deemed within the prior art.
- Sec. 15. Best mode requirement.
- Sec. 16. Technical amendments.
- Sec. 17. *Clarification of jurisdiction.*
- Sec. [17]18. Effective date; [rule of construction.]

SEC. 2. FIRST INVENTOR TO FILE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 100 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) The term 'inventor' means the individual or, if a joint invention, the individuals collectively who invented or discovered the subject matter of the invention.

"(g) The terms 'joint inventor' and 'co-inventor' mean any 1 of the individuals who invented or discovered the subject matter of a joint invention.

"(h) The term 'joint research agreement' means a written contract, grant, or cooperative agreement entered into by 2 or more persons or entities for the performance of experimental, developmental, or research work in the field of the claimed invention.

"(i)(1) The term 'effective filing date' of a claimed invention in a patent or application for patent means—

“(A) if subparagraph (B) does not apply, the actual filing date of the patent or the application for the patent containing a claim to the invention; or

“(B) the filing date of the earliest application for which the patent or application is entitled, as to such invention, to a right of priority under section 119, 365(a), or 365(b) or to the benefit of an earlier filing date under section 120, 121, or 365(c).

“(2) The effective filing date for a claimed invention in an application for reissue or reissued patent shall be determined by deeming the claim to the invention to have been contained in the patent for which reissue was sought.

“(j) The term ‘claimed invention’ means the subject matter defined by a claim in a patent or an application for a patent.”.

(b) CONDITIONS FOR PATENTABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 102 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 102. Conditions for patentability; novelty

“(a) NOVELTY; PRIOR ART.—A person shall be entitled to a patent unless—

“(1) the claimed invention was patented, described in a printed publication, or in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public before the effective filing date of the claimed invention; or

“(2) the claimed invention was described in a patent issued under section 151, or in an application for patent published or deemed published under section 122(b), in which the patent or application, as the case may be, names another inventor and was effectively filed before the effective filing date of the claimed invention.

“(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(1) DISCLOSURES MADE 1 YEAR OR LESS BEFORE THE EFFECTIVE FILING DATE OF THE CLAIMED INVENTION.—A disclosure made 1 year or less before the effective filing date of a claimed invention shall not be prior art to the claimed invention under subsection (a)(1) if—

“(A) the disclosure was made by the inventor or joint inventor or by another who obtained the subject matter disclosed directly or indirectly from the inventor or a joint inventor; or

“(B) the subject matter disclosed had, before such disclosure, been publicly disclosed by the inventor or a joint inventor or another who obtained the subject matter disclosed directly or indirectly from the inventor or a joint inventor.

“(2) DISCLOSURES APPEARING IN APPLICATIONS AND PATENTS.—A disclosure shall not be prior art to a claimed invention under subsection (a)(2) if—

“(A) the subject matter disclosed was obtained directly or indirectly from the inventor or a joint inventor;

“(B) the subject matter disclosed had, before such subject matter was effectively filed under subsection (a)(2), been publicly disclosed by the inventor or a joint inventor or another who obtained the subject matter disclosed directly or indirectly from the inventor or a joint inventor; or

“(C) the subject matter disclosed and the claimed invention, not later than the effective filing date of the claimed invention, were owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

“(c) COMMON OWNERSHIP UNDER JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENTS.—Subject matter disclosed and a claimed invention shall be deemed to have been owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person in applying the provisions of subsection (b)(2)(C) if—

“(1) the subject matter disclosed was developed and the claimed invention was made

by, or on behalf of, 1 or more parties to a joint research agreement that was in effect on or before the effective filing date of the claimed invention;

“(2) the claimed invention was made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of the joint research agreement; and

“(3) the application for patent for the claimed invention discloses or is amended to disclose the names of the parties to the joint research agreement.

“(d) PATENTS AND PUBLISHED APPLICATIONS EFFECTIVE AS PRIOR ART.—For purposes of determining whether a patent or application for patent is prior art to a claimed invention under subsection (a)(2), such patent or application shall be considered to have been effectively filed, with respect to any subject matter described in the patent or application—

“(1) if paragraph (2) does not apply, as of the actual filing date of the patent or the application for patent; or

“(2) if the patent or application for patent is entitled to claim a right of priority under section 119, 365(a), or 365(b), or to claim the benefit of an earlier filing date under section 120, 121, or 365(c), based upon 1 or more prior filed applications for patent, as of the filing date of the earliest such application that describes the subject matter.”.

(2) CONTINUITY OF INTENT UNDER THE CREATE ACT.—*The enactment of section 102(c) of title 35, United States Code, under the preceding paragraph is done with the same intent to promote joint research activities that was expressed, including in the legislative history, through the enactment of the Cooperative Research and Technology Enhancement Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-453; the “CREATE Act”), the amendments of which are stricken by subsection (c). The United States Patent and Trademark Office shall administer section 102(c) of title 35, United States Code, in a manner consistent with the legislative history of the CREATE Act that was relevant to its administration by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.*

[2](3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 102 in the table of sections for chapter 10 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“102. Conditions for patentability; novelty.”.

(c) CONDITIONS FOR PATENTABILITY; NON-OBVIOUS SUBJECT MATTER.—Section 103 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 103. Conditions for patentability; non-obvious subject matter

“A patent for a claimed invention may not be obtained, notwithstanding that the claimed invention is not identically disclosed as set forth in section 102, if the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious before the effective filing date of the claimed invention to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the claimed invention pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.”.

(d) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENTS FOR INVENTIONS MADE ABROAD.—Section 104 of title 35, United States Code, and the item relating to that section in the table of sections for chapter 10 of title 35, United States Code, are repealed.

(e) REPEAL OF STATUTORY INVENTION REGISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 157 of title 35, United States Code, and the item relating to that section in the table of sections for chapter 14 of title 35, United States Code, are repealed.

(2) REMOVAL OF CROSS REFERENCES.—Section 111(b)(8) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “sections 115, 131, 135, and 157” and inserting “sections 131 and 135”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to any request for a statutory invention registration filed on or after that date.

(f) EARLIER FILING DATE FOR INVENTOR AND JOINT INVENTOR.—Section 120 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “which is filed by an inventor or inventors named” and inserting “which names an inventor or joint inventor”.

(g) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) RIGHT OF PRIORITY.—Section 172 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “and the time specified in section 102(d)”.

(2) LIMITATION ON REMEDIES.—Section 287(c)(4) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “the earliest effective filing date of which is prior to” and inserting “which has an effective filing date before”.

(3) INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION DESIGNATING THE UNITED STATES: EFFECT.—Section 363 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “except as otherwise provided in section 102(e) of this title”.

(4) PUBLICATION OF INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION: EFFECT.—Section 374 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “sections 102(e) and 154(d)” and inserting “section 154(d)”.

(5) PATENT ISSUED ON INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION: EFFECT.—The second sentence of section 375(a) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “Subject to section 102(e) of this title, such” and inserting “Such”.

(6) LIMIT ON RIGHT OF PRIORITY.—Section 119(a) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “; but no patent shall be granted” and all that follows through “one year prior to such filing”.

(7) INVENTIONS MADE WITH FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 202(c) of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “publication, on sale, or public use,” and all that follows through “obtained in the United States” and inserting “the 1-year period referred to in section 102(b) would end before the end of that 2-year period”; and

(ii) by striking “the statutory” and inserting “that 1-year”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “any statutory bar date that may occur under this title due to publication, on sale, or public use” and inserting “the expiration of the 1-year period referred to in section 102(b)”.

(h) DERIVED PATENTS.—Section 291 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 291. Derived patents

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The owner of a patent may have relief by civil action against the owner of another patent that claims the same invention and has an earlier effective filing date if the invention claimed in such other patent was derived from the inventor of the invention claimed in the patent owned by the person seeking relief under this section.

“(b) FILING LIMITATION.—An action under this section may only be filed within 1 year after the issuance of the first patent containing a claim to the allegedly derived invention and naming an individual alleged to have derived such invention as the inventor or joint inventor.”.

(i) DERIVATION PROCEEDINGS.—Section 135 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 135. Derivation proceedings

“(a) INSTITUTION OF PROCEEDING.—An applicant for patent may file a petition to institute a derivation proceeding in the Office.

The petition shall set forth with particularity the basis for finding that an inventor named in an earlier application derived the claimed invention from an inventor named in the petitioner's application and, without authorization, the earlier application claiming such invention was filed. Any such petition may only be filed within 1 year after the first publication of a claim to an invention that is the same or substantially the same as the earlier application's claim to the invention, shall be made under oath, and shall be supported by substantial evidence. Whenever the Director determines that a petition filed under this subsection demonstrates that the standards for instituting a derivation proceeding are met, the Director may institute a derivation proceeding. The determination by the Director whether to institute a derivation proceeding shall be final and nonappealable.

(b) DETERMINATION BY PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD.—In a derivation proceeding instituted under subsection (a), the Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall determine whether an inventor named in the earlier application derived the claimed invention from an inventor named in the petitioner's application and, without authorization, the earlier application claiming such invention was filed. The Director shall prescribe regulations setting forth standards for the conduct of derivation proceedings.

(c) DEFERRAL OF DECISION.—The Patent Trial and Appeal Board may defer action on a petition for a derivation proceeding until 3 months after the date on which the Director issues a patent that includes the claimed invention that is the subject of the petition. The Patent Trial and Appeal Board also may defer action on a petition for a derivation proceeding, or stay the proceeding after it has been instituted, until the termination of a proceeding under chapter 30, 31, or 32 involving the patent of the earlier applicant.

(d) EFFECT OF FINAL DECISION.—The final decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, if adverse to claims in an application for patent, shall constitute the final refusal by the Office on those claims. The final decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, if adverse to claims in a patent, shall, if no appeal or other review of the decision has been or can be taken or had, constitute cancellation of those claims, and notice of such cancellation shall be endorsed on copies of the patent distributed after such cancellation.

(e) SETTLEMENT.—Parties to a proceeding instituted under subsection (a) may terminate the proceeding by filing a written statement reflecting the agreement of the parties as to the correct inventors of the claimed invention in dispute. Unless the Patent Trial and Appeal Board finds the agreement to be inconsistent with the evidence of record, if any, it shall take action consistent with the agreement. Any written settlement or understanding of the parties shall be filed with the Director. At the request of a party to the proceeding, the agreement or understanding shall be treated as business confidential information, shall be kept separate from the file of the involved patents or applications, and shall be made available only to Government agencies on written request, or to any person on a showing of good cause.

(f) ARBITRATION.—Parties to a proceeding instituted under subsection (a) may, within such time as may be specified by the Director by regulation, determine such contest or any aspect thereof by arbitration. Such arbitration shall be governed by the provisions of title 9, to the extent such title is inconsistent with this section. The parties shall give notice of any arbitration award to the Director, and such award shall, as between the parties to the arbitration, be dispositive of the issues to which it relates. The

arbitration award shall be unenforceable until such notice is given. Nothing in this subsection shall preclude the Director from determining the patentability of the claimed inventions involved in the proceeding."

(j) ELIMINATION OF REFERENCES TO INTERFERENCES.—(1) Sections 41, 134, 145, 146, 154, 305, and 314 of title 35, United States Code, are each amended by striking "Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences" each place it appears and inserting "Patent Trial and Appeal Board".

(2)(A) Sections 146 and 154 of title 35, United States Code, are each amended—

(i) by striking "an interference" each place it appears and inserting "a derivation proceeding"; and

(ii) by striking "interference" each additional place it appears and inserting "derivation proceeding".

(B) The subparagraph heading for section 154(b)(1)(C) of title 35, United States Code, as amended by this paragraph, is further amended by—

(i) striking "OR" and inserting "OF"; and

(ii) striking "SECURITY ORDER" and inserting "SECURITY ORDERS".

(3) The section heading for section 134 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 134. Appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board".

(4) The section heading for section 146 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 146. Civil action in case of derivation proceeding".

(5) Section 154(b)(1)(C) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking "INTERFERENCES" and inserting "DERIVATION PROCEEDINGS".

(6) The item relating to section 6 in the table of sections for chapter 1 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"6. Patent Trial and Appeal Board."

(7) The items relating to sections 134 and 135 in the table of sections for chapter 12 of title 35, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"134. Appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board.

"135. Derivation proceedings."

(8) The item relating to section 146 in the table of sections for chapter 13 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"146. Civil action in case of derivation proceeding."

(k) FALSE MARKING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 292 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

"Only the United States may sue for the penalty authorized by this subsection."; and

(B) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

"(b) Any person who has suffered a competitive injury as a result of a violation of this section may file a civil action in a district court of the United States for recovery of damages adequate to compensate for the injury."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to all cases, without exception, pending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(l) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 32 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by inserting between the third and fourth sentences the following: "A proceeding under this section shall be commenced not later than the earlier of either 10 years after the date on which

the misconduct forming the basis for the proceeding occurred, or 1 year after the date on which the misconduct forming the basis for the proceeding is made known to an officer or employee of the Office as prescribed in the regulations established under section 2(b)(2)(D)."

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director shall provide on a biennial basis to the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives a report providing a short description of incidents made known to an officer or employee of the Office as prescribed in the regulations established under section 2(b)(2)(D) of title 35, United States Code, that reflect substantial evidence of misconduct before the Office but for which the Office was barred from commencing a proceeding under section 32 of title 35, United States Code, by the time limitation established by the fourth sentence of that section.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply in all cases in which the time period for instituting a proceeding under section 32 of title 35, United States Code, had not lapsed prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

(m) SMALL BUSINESS STUDY.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term "Chief Counsel" means the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration;

(B) the term "General Counsel" means the General Counsel of the United States Patent and Trademark Office; and

(C) the term "small business concern" has the meaning given that term under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

(2) STUDY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chief Counsel, in consultation with the General Counsel, shall conduct a study of the effects of eliminating the use of dates of invention in determining whether an applicant is entitled to a patent under title 35, United States Code.

(B) AREAS OF STUDY.—The study conducted under subparagraph (A) shall include examination of the effects of eliminating the use of invention dates, including examining—

(i) how the change would affect the ability of small business concerns to obtain patents and their costs of obtaining patents;

(ii) whether the change would create, mitigate, or exacerbate any disadvantage for applicants for patents that are small business concerns relative to applicants for patents that are not small business concerns, and whether the change would create any advantages for applicants for patents that are small business concerns relative to applicants for patents that are not small business concerns;

(iii) the cost savings and other potential benefits to small business concerns of the change; and

(iv) the feasibility and costs and benefits to small business concerns of alternative means of determining whether an applicant is entitled to a patent under title 35, United States Code.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chief Counsel shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report regarding the results of the study under paragraph (2).

(n) REPORT ON PRIOR USER RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall report, to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, the findings and recommendations of the Director on the operation of

prior user rights in selected countries in the industrialized world. The report shall include the following:

(A) A comparison between patent laws of the United States and the laws of other industrialized countries, including members of the European Union and Japan, Canada, and Australia.

(B) An analysis of the effect of prior user rights on innovation rates in the selected countries.

(C) An analysis of the correlation, if any, between prior user rights and start-up enterprises and the ability to attract venture capital to start new companies.

(D) An analysis of the effect of prior user rights, if any, on small businesses, universities, and individual inventors.

(E) An analysis of legal and constitutional issues, if any, that arise from placing trade secret law in patent law.

(F) An analysis of whether the change to a first-to-file patent system creates a particular need for prior user rights.

(2) CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—In preparing the report required under paragraph (1), the Director shall consult with the United States Trade Representative, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by this section, the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to any application for patent, and to any patent issuing thereon, that contains or contained at any time—

(A) a claim to a claimed invention that has an effective filing date as defined in section 100(i) of title 35, United States Code, that is 18 months or more after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(B) a specific reference under section 120, 121, or 365(c) of title 35, United States Code, to any patent or application that contains or contained at any time such a claim.

(2) INTERFERING PATENTS.—The provisions of sections 102(g), 135, and 291 of title 35, United States Code, in effect on the day prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, shall apply to each claim of an application for patent, and any patent issued thereon, for which the amendments made by this section also apply, if such application or patent contains or contained at any time—

(A) a claim to an invention having an effective filing date as defined in section 100(i) of title 35, United States Code, earlier than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(B) a specific reference under section 120, 121, or 365(c) of title 35, United States Code, to any patent or application that contains or contained at any time such a claim.

SEC. 3. INVENTOR'S OATH OR DECLARATION.

(a) INVENTOR'S OATH OR DECLARATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 115 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 115. Inventor's oath or declaration

“(a) NAMING THE INVENTOR; INVENTOR'S OATH OR DECLARATION.—An application for patent that is filed under section 111(a) or commences the national stage under section 371 shall include, or be amended to include, the name of the inventor for any invention claimed in the application. Except as otherwise provided in this section, each individual who is the inventor or a joint inventor of a claimed invention in an application for patent shall execute an oath or declaration in connection with the application.

“(b) REQUIRED STATEMENTS.—An oath or declaration under subsection (a) shall contain statements that—

“(1) the application was made or was authorized to be made by the affiant or declarant; and

“(2) such individual believes himself or herself to be the original inventor or an original joint inventor of a claimed invention in the application.

“(c) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—The Director may specify additional information relating to the inventor and the invention that is required to be included in an oath or declaration under subsection (a).

“(d) SUBSTITUTE STATEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In lieu of executing an oath or declaration under subsection (a), the applicant for patent may provide a substitute statement under the circumstances described in paragraph (2) and such additional circumstances that the Director may specify by regulation.

“(2) PERMITTED CIRCUMSTANCES.—A substitute statement under paragraph (1) is permitted with respect to any individual who—

“(A) is unable to file the oath or declaration under subsection (a) because the individual—

“(i) is deceased;

“(ii) is under legal incapacity; or

“(iii) cannot be found or reached after diligent effort; or

“(B) is under an obligation to assign the invention but has refused to make the oath or declaration required under subsection (a).

“(3) CONTENTS.—A substitute statement under this subsection shall—

“(A) identify the individual with respect to whom the statement applies;

“(B) set forth the circumstances representing the permitted basis for the filing of the substitute statement in lieu of the oath or declaration under subsection (a); and

“(C) contain any additional information, including any showing, required by the Director.

“(e) MAKING REQUIRED STATEMENTS IN ASSIGNMENT OF RECORD.—An individual who is under an obligation of assignment of an application for patent may include the required statements under subsections (b) and (c) in the assignment executed by the individual, in lieu of filing such statements separately.

“(f) TIME FOR FILING.—A notice of allowance under section 151 may be provided to an applicant for patent only if the applicant for patent has filed each required oath or declaration under subsection (a) or has filed a substitute statement under subsection (d) or recorded an assignment meeting the requirements of subsection (e).

“(g) EARLIER-FILED APPLICATION CONTAINING REQUIRED STATEMENTS OR SUBSTITUTE STATEMENT.—

“(1) EXCEPTION.—The requirements under this section shall not apply to an individual with respect to an application for patent in which the individual is named as the inventor or a joint inventor and who claims the benefit under section 120, 121, or 365(c) of the filing of an earlier-filed application, if—

“(A) an oath or declaration meeting the requirements of subsection (a) was executed by the individual and was filed in connection with the earlier-filed application;

“(B) a substitute statement meeting the requirements of subsection (d) was filed in the earlier filed application with respect to the individual; or

“(C) an assignment meeting the requirements of subsection (e) was executed with respect to the earlier-filed application by the individual and was recorded in connection with the earlier-filed application.

“(2) COPIES OF OATHS, DECLARATIONS, STATEMENTS, OR ASSIGNMENTS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Director may require that a copy of the executed oath or declaration, the substitute statement, or the

assignment filed in the earlier-filed application be included in the later-filed application.

“(h) SUPPLEMENTAL AND CORRECTED STATEMENTS; FILING ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person making a statement required under this section may withdraw, replace, or otherwise correct the statement at any time. If a change is made in the naming of the inventor requiring the filing of 1 or more additional statements under this section, the Director shall establish regulations under which such additional statements may be filed.

“(2) SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENTS NOT REQUIRED.—If an individual has executed an oath or declaration meeting the requirements of subsection (a) or an assignment meeting the requirements of subsection (e) with respect to an application for patent, the Director may not thereafter require that individual to make any additional oath, declaration, or other statement equivalent to those required by this section in connection with the application for patent or any patent issuing thereon.

“(3) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—No patent shall be invalid or unenforceable based upon the failure to comply with a requirement under this section if the failure is remedied as provided under paragraph (1).

“(i) ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF PENALTIES.—Any declaration or statement filed pursuant to this section shall contain an acknowledgment that any willful false statement made in such declaration or statement is punishable under section 1001 of title 18 by fine or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both.”

(2) RELATIONSHIP TO DIVISIONAL APPLICATIONS.—Section 121 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “If a divisional application” and all that follows through “inventor.”

(3) REQUIREMENTS FOR NONPROVISIONAL APPLICATIONS.—Section 111(a) of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking “by the applicant” and inserting “or declaration”;

(B) in the heading for paragraph (3), by inserting “OR DECLARATION” after “AND OATH”; and

(C) by inserting “or declaration” after “and oath” each place it appears.

(4) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 115 in the table of sections for chapter 11 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“115. Inventor's oath or declaration.”

(b) FILING BY OTHER THAN INVENTOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 118 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 118. Filing by other than inventor

“A person to whom the inventor has assigned or is under an obligation to assign the invention may make an application for patent. A person who otherwise shows sufficient proprietary interest in the matter may make an application for patent on behalf of and as agent for the inventor on proof of the pertinent facts and a showing that such action is appropriate to preserve the rights of the parties. If the Director grants a patent on an application filed under this section by a person other than the inventor, the patent shall be granted to the real party in interest and upon such notice to the inventor as the Director considers to be sufficient.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 251 of title 35, United States Code, is amended in the third undesignated paragraph by inserting “or the application for the original patent was filed by the assignee of the entire interest” after “claims of the original patent”.

(c) SPECIFICATION.—Section 112 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first paragraph—

(A) by striking “The specification” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—The specification”; and

(B) by striking “of carrying out his invention” and inserting “or joint inventor of carrying out the invention”;

(2) in the second paragraph—

(A) by striking “The specification” and inserting “(b) CONCLUSION.—The specification”; and

(B) by striking “applicant regards as his invention” and inserting “inventor or a joint inventor regards as the invention”;

(3) in the third paragraph, by striking “A claim” and inserting “(c) FORM.—A claim”;

(4) in the fourth paragraph, by striking “Subject to the following paragraph,” and inserting “(d) REFERENCE IN DEPENDENT FORMS.—Subject to subsection (e).”;

(5) in the fifth paragraph, by striking “A claim” and inserting “(e) REFERENCE IN MULTIPLE DEPENDENT FORM.—A claim”; and

(6) in the last paragraph, by striking “An element” and inserting “(f) ELEMENT IN CLAIM FOR A COMBINATION.—An element”.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Sections 111(b)(1)(A) is amended by striking “the first paragraph of section 112 of this title” and inserting “section 112(a)”.

(2) Section 111(b)(2) is amended by striking “the second through fifth paragraphs of section 112,” and inserting “subsections (b) through (e) of section 112.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to patent applications that are filed on or after that effective date.

SEC. 4. DAMAGES.

(a) DAMAGES.—Section 284 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “Upon finding” and inserting the following: “(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon finding”;

(2) by striking “fixed by the court” and all that follows through “When the damages” and inserting the following: “fixed by the court. When the damages”;

(3) by striking “shall assess them.” and all that follows through “The court may receive” and inserting the following: “shall assess them. *In either event the court may increase the damages up to 3 times the amount found or assessed. Increased damages under this subsection shall not apply to provisional rights under section 154(d) of this title.* The court may receive”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINING DAMAGES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The court shall identify the methodologies and factors that are relevant to the determination of damages, and the court or jury shall consider only those methodologies and factors relevant to making such determination.

“(2) DISCLOSURE OF CLAIMS.—By no later than the entry of the final pretrial order, unless otherwise ordered by the court, the parties shall state, in writing and with particularity, the methodologies and factors the parties propose for instruction to the jury in determining damages under this section, specifying the relevant underlying legal and factual bases for their assertions.

“(3) SUFFICIENCY OF EVIDENCE.—Prior to the introduction of any evidence concerning the determination of damages, upon motion of either party or sua sponte, the court shall consider whether one or more of a party’s damages contentions lacks a legally sufficient evidentiary basis. After providing a nonmovant the opportunity to be heard, and after any further proffer of evidence, briefing, or argument that the court may deem appropriate, the court shall identify on the

record those methodologies and factors as to which there is a legally sufficient evidentiary basis, and the court or jury shall consider only those methodologies and factors in making the determination of damages under this section. The court shall only permit the introduction of evidence relating to the determination of damages that is relevant to the methodologies and factors that the court determines may be considered in making the damages determination.

“(c) SEQUENCING.—Any party may request that a patent-infringement trial be sequenced so that the trier of fact decides questions of the patent’s infringement and validity before the issues of damages and willful infringement are tried to the court or the jury. The court shall grant such a request absent good cause to reject the request, such as the absence of issues of significant damages or infringement and validity. The sequencing of a trial pursuant to this subsection shall not affect other matters, such as the timing of discovery. This subsection does not authorize a party to request that the issues of damages and willful infringement be tried to a jury different than the one that will decide questions of the patent’s infringement and validity.

“(d) WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The court may increase damages up to 3 times the amount found or assessed if the court or the jury, as the case may be, determines that the infringement of the patent was willful. Increased damages under this subsection shall not apply to provisional rights under section 154(d). Infringement is not willful unless the claimant proves by clear and convincing evidence that the accused infringer’s conduct with respect to the patent was objectively reckless. An accused infringer’s conduct was objectively reckless if the infringer was acting despite an objectively high likelihood that his actions constituted infringement of a valid patent, and this objectively-defined risk was either known or so obvious that it should have been known to the accused infringer.

“(2) PLEADING STANDARDS.—A claimant asserting that a patent was infringed willfully shall comply with the pleading requirements set forth under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 9(b).

“(3) KNOWLEDGE ALONE INSUFFICIENT.—Infringement of a patent may not be found to be willful solely on the basis that the infringer had knowledge of the infringed patent.

“(4) PRE-SUIT NOTIFICATION.—A claimant seeking to establish willful infringement may not rely on evidence of pre-suit notification of infringement unless that notification identifies with particularity the asserted patent, identifies the product or process accused, and explains with particularity, to the extent possible following a reasonable investigation or inquiry, how the product or process infringes one or more claims of the patent.

“(5) CLOSE CASE.—The court shall not increase damages under this subsection if the court determines that there is a close case as to infringement, validity, or enforceability. On the motion of either party, the court shall determine whether a close case as to infringement, validity, or enforceability exists, and the court shall explain its decision. Once the court determines that such a close case exists, the issue of willful infringement shall not thereafter be tried to the jury.

“(6) ACCRUED DAMAGES.—If a court or jury finds that the infringement of patent was willful, the court may increase only those damages that accrued after the infringement became willful.”.]

(b) DEFENSE TO INFRINGEMENT BASED ON EARLIER INVENTOR.—Section 273(b)(6) of title

35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(6) PERSONAL DEFENSE.—The defense under this section may be asserted only by the person who performed or caused the performance of the acts necessary to establish the defense as well as any other entity that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such person and, except for any transfer to the patent owner, the right to assert the defense shall not be licensed or assigned or transferred to another person except as an ancillary and subordinate part of a good faith assignment or transfer for other reasons of the entire enterprise or line of business to which the defense relates. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, any person may, on its own behalf, assert a defense based on the exhaustion of rights provided under paragraph (3), including any necessary elements thereof.”.

(c) VIRTUAL MARKING.—Section 287(a) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, 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” before “, or when”.

(d) ADVICE OF COUNSEL.—Chapter 29 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 298. Advice of Counsel

“The failure of an infringer to obtain the advice of counsel with respect to any allegedly infringed patent or the failure of the infringer to present such advice to the court or jury may not be used to prove that the accused infringer willfully infringed the patent or that the infringer intended to induce infringement of the patent.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any civil action commenced on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. POST-GRANT REVIEW PROCEEDINGS.

(a) INTER PARTES REVIEW.—Chapter 31 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“CHAPTER 31—INTER PARTES REVIEW

“Sec.

“311. Inter partes review.

“312. Petitions.

“313. Preliminary response to petition.

“314. Institution of inter partes review.

“315. Relation to other proceedings or actions.

“316. Conduct of inter partes review.

“317. Settlement.

“318. Decision of the board.

“319. Appeal.

“§ 311. Inter partes review

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this chapter, a person who is not the patent owner may file with the Office a petition to institute an inter partes review for a patent. The Director shall establish, by regulation, fees to be paid by the person requesting the review, in such amounts as the Director determines to be reasonable, considering the aggregate costs of the review.

“(b) SCOPE.—A petitioner in an inter partes review may request to cancel as unpatentable 1 or more claims of a patent only on a ground that could be raised under section 102 or 103 and only on the basis of prior art consisting of patents or printed publications.

“(c) FILING DEADLINE.—A petition for inter partes review shall be filed after the later of either—

“(1) 9 months after the grant of a patent or issuance of a reissue of a patent; or

“(2) if a post-grant review is instituted under chapter 32, the date of the termination of such post-grant review.

“§ 312. Petitions

“(a) REQUIREMENTS OF PETITION.—A petition filed under section 311 may be considered only if—

“(1) the petition is accompanied by payment of the fee established by the Director under section 311;

“(2) the petition identifies all real parties in interest;

“(3) the petition identifies, in writing and with particularity, each claim challenged, the grounds on which the challenge to each claim is based, and the evidence that supports the grounds for the challenge to each claim, including—

“(A) copies of patents and printed publications that the petitioner relies upon in support of the petition; and

“(B) affidavits or declarations of supporting evidence and opinions, if the petitioner relies on expert opinions;

“(4) the petition provides such other information as the Director may require by regulation; and

“(5) the petitioner provides copies of any of the documents required under paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) to the patent owner or, if applicable, the designated representative of the patent owner.

“(b) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—As soon as practicable after the receipt of a petition under section 311, the Director shall make the petition available to the public.

“§ 313. Preliminary response to petition

“(a) PRELIMINARY RESPONSE.—If an inter partes review petition is filed under section 311, the patent owner shall have the right to file a preliminary response within a time period set by the Director.

“(b) CONTENT OF RESPONSE.—A preliminary response to a petition for inter partes review shall set forth reasons why no inter partes review should be instituted based upon the failure of the petition to meet any requirement of this chapter.

“§ 314. Institution of inter partes review

“(a) THRESHOLD.—The Director may not authorize an inter partes review to commence unless the Director determines that the information presented in the petition filed under section 311 and any response filed under section 313 shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.

“(b) TIMING.—The Director shall determine whether to institute an inter partes review under this chapter within 3 months after receiving a preliminary response under section 313 or, if none is filed, within three months after the expiration of the time for filing such a response.

“(c) NOTICE.—The Director shall notify the petitioner and patent owner, in writing, of the Director's determination under subsection (a), and shall make such notice available to the public as soon as is practicable. Such notice shall list the date on which the review shall commence.

“(d) NO APPEAL.—The determination by the Director whether to institute an inter partes review under this section shall be final and nonappealable.

“§ 315. Relation to other proceedings or actions

“(a) INFRINGER'S ACTION.—An inter partes review may not be instituted or maintained if the petitioner or real party in interest has filed a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of the patent.

“(b) PATENT OWNER'S ACTION.—An inter partes review may not be instituted if the petition requesting the proceeding is filed more than 3 months after the date on which the petitioner, real party in interest, or his privy is required to respond to a civil action alleging infringement of the patent.】

“(b) PATENT OWNER'S ACTION.—An inter partes review may not be instituted if the petition requesting the proceeding is filed more than 6 months after the date on which the petitioner, real party in interest, or his privy is served with a complaint alleging infringement of the patent. The time limitation set forth in the preceding sentence shall not apply to a request for joinder under subsection (c).

“(c) JOINDER.—If the Director institutes an inter partes review, the Director, in his discretion, may join as a party to that inter partes review any person who properly files a petition under section 311 that the Director, after receiving a preliminary response under section 313 or the expiration of the time for filing such a response, determines warrants the institution of an inter partes review under section 314.

“(d) MULTIPLE PROCEEDINGS.—Notwithstanding sections 135(a), 251, and 252, and chapter 30, during the pendency of an inter partes review, if another proceeding or matter involving the patent is before the Office, the Director may determine the manner in which the inter partes review or other proceeding or matter may proceed, including providing for stay, transfer, consolidation, or termination of any such matter or proceeding.

“(e) ESTOPPEL.—

“(1) PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE OFFICE.—The petitioner in an inter partes review under this chapter, or his real party in interest or privy, may not request or maintain a proceeding before the Office with respect to a claim on any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised during an inter partes review of the claim that resulted in a final written decision under section 318(a).

“(2) CIVIL ACTIONS AND OTHER PROCEEDINGS.—The petitioner in an inter partes review under this chapter, or his real party in interest or privy, may not assert either in a civil action arising in whole or in part under section 1338 of title 28 or in a proceeding before the International Trade Commission that a claim in a patent is invalid on any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised during an inter partes review of the claim that resulted in a final written decision under section 318(a).

“§ 316. Conduct of inter partes review

“(a) REGULATIONS.—The Director shall prescribe regulations—

“(1) providing that the file of any proceeding under this chapter shall be made available to the public, except that any petition or document filed with the intent that it be sealed shall be accompanied by a motion to seal, and such petition or document shall be treated as sealed pending the outcome of the ruling on the motion;

“(2) setting forth the standards for the showing of sufficient grounds to institute a review under section 314(a);

“(3) establishing procedures for the submission of supplemental information after the petition is filed;

“(4) in accordance with section 2(b)(2), establishing and governing inter partes review under this chapter and the relationship of such review to other proceedings under this title;

“(5) setting a time period for requesting joinder under section 315(c);

“(6) setting forth standards and procedures for discovery of relevant evidence, including that such discovery shall be limited to—

“(A) the deposition of witnesses submitting affidavits or declarations; and

“(B) what is otherwise necessary in the interest of justice;

“(7) prescribing sanctions for abuse of discovery, abuse of process, or any other improper use of the proceeding, such as to har-

ass or to cause unnecessary delay or an unnecessary increase in the cost of the proceeding;

“(8) providing for protective orders governing the exchange and submission of confidential information;

“(9) allowing the patent owner to file a response to the petition after an inter partes review has been instituted, and requiring that the patent owner file with such response, through affidavits or declarations, any additional factual evidence and expert opinions on which the patent owner relies in support of the response;

“(10) setting forth standards and procedures for allowing the patent owner to move to amend the patent under subsection (d) to cancel a challenged claim or propose a reasonable number of substitute claims, and ensuring that any information submitted by the patent owner in support of any amendment entered under subsection (d) is made available to the public as part of the prosecution history of the patent;

“(11) providing either party with the right to an oral hearing as part of the proceeding; and

“(12) requiring that the final determination in an inter partes review be issued not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director notices the institution of a review under this chapter, except that the Director may, for good cause shown, extend the 1-year period by not more than 6 months, and may adjust the time periods in this paragraph in the case of joinder under section 315(c).

“(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In prescribing regulations under this section, the Director shall consider the effect of any such regulation on the economy, the integrity of the patent system, the efficient administration of the Office, and the ability of the Office to timely complete proceedings instituted under this chapter.

“(c) PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD.—The Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall, in accordance with section 6, conduct each proceeding authorized by the Director.

“(d) AMENDMENT OF THE PATENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—During an inter partes review instituted under this chapter, the patent owner may file 1 motion to amend the patent in 1 or more of the following ways:

“(A) Cancel any challenged patent claim.

“(B) For each challenged claim, propose a reasonable number of substitute claims.

“(2) ADDITIONAL MOTIONS.—Additional motions to amend may be permitted upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner to materially advance the settlement of a proceeding under section 317, or as permitted by regulations prescribed by the Director.

“(3) SCOPE OF CLAIMS.—An amendment under this subsection may not enlarge the scope of the claims of the patent or introduce new matter.

“(e) EVIDENTIARY STANDARDS.—In an inter partes review instituted under this chapter, the petitioner shall have the burden of proving a proposition of unpatentability by a preponderance of the evidence.

“§ 317. Settlement

“(a) IN GENERAL.—An inter partes review instituted under this chapter shall be terminated with respect to any petitioner upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner, unless the Office has decided the merits of the proceeding before the request for termination is filed. If the inter partes review is terminated with respect to a petitioner under this section, no estoppel under section 315(e) shall apply to that petitioner. If no petitioner remains in the inter partes review, the Office may terminate the review or proceed to a final written decision under section 318(a).

“(b) AGREEMENTS IN WRITING.—Any agreement or understanding between the patent owner and a petitioner, including any collateral agreements referred to in such agreement or understanding, made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of an inter partes review under this section shall be in writing and a true copy of such agreement or understanding shall be filed in the Office before the termination of the inter partes review as between the parties. If any party filing such agreement or understanding so requests, the copy shall be kept separate from the file of the inter partes review, and shall be made available only to Federal Government agencies upon written request, or to any other person on a showing of good cause.

“§ 318. Decision of the board

“(a) FINAL WRITTEN DECISION.—If an inter partes review is instituted and not dismissed under this chapter, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall issue a final written decision with respect to the patentability of any patent claim challenged by the petitioner and any new claim added under section 316(d).

“(b) CERTIFICATE.—If the Patent Trial and Appeal Board issues a final written decision under subsection (a) and the time for appeal has expired or any appeal has terminated, the Director shall issue and publish a certificate canceling any claim of the patent finally determined to be unpatentable, confirming any claim of the patent determined to be patentable, and incorporating in the patent by operation of the certificate any new or amended claim determined to be patentable.

“§ 319. Appeal

“A party dissatisfied with the final written decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board under section 318(a) may appeal the decision pursuant to sections 141 through 144. Any party to the inter partes review shall have the right to be a party to the appeal.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for part III of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to chapter 31 and inserting the following:

“31. Inter Partes Review 311.”

(c) REGULATIONS AND EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—The Director shall, not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, issue regulations to carry out chapter 31 of title 35, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a) of this section.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to all patents issued before, on, or after the effective date of subsection (a).

(B) EXCEPTION.—The provisions of chapter 31 of title 35, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (3), shall continue to apply to requests for inter partes reexamination that are filed prior to the effective date of subsection (a) as if subsection (a) had not been enacted.

(C) GRADUATED IMPLEMENTATION.—The Director may impose a limit on the number of inter partes reviews that may be instituted during each of the first 4 years following the effective date of subsection (a), provided that such number shall in each year be equivalent to or greater than the number of inter partes reexaminations that are ordered in the last full fiscal year prior to the effective date of subsection (a).

(3) TRANSITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 31 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in section 312—

(I) in subsection (a)—

(aa) in the first sentence, by striking “a substantial new question of patentability affecting any claim of the patent concerned is raised by the request,” and inserting “the information presented in the request shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the requester would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the request,”; and

(bb) in the second sentence, by striking “The existence of a substantial new question of patentability” and inserting “A showing that there is a reasonable likelihood that the requester would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the request”; and

(II) in subsection (c), in the second sentence, by striking “no substantial new question of patentability has been raised,” and inserting “the showing required by subsection (a) has not been made,”; and

(ii) in section 313, by striking “a substantial new question of patentability affecting a claim of the patent is raised” and inserting “it has been shown that there is a reasonable likelihood that the requester would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the request”.

(B) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this paragraph shall apply to requests for inter partes reexamination that are filed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, but prior to the effective date of subsection (a).

(d) POST-GRANT REVIEW.—Part III of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“CHAPTER 32—POST-GRANT REVIEW

“Sec.

“321. Post-grant review.

“322. Petitions.

“323. Preliminary response to petition.

“324. Institution of post-grant review.

“325. Relation to other proceedings or actions.

“326. Conduct of post-grant review.

“327. Settlement.

“328. Decision of the board.

“329. Appeal.

“§ 321. Post-grant review

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this chapter, a person who is not the patent owner may file with the Office a petition to institute a post-grant review for a patent. The Director shall establish, by regulation, fees to be paid by the person requesting the review, in such amounts as the Director determines to be reasonable, considering the aggregate costs of the post-grant review.

“(b) SCOPE.—A petitioner in a post-grant review may request to cancel as unpatentable 1 or more claims of a patent on any ground that could be raised under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 282(b) (relating to invalidity of the patent or any claim).

“(c) FILING DEADLINE.—A petition for a post-grant review shall be filed not later than 9 months after the grant of the patent or issuance of a reissue patent.

“§ 322. Petitions

“(a) REQUIREMENTS OF PETITION.—A petition filed under section 321 may be considered only if—

“(1) the petition is accompanied by payment of the fee established by the Director under section 321;

“(2) the petition identifies all real parties in interest;

“(3) the petition identifies, in writing and with particularity, each claim challenged, the grounds on which the challenge to each claim is based, and the evidence that supports the grounds for the challenge to each claim, including—

“(A) copies of patents and printed publications that the petitioner relies upon in support of the petition; and

“(B) affidavits or declarations of supporting evidence and opinions, if the petitioner relies on other factual evidence or on expert opinions;

“(4) the petition provides such other information as the Director may require by regulation; and

“(5) the petitioner provides copies of any of the documents required under paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) to the patent owner or, if applicable, the designated representative of the patent owner.

“(b) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—As soon as practicable after the receipt of a petition under section 321, the Director shall make the petition available to the public.

“§ 323. Preliminary response to petition

“(a) PRELIMINARY RESPONSE.—If a post-grant review petition is filed under section 321, the patent owner shall have the right to file a preliminary response within 2 months of the filing of the petition.

“(b) CONTENT OF RESPONSE.—A preliminary response to a petition for post-grant review shall set forth reasons why no post-grant review should be instituted based upon the failure of the petition to meet any requirement of this chapter.

“§ 324. Institution of post-grant review

“(a) THRESHOLD.—The Director may not authorize a post-grant review to commence unless the Director determines that the information presented in the petition, if such information is not rebutted, would demonstrate that it is more likely than not that at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition is unpatentable.

“(b) ADDITIONAL GROUNDS.—The determination required under subsection (a) may also be satisfied by a showing that the petition raises a novel or unsettled legal question that is important to other patents or patent applications.

“(c) TIMING.—The Director shall determine whether to institute a post-grant review under this chapter within 3 months after receiving a preliminary response under section 323 or, if none is filed, the expiration of the time for filing such a response.

“(d) NOTICE.—The Director shall notify the petitioner and patent owner, in writing, of the Director's determination under subsection (a) or (b), and shall make such notice available to the public as soon as is practicable. The Director shall make each notice of the institution of a post-grant review available to the public. Such notice shall list the date on which the review shall commence.

“(e) NO APPEAL.—The determination by the Director whether to institute a post-grant review under this section shall be final and nonappealable.

“§ 325. Relation to other proceedings or actions

“(a) INFRINGER'S ACTION.—A post-grant review may not be instituted or maintained if the petitioner or real party in interest has filed a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of the patent.

“(b) PATENT OWNER'S ACTION.—A post-grant review may not be instituted if the petition requesting the proceeding is filed more than 3 months after the date on which the petitioner, real party in interest, or his privy is required to respond to a civil action alleging infringement of the patent.”

“(b) PATENT OWNER'S ACTION.—A post-grant review may not be instituted if the petition requesting the proceeding is filed more than 6 months after the date on which the petitioner, real party in interest, or his privy is served with a complaint alleging infringement of the patent.

The time limitation set forth in the preceding sentence shall not apply to a request for joinder under subsection (c).

“(c) JOINDER.—If more than 1 petition for a post-grant review is properly filed against the same patent and the Director determines that more than 1 of these petitions warrants the institution of a post-grant review under section 324, the Director may consolidate such reviews into a single post-grant review.

“(d) MULTIPLE PROCEEDINGS.—Notwithstanding sections 135(a), 251, and 252, and chapter 30, during the pendency of any post-grant review, if another proceeding or matter involving the patent is before the Office, the Director may determine the manner in which the post-grant review or other proceeding or matter may proceed, including providing for stay, transfer, consolidation, or termination of any such matter or proceeding. In determining whether to institute or order a proceeding under this chapter, chapter 30, or chapter 31, the Director may take into account whether, and reject the petition or request because, the same or substantially the same prior art or arguments previously were presented to the Office.

“(e) ESTOPPEL.—

“(1) PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE OFFICE.—The petitioner in a post-grant review under this chapter, or his real party in interest or privy, may not request or maintain a proceeding before the Office with respect to a claim on any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised during a post-grant review of the claim that resulted in a final written decision under section 328(a).

“(2) CIVIL ACTIONS AND OTHER PROCEEDINGS.—The petitioner in a post-grant review under this chapter, or his real party in interest or privy, may not assert either in a civil action arising in whole or in part under section 1338 of title 28 or in a proceeding before the International Trade Commission that a claim in a patent is invalid on any ground that the petitioner raised during a post-grant review of the claim that resulted in a final written decision under section 328(a).

“(f) PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS.—If a civil action alleging infringement of a patent is filed within 3 months of the grant of the patent, the court may not stay its consideration of the patent owner's motion for a preliminary injunction against infringement of the patent on the basis that a petition for post-grant review has been filed or that such a proceeding has been instituted.

“(g) REISSUE PATENTS.—A post-grant review may not be instituted if the petition requests cancellation of a claim in a reissue patent that is identical to or narrower than a claim in the original patent from which the reissue patent was issued, and the time limitations in section 321(c) would bar filing a petition for a post-grant review for such original patent.

“§ 326. Conduct of post-grant review

“(a) REGULATIONS.—The Director shall prescribe regulations—

“(1) providing that the file of any proceeding under this chapter shall be made available to the public, except that any petition or document filed with the intent that it be sealed shall be accompanied by a motion to seal, and such petition or document shall be treated as sealed pending the outcome of the ruling on the motion;

“(2) setting forth the standards for the showing of sufficient grounds to institute a review under subsections (a) and (b) of section 324;

“(3) establishing procedures for the submission of supplemental information after the petition is filed;

“(4) in accordance with section 2(b)(2), establishing and governing a post-grant review

under this chapter and the relationship of such review to other proceedings under this title;

“(5) setting forth standards and procedures for discovery of relevant evidence, including that such discovery shall be limited to evidence directly related to factual assertions advanced by either party in the proceeding;

“(6) prescribing sanctions for abuse of discovery, abuse of process, or any other improper use of the proceeding, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or an unnecessary increase in the cost of the proceeding;

“(7) providing for protective orders governing the exchange and submission of confidential information;

“(8) allowing the patent owner to file a response to the petition after a post-grant review has been instituted, and requiring that the patent owner file with such response, through affidavits or declarations, any additional factual evidence and expert opinions on which the patent owner relies in support of the response;

“(9) setting forth standards and procedures for allowing the patent owner to move to amend the patent under subsection (d) to cancel a challenged claim or propose a reasonable number of substitute claims, and ensuring that any information submitted by the patent owner in support of any amendment entered under subsection (d) is made available to the public as part of the prosecution history of the patent;

“(10) providing either party with the right to an oral hearing as part of the proceeding; and

“(11) requiring that the final determination in any post-grant review be issued not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director notices the institution of a proceeding under this chapter, except that the Director may, for good cause shown, extend the 1-year period by not more than 6 months, and may adjust the time periods in this paragraph in the case of joinder under section 325(c).

“(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In prescribing regulations under this section, the Director shall consider the effect of any such regulation on the economy, the integrity of the patent system, the efficient administration of the Office, and the ability of the Office to timely complete proceedings instituted under this chapter.

“(c) PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD.—The Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall, in accordance with section 6, conduct each proceeding authorized by the Director.

“(d) AMENDMENT OF THE PATENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—During a post-grant review instituted under this chapter, the patent owner may file 1 motion to amend the patent in 1 or more of the following ways:

“(A) Cancel any challenged patent claim.

“(B) For each challenged claim, propose a reasonable number of substitute claims.

“(2) ADDITIONAL MOTIONS.—Additional motions to amend may be permitted upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner to materially advance the settlement of a proceeding under section 327, or upon the request of the patent owner for good cause shown.

“(3) SCOPE OF CLAIMS.—An amendment under this subsection may not enlarge the scope of the claims of the patent or introduce new matter.

“(e) EVIDENTIARY STANDARDS.—In a post-grant review instituted under this chapter, the petitioner shall have the burden of proving a proposition of unpatentability by a preponderance of the evidence.

“§ 327. Settlement

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A post-grant review instituted under this chapter shall be termi-

nated with respect to any petitioner upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner, unless the Office has decided the merits of the proceeding before the request for termination is filed. If the post-grant review is terminated with respect to a petitioner under this section, no estoppel under section 325(e) shall apply to that petitioner. If no petitioner remains in the post-grant review, the Office may terminate the post-grant review or proceed to a final written decision under section 328(a).

“(b) AGREEMENTS IN WRITING.—Any agreement or understanding between the patent owner and a petitioner, including any collateral agreements referred to in such agreement or understanding, made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of a post-grant review under this section shall be in writing, and a true copy of such agreement or understanding shall be filed in the Office before the termination of the post-grant review as between the parties. If any party filing such agreement or understanding so requests, the copy shall be kept separate from the file of the post-grant review, and shall be made available only to Federal Government agencies upon written request, or to any other person on a showing of good cause.

“§ 328. Decision of the board

“(a) FINAL WRITTEN DECISION.—If a post-grant review is instituted and not dismissed under this chapter, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall issue a final written decision with respect to the patentability of any patent claim challenged by the petitioner and any new claim added under section 326(d).

“(b) CERTIFICATE.—If the Patent Trial and Appeal Board issues a final written decision under subsection (a) and the time for appeal has expired or any appeal has terminated, the Director shall issue and publish a certificate canceling any claim of the patent finally determined to be unpatentable, confirming any claim of the patent determined to be patentable, and incorporating in the patent by operation of the certificate any new or amended claim determined to be patentable.

“§ 329. Appeal

“A party dissatisfied with the final written decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board under section 328(a) may appeal the decision pursuant to sections 141 through 144. Any party to the post-grant review shall have the right to be a party to the appeal.”

(e) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for part III of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“32. Post-Grant Review 321.”.

(f) REGULATIONS AND EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—The Director shall, not later than the date that is 1 year 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, issue regulations to carry out chapter 32 of title 35, United States Code, as added by subsection (d) of this section.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (d) shall take effect on the date that is [1 year] 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply only to patents issued on or after that date. The Director may impose a limit on the number of post-grant reviews that may be instituted during each of the 4 years following the effective date of subsection (d).

(3) PENDING INTERFERENCES.—The Director shall determine the procedures under which interferences commenced before the effective date of subsection (d) are to proceed, including whether any such interference is to be dismissed without prejudice to the filing of a petition for a post-grant review under chapter 32 of title 35, United States Code, or is to

proceed as if this Act had not been enacted. The Director shall include such procedures in regulations issued under paragraph (1). For purposes of an interference that is commenced before the effective date of subsection (d), the Director may deem the Patent Trial and Appeal Board to be the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, and may allow the Patent Trial and Appeal Board to conduct any further proceedings in that interference. The authorization to appeal or have remedy from derivation proceedings in sections 141(d) and 146 of title 35, United States Code, and the jurisdiction to entertain appeals from derivation proceedings in section 1295(a)(4)(A) of title 28, United States Code, shall be deemed to extend to final decisions in interferences that are commenced before the effective date of subsection (d) and that are not dismissed pursuant to this paragraph.

(g) CITATION OF PRIOR ART AND WRITTEN STATEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 301 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 301. Citation of prior art and written statements

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Any person at any time may cite to the Office in writing—

“(1) prior art consisting of patents or printed publications which that person believes to have a bearing on the patentability of any claim of a particular patent; or

“(2) statements of the patent owner filed in a proceeding before a Federal court or the Office in which the patent owner took a position on the scope of any claim of a particular patent.

“(b) OFFICIAL FILE.—If the person citing prior art or written statements pursuant to subsection (a) explains in writing the pertinence and manner of applying the prior art or written statements to at least 1 claim of the patent, the citation of the prior art or written statements and the explanation thereof shall become a part of the official file of the patent.

“(c) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—A party that submits a written statement pursuant to subsection (a)(2) shall include any other documents, pleadings, or evidence from the proceeding in which the statement was filed that addresses the written statement.

“(d) LIMITATIONS.—A written statement submitted pursuant to subsection (a)(2), and additional information submitted pursuant to subsection (c), shall not be considered by the Office for any purpose other than to determine the proper meaning of a patent claim in a proceeding that is ordered or instituted pursuant to section 304, 314, or 324. If any such written statement or additional information is subject to an applicable protective order, it shall be redacted to exclude information that is subject to that order.

“(e) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Upon the written request of the person citing prior art or written statements pursuant to subsection (a), that person's identity shall be excluded from the patent file and kept confidential.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall take effect [1 year] 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to patents issued before, on, or after that effective date.

(h) REEXAMINATION.—

(1) DETERMINATION BY DIRECTOR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 303(a) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 301 of this title” and inserting “section 301 or 302”.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this paragraph shall take effect [1 year] 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to patents issued before, on, or after that effective date.

(2) APPEAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 306 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “145” and inserting “144”.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this paragraph shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and shall apply to appeals of reexaminations that are pending before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences or the Patent Trial and Appeal Board on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD.

(a) COMPOSITION AND DUTIES.—Section 6 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 6. Patent Trial and Appeal Board

“(a) There shall be in the Office a Patent Trial and Appeal Board. The Director, the Deputy Director, the Commissioner for Patents, the Commissioner for Trademarks, and the administrative patent judges shall constitute the Patent Trial and Appeal Board. The administrative patent judges shall be persons of competent legal knowledge and scientific ability who are appointed by the Secretary, in consultation with the Director. Any reference in any Federal law, Executive order, rule, regulation, or delegation of authority, or any document of or pertaining to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences is deemed to refer to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board.

“(b) The Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall—

“(1) on written appeal of an applicant, review adverse decisions of examiners upon applications for patents pursuant to section 134(a);

“(2) review appeals of reexaminations pursuant to section 134(b);

“(3) conduct derivation proceedings pursuant to section 135; and

“(4) conduct inter partes reviews and post-grant reviews pursuant to chapters 31 and 32.

“(c) Each appeal, derivation proceeding, post-grant review, and inter partes review shall be heard by at least 3 members of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, who shall be designated by the Director. Only the Patent Trial and Appeal Board may grant rehearings.

“(d) The Secretary of Commerce may, in his discretion, deem the appointment of an administrative patent judge who, before the date of the enactment of this subsection, held office pursuant to an appointment by the Director to take effect on the date on which the Director initially appointed the administrative patent judge. It shall be a defense to a challenge to the appointment of an administrative patent judge on the basis of the judge's having been originally appointed by the Director that the administrative patent judge so appointed was acting as a de facto officer.”.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS.—Section 134 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “any reexamination proceeding” and inserting “a reexamination”; and

(2) by striking subsection (c).

(c) CIRCUIT APPEALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 141 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 141. Appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

“(a) EXAMINATIONS.—An applicant who is dissatisfied with the final decision in an appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board under section 134(a) may appeal the Board's decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. By filing such an appeal, the applicant waives his right to proceed under section 145.

“(b) REEXAMINATIONS.—A patent owner who is dissatisfied with the final decision in an appeal of a reexamination to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board under section 134(b) may appeal the Board's decision only to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

“(c) POST-GRANT AND INTER PARTES REVIEWS.—A party to a post-grant or inter partes review who is dissatisfied with the final written decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board under section 318(a) or 328(a) may appeal the Board's decision only to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

“(d) DERIVATION PROCEEDINGS.—A party to a derivation proceeding who is dissatisfied with the final decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board on the proceeding may appeal the decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, but such appeal shall be dismissed if any adverse party to such derivation proceeding, within 20 days after the appellant has filed notice of appeal in accordance with section 142, files notice with the Director that the party elects to have all further proceedings conducted as provided in section 146. If the appellant does not, within 30 days after the filing of such notice by the adverse party, file a civil action under section 146, the Board's decision shall govern the further proceedings in the case.”.

(2) JURISDICTION.—Section 1295(a)(4)(A) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(A) the Patent Trial and Appeal Board of the United States Patent and Trademark Office with respect to patent applications, derivation proceedings, reexaminations, post-grant reviews, and inter partes reviews at the instance of a party who exercised his right to participate in a proceeding before or appeal to the Board, except that an applicant or a party to a derivation proceeding may also have remedy by civil action pursuant to section 145 or 146 of title 35. An appeal under this subparagraph of a decision of the Board with respect to an application or derivation proceeding shall waive the right of such applicant or party to proceed under section 145 or 146 of title 35.”.

(3) PROCEEDINGS ON APPEAL.—Section 143 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: “In an ex parte case, the Director shall submit to the court in writing the grounds for the decision of the Patent and Trademark Office, addressing all of the issues raised in the appeal. The Director shall have the right to intervene in an appeal from a decision entered by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in a derivation proceeding under section 135 or in an inter partes or post-grant review under chapter 31 or 32.”; and

(B) by repealing the second of the two identical fourth sentences.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect [1 year] 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to proceedings commenced on or after that effective date, except that—

(1) the extension of jurisdiction to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit to entertain appeals of decisions of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in reexaminations under the amendment made by subsection (c)(2) shall be deemed to take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and shall extend to any decision of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences with respect to a reexamination that is entered before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) the provisions of sections 6, 134, and 141 of title 35, United States Code, in effect on

the day prior to the date of the enactment of this Act shall continue to apply to inter partes reexaminations that are requested under section 311 prior to the date that is [1 year] 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act;

(3) the Patent Trial and Appeal Board may be deemed to be the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for purposes of appeals of inter partes reexaminations that are requested under section 311 prior to the date that is [1 year] 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(4) the Director's right under the last sentence of section 143 of title 35, United States Code, as amended by subsection (c)(3), to intervene in an appeal from a decision entered by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall be deemed to extend to inter partes reexaminations that are requested under section 311 prior to the date that is [1 year] 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. PREISSUANCE SUBMISSIONS BY THIRD PARTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 122 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PREISSUANCE SUBMISSIONS BY THIRD PARTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any third party may submit for consideration and inclusion in the record of a patent application, any patent, published patent application, or other printed publication of potential relevance to the examination of the application, if such submission is made in writing before the earlier of—

“(A) the date a notice of allowance under section 151 is given or mailed in the application for patent; or

“(B) the later of—

“(i) 6 months after the date on which the application for patent is first published under section 122 by the Office, or

“(ii) the date of the first rejection under section 132 of any claim by the examiner during the examination of the application for patent.

“(2) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Any submission under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) set forth a concise description of the asserted relevance of each submitted document;

“(B) be accompanied by such fee as the Director may prescribe; and

“(C) include a statement by the person making such submission affirming that the submission was made in compliance with this section.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to patent applications filed before, on, or after that effective date.

SEC. 8. VENUE.

(a) CHANGE OF VENUE.—Section 1400 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) CHANGE OF VENUE.—For the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, a district court shall transfer any civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents upon a showing that the transferee venue is clearly more convenient than the venue in which the civil action is pending.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO VENUE.—Sections 32, 145, 146, 154(b)(4)(A), and 293 of title 35, United States Code, and section 21(b)(4) of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes”, approved July 5, 1946 (commonly referred to as the “Trademark Act of 1946” or the “Lanham Act”); 15 U.S.C. 1071(b)(4)), are each amended

by striking “United States District Court for the District of Columbia” each place that term appears and inserting “United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to civil actions commenced on or after that date.

SEC. 9. FEE SETTING AUTHORITY.

(a) FEE SETTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall have authority to set or adjust by rule any fee established or charged by the Office under sections 41 and 376 of title 35, United States Code, or under section 31 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1113), or any other fee established or charged by the Office under any other provision of law, notwithstanding the fee amounts established or charged thereunder, for the filing or processing of any submission to, and for all other services performed by or materials furnished by, the Office, provided that patent and trademark fee amounts are in the aggregate set to recover the estimated cost to the Office for processing, activities, services and materials relating to patents and trademarks, respectively, including proportionate shares of the administrative costs of the Office.

(2) SMALL AND MICRO ENTITIES.—The fees established under paragraph (1) for filing, processing, issuing, and maintaining patent applications and patents shall be reduced by 50 percent with respect to their application to any small entity that qualifies for reduced fees under section 41(h)(1) of title 35, United States Code, and shall be reduced by 75 percent with respect to their application to any micro entity as defined in section 123 of that title.

(3) REDUCTION OF FEES IN CERTAIN FISCAL YEARS.—In any fiscal year, the Director—

(A) shall consult with the Patent Public Advisory Committee and the Trademark Public Advisory Committee on the advisability of reducing any fees described in paragraph (1); and

(B) after the consultation required under subparagraph (A), may reduce such fees.

(4) ROLE OF THE PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Director shall—

(A) submit to the Patent Public Advisory Committee or the Trademark Public Advisory Committee, or both, as appropriate, any proposed fee under paragraph (1) not less than 45 days before publishing any proposed fee in the Federal Register;

(B) provide the relevant advisory committee described in subparagraph (A) a 30-day period following the submission of any proposed fee, on which to deliberate, consider, and comment on such proposal, and require that—

(i) during such 30-day period, the relevant advisory committee hold a public hearing related to such proposal; and

(ii) the Director shall assist the relevant advisory committee in carrying out such public hearing, including by offering the use of Office resources to notify and promote the hearing to the public and interested stakeholders;

(C) require the relevant advisory committee to make available to the public a written report detailing the comments, advice, and recommendations of the committee regarding any proposed fee;

(D) consider and analyze any comments, advice, or recommendations received from the relevant advisory committee before setting or adjusting any fee; and

(E) notify, through the Chair and Ranking Member of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees, the Congress of any final rule setting or adjusting fees under paragraph (1).

(5) PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any rules prescribed under this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register.

(B) RATIONALE.—Any proposal for a change in fees under this section shall—

(i) be published in the Federal Register; and

(ii) include, in such publication, the specific rationale and purpose for the proposal, including the possible expectations or benefits resulting from the proposed change.

(C) PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.—Following the publication of any proposed fee in the Federal Register pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Director shall seek public comment for a period of not less than 45 days.

(6) CONGRESSIONAL COMMENT PERIOD.—Following the notification described in paragraph (3)(E), Congress shall have not more than 45 days to consider and comment on any final rule setting or adjusting fees under paragraph (1). No fee set or adjusted under paragraph (1) shall be effective prior to the end of such 45-day comment period.

(7) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—No rules prescribed under this subsection may diminish—

(A) an applicant's rights under title 35, United States Code, or the Trademark Act of 1946; or

(B) any rights under a ratified treaty.

(b) FEES FOR PATENT SERVICES.—Division B of Public Law 108-447 is amended in title VIII of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2005—

(1) in subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 801, by—

(A) striking “During” and all that follows through “2006, subsection” and inserting “Subsection”; and

(B) striking “shall be administered as though that subsection reads” and inserting “is amended to read”;

(2) in subsection (d) of section 801, by striking “During” and all that follows through “2006, subsection” and inserting “Subsection”; and

(3) in subsection (e) of section 801, by—

(A) striking “During” and all that follows through “2006, subsection” and inserting “Subsection”; and

(B) striking “shall be administered as though that subsection”.

(c) ADJUSTMENT OF TRADEMARK FEES.—Division B of Public Law 108-447 is amended in title VIII of the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2005, in section 802(a) by striking “During fiscal years 2005, 2006 and 2007”, and inserting “Until such time as the Director sets or adjusts the fees otherwise.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE, APPLICABILITY, AND TRANSITION PROVISIONS.—Division B of Public Law 108-447 is amended in title VIII of the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2005, in section 803(a) by striking “and shall apply only with respect to the remaining portion of fiscal year 2005, 2006 and 2007”.

(e) STATUTORY AUTHORITY.—Section 41(d)(1)(A) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “, and the Director may not increase any such fee thereafter”.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any other provision of Division B of Public Law 108-447, including section 801(c) of title VIII of the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2005.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

(2) OFFICE.—The term “Office” means the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

(3) TRADEMARK ACT OF 1946.—The term “Trademark Act of 1946” means an Act entitled “Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes”, approved July 5, 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.) (commonly referred to as the Trademark Act of 1946 or the Lanham Act).

(h) ELECTRONIC FILING INCENTIVE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a fee of \$400 shall be established for each application for an original patent, except for a design, plant, or provisional application, that is not filed by electronic means as prescribed by the Director. The fee established by this subsection shall be reduced 50 percent for small entities that qualify for reduced fees under section 41(h)(1) of title 35, United States Code. All fees paid under this subsection shall be deposited in the Treasury as an offsetting receipt that shall not be available for obligation or expenditure.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall become effective 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(i) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (h), the provisions of this section shall take effect upon the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 10. SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 25 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§257. Supplemental examinations to consider, reconsider, or correct information

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A patent owner may request supplemental examination of a patent in the Office to consider, reconsider, or correct information believed to be relevant to the patent. Within 3 months of the date a request for supplemental examination meeting the requirements of this section is received, the Director shall conduct the supplemental examination and shall conclude such examination by issuing a certificate indicating whether the information presented in the request raises a substantial new question of patentability.

“(b) REEXAMINATION ORDERED.—If a substantial new question of patentability is raised by 1 or more items of information in the request, the Director shall order reexamination of the patent. The reexamination shall be conducted according to procedures established by chapter 30, except that the patent owner shall not have the right to file a statement pursuant to section 304. During the reexamination, the Director shall address each substantial new question of patentability identified during the supplemental examination, notwithstanding the limitations therein relating to patents and printed publication or any other provision of chapter 30.

“(c) EFFECT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A patent shall not be held unenforceable on the basis of conduct relating to information that had not been considered, was inadequately considered, or was incorrect in a prior examination of the patent if the information was considered, reconsidered, or corrected during a supplemental examination of the patent. The making of a request under subsection (a), or the absence thereof, shall not be relevant to enforceability of the patent under section 282.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) PRIOR ALLEGATIONS.—This subsection shall not apply to an allegation pled with particularity, or set forth with particularity in a notice received by the patent owner under section 505(j)(2)(B)(iv)(II) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C.

355(j)(2)(B)(iv)(II)), before the date of a supplemental-examination request under subsection (a) to consider, reconsider, or correct information forming the basis for the allegation.

“(B) PATENT ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.—In an action brought under section 337(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337(a)), or section 281 of this title, this subsection shall not apply to any defense raised in the action that is based upon information that was considered, reconsidered, or corrected pursuant to a supplemental-examination request under subsection (a) unless the supplemental examination, and any reexamination ordered pursuant to the request, are concluded before the date on which the action is brought.

“(d) FEES AND REGULATIONS.—The Director shall, by regulation, establish fees for the submission of a request for supplemental examination of a patent, and to consider each item of information submitted in the request. If reexamination is ordered pursuant to subsection (a), fees established and applicable to ex parte reexamination proceedings under chapter 30 shall be paid in addition to fees applicable to supplemental examination. The Director shall promulgate regulations governing the form, content, and other requirements of requests for supplemental examination, and establishing procedures for conducting review of information submitted in such requests.

“(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

“(1) to preclude the imposition of sanctions based upon criminal or antitrust laws (including section 1001(a) of title 18, the first section of the Clayton Act, and section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act to the extent that section relates to unfair methods of competition);

“(2) to limit the authority of the Director to investigate issues of possible misconduct and impose sanctions for misconduct in connection with matters or proceedings before the Office; or

“(3) to limit the authority of the Director to promulgate regulations under chapter 3 relating to sanctions for misconduct by representatives practicing before the Office.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to patents issued before, on, or after that date.

SEC. 11. RESIDENCY OF FEDERAL CIRCUIT JUDGES.

[(a) RESIDENCY.—The second sentence of section 44(c) of title 28, United States Code, is repealed.

[(b) FACILITIES.—Section 44 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“[(e)(1) The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall provide—

“[(A) a judge of the Federal judicial circuit who lives within 50 miles of the District of Columbia with appropriate facilities and administrative support services in the District of the District of Columbia; and

“[(B) a judge of the Federal judicial circuit who does not live within 50 miles of the District of Columbia with appropriate facilities and administrative support services—

“[(i) in the district and division in which that judge resides; or

“[(ii) if appropriate facilities are not available in the district and division in which that judge resides, in the district and division closest to the residence of that judge in which such facilities are available, as determined by the Director.

“[(2) Nothing in this subsection may be construed to authorize or require the construction of new facilities.”.]

SEC. 11. RESIDENCY OF FEDERAL CIRCUIT JUDGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 44(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by repealing the second sentence; and

(2) in the third sentence, by striking “state” and inserting “State”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 12. MICRO ENTITY DEFINED.

Chapter 11 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 123. Micro entity defined

“(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this title, the term ‘micro entity’ means an applicant who makes a certification under either subsection (b) or (c).

“(b) UNASSIGNED APPLICATION.—For an unassigned application, each applicant shall certify that the applicant—

“(1) qualifies as a small entity, as defined in regulations issued by the Director;

“(2) has not been named on 5 or more previously filed patent applications;

“(3) has not assigned, granted, or conveyed, and is not under an obligation by contract or law to assign, grant, or convey, a license or any other ownership interest in the particular application; and

“(4) does not have a gross income, as defined in section 61(a) of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. 61(a)), exceeding 2.5 times the average gross income, as reported by the Department of Labor, in the calendar year immediately preceding the calendar year in which the examination fee is being paid.

“(c) ASSIGNED APPLICATION.—For an assigned application, each applicant shall certify that the applicant—

“(1) qualifies as a small entity, as defined in regulations issued by the Director, and meets the requirements of subsection (b)(4);

“(2) has not been named on 5 or more previously filed patent applications; and

“(3) has assigned, granted, conveyed, or is under an obligation by contract or law to assign, grant, or convey, a license or other ownership interest in the particular application to an entity that has 5 or fewer employees and that such entity has a gross income, as defined in section 61(a) of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. 61(a)), that does not exceed 2.5 times the average gross income, as reported by the Department of Labor, in the calendar year immediately preceding the calendar year in which the examination fee is being paid.

“(d) INCOME LEVEL ADJUSTMENT.—The gross income levels established under subsections (b) and (c) shall be adjusted by the Director on October 1, 2009, and every year thereafter, to reflect any fluctuations occurring during the previous 12 months in the Consumer Price Index, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.”.

SEC. 13. FUNDING AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(c)(7)(E)(i) of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “75 percent” and inserting “15 percent”; and

(2) by striking “25 percent” and inserting “85 percent”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and shall apply to patents issued before, on, or after that date.

SEC. 14. TAX STRATEGIES DEEMED WITHIN THE PRIOR ART.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of evaluating an invention under section 102 or 103 of title 35, United States Code, any strategy for reducing, avoiding, or deferring tax liability, whether known or unknown at the time of the invention or application for patent, shall be deemed insufficient to differentiate a claimed invention from the prior art.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term “tax liability” refers to any liability for a tax under any Federal, State, or local law, or the law of any foreign jurisdiction, including any statute, rule, regulation, or ordinance that levies, imposes, or assesses such tax liability.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.—This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and shall apply to any patent application pending and any patent issued on or after that date.

SEC. 15. BEST MODE REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 282 of title 35, United States Code, is amended in its second undesignated paragraph by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) Invalidity of the patent or any claim in suit for failure to comply with—

“(A) any requirement of section 112, except that the failure to disclose the best mode shall not be a basis on which any claim of a patent may be canceled or held invalid or otherwise unenforceable; or

“(B) any requirement of section 251.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Sections 119(e)(1) and 120 of title 35, United States Code, are each amended by striking “the first paragraph of section 112 of this title” and inserting “section 112(a) (other than the requirement to disclose the best mode)”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to proceedings commenced on or after that date.

SEC. 16. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) JOINT INVENTIONS.—Section 116 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first paragraph, by striking “When” and inserting “(a) JOINT INVENTIONS.—When”;

(2) in the second paragraph, by striking “If a joint inventor” and inserting “(b) OMITTED INVENTOR.—If a joint inventor”;

(3) in the third paragraph—

(A) by striking “Whenever” and inserting “(c) CORRECTION OF ERRORS IN APPLICATION.—Whenever”;

(B) by striking “and such error arose without any deceptive intent on his part.”.

(b) FILING OF APPLICATION IN FOREIGN COUNTRY.—Section 184 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first paragraph—

(A) by striking “Except when” and inserting “(a) FILING IN FOREIGN COUNTRY.—Except when”;

(B) by striking “and without deceptive intent”;

(2) in the second paragraph, by striking “The term” and inserting “(b) APPLICATION.—The term”;

(3) in the third paragraph, by striking “The scope” and inserting “(c) SUBSEQUENT MODIFICATIONS, AMENDMENTS, AND SUPPLEMENTS.—The scope”.

(c) FILING WITHOUT A LICENSE.—Section 185 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “and without deceptive intent”.

(d) REISSUE OF DEFECTIVE PATENTS.—Section 251 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first paragraph—

(A) by striking “Whenever” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—Whenever”;

(B) by striking “without any deceptive intention”;

(2) in the second paragraph, by striking “The Director” and inserting “(b) MULTIPLE REISSUED PATENTS.—The Director”;

(3) in the third paragraph, by striking “The provisions” and inserting “(c) APPLICABILITY OF THIS TITLE.—The provisions”;

(4) in the last paragraph, by striking “No reissued patent” and inserting “(d) REISSUE PATENT ENLARGING SCOPE OF CLAIMS.—No reissued patent”.

(e) EFFECT OF REISSUE.—Section 253 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first paragraph, by striking “Whenever, without any deceptive intention” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—Whenever”;

(2) in the second paragraph, by striking “in like manner” and inserting “(b) ADDITIONAL DISCLAIMER OR DEDICATION.—In the manner set forth in subsection (a).”.

(f) CORRECTION OF NAMED INVENTOR.—Section 256 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first paragraph—

(A) by striking “Whenever” and inserting “(a) CORRECTION.—Whenever”;

(B) by striking “and such error arose without any deceptive intention on his part”;

(2) in the second paragraph, by striking “The error” and inserting “(b) PATENT VALID IF ERROR CORRECTED.—The error”.

(g) PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY.—Section 282 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first undesignated paragraph—

(A) by striking “A patent” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—A patent”;

(B) by striking the third sentence;

(2) in the second undesignated paragraph, by striking “The following” and inserting “(b) DEFENSES.—The following”;

(3) in the third undesignated paragraph, by striking “In actions” and inserting “(c) NOTICE OF ACTIONS; ACTIONS DURING EXTENSION OF PATENT TERM.—In actions”.

(h) ACTION FOR INFRINGEMENT.—Section 288 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “, without deceptive intention.”.

(i) REVISER’S NOTES.—

(1) Section 3(e)(2) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “this Act,” and inserting “that Act.”.

[(2) Section 202(b)(3) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “the section 203(b)” and inserting “section 203(b)”.]

(2) Section 202 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(3), by striking “the section 203(b)” and inserting “section 203(b)”;

(B) in subsection (c)(7)—

(i) in subparagraph (D), by striking “except where it proves” and all that follows through “; and” and inserting: “except where it is determined to be infeasible following a reasonable inquiry, a preference in the licensing of subject inventions shall be given to small business firms; and”;

(ii) in subparagraph (E)(i), by striking “as described above in this clause (D);” and inserting “described above in this clause;”.

(3) Section 209(d)(1) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “nontransferable” and inserting “non-transferable”.

(4) Section 287(c)(2)(G) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “any state” and inserting “any State”.

(5) Section 371(b) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “of the treaty” and inserting “of the treaty”.

(j) UNNECESSARY REFERENCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “of this title” each place that term appears.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall not apply to the use of such term in the following sections of title 35, United States Code:

(A) Section 1(c).

(B) Section 101.

(C) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 105.

(D) The first instance of the use of such term in section 111(b)(8).

(E) Section 157(a).

(F) Section 161.

(G) Section 164.

(H) Section 171.

(I) Section 251(c), as so designated by this section.

(J) Section 261.

(K) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 271.

(L) Section 287(b)(1).

(M) Section 289.

(N) The first instance of the use of such term in section 375(a).

(k) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to proceedings commenced on or after that effective date.

SEC. 17. CLARIFICATION OF JURISDICTION.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Intellectual Property Jurisdiction Clarification Act of 2011”.

(b) STATE COURT JURISDICTION.—Section 1338(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: “No State court shall have jurisdiction over any claim for relief arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, plant variety protection, or copyrights.”.

(c) COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT.—Section 1295(a)(1) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(1) of an appeal from a final decision of a district court of the United States, the District Court of Guam, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, or the District Court of the Northern Mariana Islands, in any civil action arising under, or in any civil action in which a party has asserted a compulsory counterclaim arising under, any Act of Congress relating to patents or plant variety protection;”.

(d) REMOVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 89 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 1454. Patent, plant variety protection, and copyright cases

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A civil action in which any party asserts a claim for relief arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, plant variety protection, or copyrights may be removed to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place where such action is pending.

“(b) SPECIAL RULES.—The removal of an action under this section shall be made in accordance with section 1446 of this chapter, except that if the removal is based solely on this section—

“(1) the action may be removed by any party; and

“(2) the time limitations contained in section 1446(b) may be extended at any time for cause shown.

“(c) REMAND.—If a civil action is removed solely under this section, the district court—

“(1) shall remand all claims that are neither a basis for removal under subsection (a) nor within the original or supplemental jurisdiction of the district court under any Act of Congress; and

“(2) may, under the circumstances specified in section 1367(c), remand any claims within the supplemental jurisdiction of the district court under section 1367.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 89 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“1454. Patent, plant variety protection, and copyright cases.”.

(e) TRANSFER BY COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 99 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 1632. Transfer by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

“When a case is appealed to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit under section 1295(a)(1), and no claim for relief arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents or plant variety protection is the subject of the appeal by

any party, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit shall transfer the appeal to the court of appeals for the regional circuit embracing the district from which the appeal has been taken.”.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 99 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“1632. Transfer by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.”.

(f) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any civil action commenced on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 117.118. EFFECTIVE DATE; RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

[(a) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the provisions of this Act shall take effect 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any patent issued on or after that effective date.

[(b) **CONTINUITY OF INTENT UNDER THE CREATE ACT.**—The enactment of section 102(c) of title 35, United States Code, under section (2)(b) of this Act is done with the same intent to promote joint research activities that was expressed, including in the legislative history, through the enactment of the Cooperative Research and Technology Enhancement Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-453; the “CREATE Act”), the amendments of which are stricken by section 2(c) of this Act. The United States Patent and Trademark Office shall administer section 102(c) of title 35, United States Code, in a manner consistent with the legislative history of the CREATE Act that was relevant to its administration by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.]

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendments be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; further, that the amended version be considered original text for the purposes of further amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Senate today is turning its attention to a measure that will help create jobs, energize the economy, and promote innovation. The Patent Reform Act, which has also come to be called the America Invents Act, is a key part of any jobs agenda.

We can help unleash innovation and promote American invention, all without adding a penny to the deficit. This is commonsense and bipartisan legislation. During the next few days, the Senate can come together to pass this needed legislation, and do so in a bipartisan manner. It represents the finest traditions of the Senate.

I thank the majority leader for proceeding to this measure, and the Republican leader for his cooperation.

This is a bill that was reported unanimously by the members of the Judiciary Committee. Republicans and Democrats alike recognize that it is important to our country's continued economic recovery, and to our ability to successfully compete in the global economy. America needs a 21st century

patent system in order to lead. The last reform of our patent system was nearly 60 years ago, and I think it is about time the patent system caught up with the needs of this country and what the rest of the world has already done.

In his State of the Union Address, President Obama challenged the Nation to out-innovate, out-build, and out-educate. Enacting the America Invents Act is a key to meeting this challenge.

Reforming the Nation's antiquated patent system will promote American innovation, it will create American jobs, and it will grow America's economy. I thank the President and his administration for their help and support for the Leahy-Hatch-Grassley America Invents Act.

Commerce Secretary Locke has been a strong partner in our efforts, and Director Kappos of the Patent and Trademark Office has been an indispensable source of wise counsel.

Innovation drives the Nation's economy, and that entrepreneurial spirit can only be protected by a patent system that promotes invention and spurs new ideas. We need to reform our patent system so that these innovations can more quickly get to market.

A modernized patent system—one that puts American entrepreneurs on the same playing field as those throughout the world—is a key to that success. This is an idea that cuts across the political spectrum.

Our bipartisan Senate cosponsors include Senator KOHL of Wisconsin, Senator KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota, Senator GILLIBRAND of New York, the distinguished Acting President pro tempore, Senator COONS of Delaware, as well as Senator KYL, the assistant Republican leader, Senator SESSIONS of Alabama, Senator LIEBERMAN of Connecticut, Senator FRANKEN of Minnesota, Senator BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut, and Senator HARKIN of Iowa.

Republicans and Democrats from big States and small, and from all ends of the political spectrum, are coming together to support American innovation.

The Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously approved this legislation on February 3, 2011. But this effort extends back several years. Our current congressional efforts to reform the Nation's patent system began in 2005. Indeed, our bill is the product of years of work and compromise. The Senate Judiciary Committee has reported patent reform legislation to the Senate in each of the last three Congresses. And the House has seen efforts over the same period led by Congressmen LAMAR SMITH of Texas and HOWARD BERMAN of California. The legislation we are considering today, in fact, is structured on the original House bill and contains many of the original provisions.

From the beginning, we each recognized the need for a more effective and efficient patent system, one that im-

proves patent quality and provides incentives for entrepreneurs to create jobs.

A balanced and efficient intellectual property system that rewards invention and promotes innovation through high-quality patents is crucial to our Nation's economic prosperity and job growth. It is how we win the future—by unleashing the American inventive spirit. This bill, the America Invents Act, will allow our inventors and innovators to flourish, and it will do so without adding a penny to the deficit.

Not a dime in taxpayer money is spent on the Patent and Trademark Office reforms. They are all funded by patent fees, not taxes.

The America Invents Act will accomplish three important goals, which have been at the center of the patent reform debate from the beginning: It will improve and harmonize operations at the Patent and Trademark Office; it will improve the quality of patents that are issued; and it will provide more certainty in litigation.

Particularly, this legislation will transition our Nation's patent system to a first-inventor-to-file system. It will also make changes to improve the quality of patents that are issued, and it will provide the PTO with the resources it needs to work through its backlog.

The America Invents Act provides the tools the PTO needs to separate the inventive wheat from the chaff, to help businesses bring new products to market and create jobs.

This is interesting because this is a piece of legislation that is supported by both business and labor—something we all want to see in this Chamber—including the National Association of Manufacturers, the United Steelworkers, the National Venture Capital Association, the AFL-CIO, the Association of American Universities, and companies representing all sectors of the patent community that have been urging action on patent reform proposals for years.

Innovation has always been at the heart of America and American success. From the founding of our Nation, we recognized the importance of promoting and protecting innovation. The Constitution explicitly grants Congress the power to “promote the progress and science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to . . . inventors the exclusive right to their respective . . . discoveries.” It is not a creature of the legislature but an integral part of our Constitution.

The patent system plays a key role in encouraging innovation and bringing new products to market. The discoveries made by American inventors and research institutions, commercialized by our companies, and protected and promoted by our patent laws, have made our system the envy of the world.

In spite of this, a Newsweek study last year found that only 41 percent of Americans believe the United States is staying ahead of China in innovation.

A Thompson Reuters analysis has already predicted that China will outpace the United States in patent filings this year.

China has a specific plan not just to overtake the United States in patent applications, but to more than quadruple its patent filings over the next 5 years—all the more reason why we must act now. This is not something that should be delayed. We should act on it. Delaying it is saying we want China to overtake the United States. Moving forward says we want to be competitive.

It is astonishing to consider that China has been modernizing its patent laws and promoting innovation, but the United States has failed to keep pace. I said before, it has been 60 years since we last enacted reform of American patent law. We can no longer wait. We can no longer remain complacent and expect to stay on top.

In many areas that were highly contentious when the patent reform debate began, the courts have acted. Their decisions reflect the concerns heard in Congress that questionable patents were too easily obtained, too difficult to challenge. The courts have moved the law in a generally positive direction, more closely aligned with the text of the statutes.

More recently, the Federal circuit aggressively moved to constrain runaway damage awards, which plagued the patent system by basing awards on unreliable numbers, untethered to the reality of licensing decisions.

The courts have addressed issues where they can, but in some areas only Congress can take the necessary steps. Our act will both speed the application process and, at the same time, improve patent quality. It will provide the USPTO with the resources it needs to work through its application backlog, while also providing for greater input from third parties to improve the quality of patents issued and that remain in effect.

High quality patents are the key to our economic growth. They benefit both patent owners and users, who can be more confident in the validity of issued patents. Patents of low quality and dubious validity, by contrast, enable patent trolls who extort unreasonable licensing fees from legitimate businesses, and constitute a drag on innovation. Too many dubious patents also unjustly cast doubt on truly high quality patents.

The Department of Commerce issued a report indicating that these reforms will create jobs without adding to the deficit. The Obama administration supports these efforts, as do industries and stakeholders from all sectors of the patent community. Congressional action can no longer be delayed.

Innovation and economic development are not uniquely Democratic or Republican objectives, so we worked together to find the proper balance for America, for our economy, for our inventors, for our consumers.

Thomas Friedman wrote not too long ago in the New York Times that the country which “endows its people with more tools and basic research to invent new goods and services . . . is the one that will not just survive but thrive down the road. . . . We might be able to stimulate our way back to stability, but we can only invent our way back to prosperity.”

I think of the country's first patent, which was issued to a Vermonter, Thomas Jefferson, the Secretary of State, examined the application, and President George Washington signed it.

A recent Judiciary Committee meeting on this measure was on the anniversary of the day Thomas Edison received the historic patent for the principles of his incandescent lamp that paved the way for the bulb that has illuminated our homes, offices, and venues in our country and around the world.

This week is when the patent was issued for lifesaving improvements to the diver's suit. It was magician Harry Houdini who devised a mechanism that allowed divers in distress to safely escape a diving suit.

So we can smooth the path for more interesting and great American inventions. That is what the bipartisan comprehensive patent reform bill would do.

I wish to recognize in particular the work of Senator HATCH, who is here on the Senate floor—and he has been a longtime partner of mine on intellectual property issues—and Senator GRASSLEY, the ranking Republican on our committee. The bill has also received tremendous input from Senator KYL, Senator KLOBUCHAR, Senator SESSIONS and many others. We are working together, along with those on both sides of the aisle in the House, to reach the goal of improving patent quality and the operations at the PTO, and to address the related unpredictability of litigation that has been harming innovation.

No one claims that ours is a perfect bill. It is a compromise that will make key improvements in the patent system. Over the course of the next couple of days, the Senate will have the opportunity to consider amendments.

Senator COBURN intends to bring an amendment on the use of patent fees. Other Senators who disagree with the move to a first-to-file system may seek to reverse that progress. I urge those Senators that have amendments to come forward, agree to time agreements and proceed without delay.

We should be able to complete action on this bill this week and I would hope by Wednesday night. Then the Senate will need to move on to other important matters. So after a brief period for opening statements to outline the bill and frame the debate, I will call for Senators to come forward with any amendments they may have to the bill. This bill is important and its scheduling comes as no surprise. It was more than 10 days ago that the Senate unanimously agreed to its consideration.

So, let us do our job, and get to the task of considering and completing action on this important bill in order to help create jobs, encourage innovation and promote American invention.

Mr. President, some of the Nation's leading innovators and inventors have expressed strong support for S. 23, the America Invents Act. The Coalition for Patent and Trademark Information Dissemination, whose members are patent and trademark holders, recently wrote to the Senate Judiciary Committee in support of the bill, stating that its members have “an interest in a more efficient system that produces higher-quality patents and trademarks.” The Intellectual Property Owners Association, one of the largest trade associations devoted to intellectual property rights also recently wrote to Senators endorsing important provisions in the bill, including the first-to-file system. I ask that these letters, as well as a statement of support from the Coalition for 21st Century Patent Reform be printed in the RECORD at this time. I also ask that a list of cross-sector manufacturers and innovators that support S. 23 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COALITION FOR PATENT AND TRADEMARK INFORMATION DISSEMINATION,

February 1, 2011.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Chairman, Judiciary Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY
Ranking Member, Judiciary Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY AND RANKING MEMBER GRASSLEY: The Coalition writes in support of S. 23, the Patent Reform Act of 2011.

Coalition members are information services and workflow solution provider companies that offer value-added patent and trademark information services. Our services are aimed at enabling patent and trademark applicants to find and make available the most relevant information related to their claimed inventions and marks through the data enhancements and state of the art search tools provided. Members also are patent and trademark holders with growing numbers of patent and trademark applications who have an interest in a more efficient system that produces higher-quality patents and trademarks.

Patent quality is directly related to the adequacy of the prior art presented to examiners. When applicants conduct a patentability search and disclose all relevant prior art to examiners, examiners will have a significantly increased likelihood of making the right decision about patentability. A major positive addition to patent law would be the provisions in S. 23 allowing submission of patents or other publications by third parties while applications are still under consideration by the USPTO. This should further add to the prior art made available to the examiner and has the potential to greatly enhance patent quality.

Additionally, we applaud the inclusion of supplemental examination provisions in the bill. This will allow patent holders to request a review of patents where pertinent history or information may have been intentionally omitted in original requests. The inclusion

of this provision will further strengthen our laws to prevent unlawful infringement.

We are delighted that a provision disallowing outsourcing of USPTO searches no longer seems to be under consideration. Coalition members believe that the USPTO should be able to contract with private companies to perform searches, whether as part of the PCT process, as is now currently permitted, or possibly for national searches at some future time. USPTO operational flexibility with PCT searches has proven to drastically reduce pendency rates. Achieving quality, speed, and cost-effectiveness in USPTO processes is a goal to encourage. USPTO management should be empowered to use the best source or sources for searches.

There is one addition to S. 23 that we would hope to see as the legislation advances. Coalition members believe that full disclosure of prior art information to examiners is constrained by concerns about inequitable conduct liability. We urge Congress to reform the inequitable conduct defense in order to remove the disincentive for full disclosure of all prior art.

We appreciate this opportunity to express our positions on patent reform issues, and the members of the Coalition stand ready to work with the Senate Judiciary Committee as it considers patent reform legislation.

Sincerely,

MARLA GROSSMAN,
*Executive Director, Coalition for Patent
and Trademark Information Dissemination.*

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
OWNERS ASSOCIATION,
February 25, 2011.

Re amendments to S. 23, the "Patent Reform Act of 2011"

The Hon. _____
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR _____: Intellectual Property Owners Association (IPO) is pleased that the Senate is planning to proceed with consideration of S. 23, the "Patent Reform Act of 2011."

IPO is one of the largest and most diverse trade associations devoted to intellectual property rights. Our 200 corporate members cover a broad spectrum of U.S. companies in industries ranging from information technology to consumer products to pharmaceuticals and biotechnology.

We wish to give you our advice on amendments that we understand might be offered during consideration of S. 23:

Vote AGAINST any amendment to delete the "first-inventor-to-file" and related provisions in section 2 of the bill. First-inventor-to-file, explained in a 1-page attachment to this letter, is central to modernization and simplification of patent law and is very widely supported by U.S. companies.

Vote FOR any amendment guaranteeing the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office access to all user fees paid to the agency by patent and trademark owners and applicants. Current delays in processing patent applications are totally unacceptable and the result of an underfunded Patent and Trademark Office.

Vote AGAINST any amendment that would interpose substantial barriers to enforcement of validly-granted "business method" patents. IPO supports business method patents that were upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in the recent *Bilski* decision.

For more information, please call IPO at 202-507-4500.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS K. NORMAN,
President.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
OWNERS ASSOCIATION,
February 25, 2011.

FIRST-INVENTOR-TO-FILE IN S. 23, THE
"PATENT REFORM ACT OF 2011"

Section 2 of S. 23 simplifies and modernizes U.S. patent law by awarding the patent to the first of two competing inventors to file in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), a change from the traditional system of awarding the patent, in theory, to the first inventor to invent. First-inventor-to-file in S. 23 has these advantages:

Eliminates costly and slow patent interference proceedings conducted in the PTO and the courts to determine which inventor was the first to invent.

Creates legal certainty about rights in all patents, the vast majority of which never become entangled in interference proceedings in the first place, but which are still subject to the possibility under current law that another inventor might come forward and seek to invalidate the patent on the ground that this other inventor, who never applied for a patent, was the first to invent.

Encourages both large and small patent applicants to file more quickly in order to establish an early filing date. Early filing leads to early disclosure of technology to the public, enabling other parties to build on and improve the technology. (Applicants who plan to file afterward in other countries already have the incentive to file quickly in the U.S.)

Makes feasible the introduction of post-grant opposition proceedings to improve the quality of patents, by reducing the issues that could be raised in a post-grant proceeding, thereby limiting costs and delay.

Follows up on changes already made by Congress that (1) established inexpensive and easy-to-file provisional patent applications and, (2) in order to comply with treaty obligations, allowed foreign inventors to participate in U.S. patent interference proceedings.

THE COALITION FOR 21ST
CENTURY PATENT REFORM

BIPARTISAN EFFORTS MOVE STRONG PATENT REFORM BILL FORWARD IN SENATE—COALITION SUPPORTS COMMITMENT TO IMPROVE PATENT SYSTEM FOR ALL INVENTORS

Washington, DC.—Gary Griswold of the Coalition for 21st Century Patent Reform today released the following statement after the Senate Judiciary Committee overwhelmingly approved S. 23, The Patent Reform Act of 2011. The Coalition appreciates the strong bipartisan support of the bill in the committee and the recognition by the Senators that patent reform will spur innovation and help create jobs across all business sectors.

"Our Coalition is grateful for the bipartisan vote in support of the legislation and the Senators' hard work to craft legislation that will improve the patent system for all the nation's innovators. It is very encouraging to have the committee's overwhelming support for the legislation as it moves to the Senate floor. We recognize Senators will continue to fine-tune the language of the bill and we look forward to working actively with them to address outstanding issues.

The members of our Coalition will be working with other inventors and innovators in the coming weeks to communicate with all Senators as well as members of the House about the importance of this legislation for jobs, promoting innovation, and solidifying our global competitiveness."

CROSS-SECTOR MANUFACTURERS &
INNOVATORS IN SUPPORT OF S. 23

3M, Air Liquide, Air Products, BP,
Bridgestone American Holdings, Inc.,

Cargill, Caterpillar, Coalition for Patent and Trademark Information Dissemination, Coalition for 21st Century Patent Reform, Cummins.

The Dow Chemical Company, DuPont, Eastman Chemical Company, ExxonMobil, General Electric, General Mills, Henkel Corporation, Honeywell, Intellectual Property Owners Association.

Illinois Tool Works, Kodak, Milliken and Company, Monsanto, Northrop Grumman, PepsiCo, Inc., Procter & Gamble, United Technologies, USG Corporation, Weyerhaeuser.

AMENDMENT NO. 114

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as part of the housekeeping measures we have, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] proposes an amendment numbered 114.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

On page 1, strike line 5, and insert the following: "America Invents Act".

On page 79, strike lines 1 through 17, and insert the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall have authority to set or adjust by rule any fee established, authorized, or charged under title 35, United States Code, and the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.), notwithstanding the fee amounts established, authorized, or charged thereunder, for all services performed by or materials furnished by, the Office, provided that patent and trademark fee amounts are in the aggregate set to recover the estimated cost to the Office for processing, activities, services, and materials relating to patents and trademarks, respectively, including proportionate shares of the administrative costs of the Office.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see the distinguished senior Senator from Utah on the Senate floor, a man who has worked for years on this issue and has made every effort to keep it bipartisan.

I yield to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee. He has been one of the leaders the whole time I have been on that committee with regard to intellectual property issues. It has always been a pleasure to work with him and his staff. They are good people.

This is a particularly important bill. It is only the first step, once we bring it up and hopefully pass it, and then the House will bring up their bill. There are likely to be differences between the two, and we will have to get together in conference to resolve those differences. So those who might have some angst about this particular bill, give it time. We will be working diligently—the distinguished Senator from Vermont, myself, and others, including, of course, our ranking member, Senator GRASSLEY—we will be working diligently to try and resolve these

problems and hopefully we will end up with a bill that everybody in this country should recognize as what needs to be done to keep us at the forefront of all technological innovation in this world.

I rise today to express my support for the pending patent reform legislation before us. As many know, several of my colleagues and I have been working together on this bill for several Congresses. I especially wish to recognize the ongoing efforts of our Judiciary Committee chairman, PAT LEAHY. Over the years he and I have worked tirelessly to bring about long overdue reform to our Nation's patent system. I also wish to recognize the efforts of the Judiciary Committee ranking member, CHUCK GRASSLEY, as well as many of my Senate colleagues who have been instrumental in forging the compromise before us today which, in my opinion, is the first step in trying to arrive at a final consensus bill.

Similarly, no enumeration would be complete without recognizing the considerable work that has been done by our colleagues over in the House of Representatives. House Judiciary Committee chairman LAMAR SMITH has been a leader on patent reform legislation for many years. His vision, his expertise, and his leadership are highly respected and appreciated by me, by my colleagues as well, and by many throughout the patent community.

I also wish to specifically acknowledge the invaluable contributions of Representatives JOHN CONYERS, HOWARD BERMAN, BOB GOODLATTE, HOWARD COBLE, DARRELL ISSA, and ZOE LOFGREN. They have all been very effective people with regard to these very important issues. They have been stalwarts in underscoring the vital need to reform our patent system. I look forward to seeing the results of their process and working with them to complete this important task.

Most of us are very familiar with the history of patent legislation, but it bears repeating that we have not had meaningful reform to our patent system in well over a half century—not any meaningful reform whatsoever, even though many things have changed during these intervening years—courts have instituted welcome changes to our patent system, a lot of technology has changed, and a lot of innovation has occurred.

I am not going to spend my time today on a history lesson. Instead, I urge everyone to consider not the past, but to look forward to the future, and that future begins with examining our present. The Nation's current economic situation requires that we take advantage of our ingenuity that has made America the economic envy of the world.

If enacted, the American Invents Act would move the United States to a first-inventor-to-file system, which will create a system that is more transparent, objective, and predictable for the patentee. In addition,

transitioning to a first-to-inventor-to-file system will facilitate harmonization with other patent offices across the world and contribute to ongoing work-sharing processes.

The bill will also establish another means to administratively challenge the validity of a patent at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, USPTO—creating a cost-effective alternative to formal litigation, which will further enhance our patent system.

Patent owners will be able to improve the quality of their patents through a new supplemental examination process. The bill further prevents patents from being issued on claims for tax strategies and provides fee-setting authority for the USPTO Director to ensure the Office is properly funded.

This bipartisan bill also contains provisions on venue to curb forum shopping; changes to the best mode disclosure requirement; increased incentives for government laboratories to commercialize inventions; restrictions on false marking claims, and removes restrictions on the residency of Federal Circuit judges.

For me, it is pretty simple. Patent reform is more than words on paper. It is about jobs and the positive impact they have on our economy. Chairman LEAHY understands this connection and has wisely named the bill the America Invents Act of 2011.

While we debate this important legislation, it is crucial that we keep the creation of jobs and economic prosperity at the forefront of our thoughts. After all, patents encourage technological advancement by providing incentives to invent, to invest in, and to disclose new technology. Now more than ever we must ensure efficiency and increased quality in the issuance of patents. This, in turn, will create an environment that fosters entrepreneurship and the creation of new jobs, thereby contributing to growth within all sectors of our economy.

If we think about it, one single deployed patent has a ripple effect that works like this: A properly examined patent, promptly issued by the USPTO, creates jobs—jobs that are dedicated to developing and producing new products and services. Unfortunately, the current USPTO backlog now exceeds 700,000 applicants. The sheer volume of the patent applications not only reflects the vibrant, innovative spirit that has made America a worldwide innovative leader in science, education, and technology, but the patent backlog also represents dynamic economic growth waiting to be unleashed. We cannot afford to go down this path any longer. We need to take advantage of this opportunity to expand our economy.

During consideration of the America Invents Act, I encourage my colleagues to be mindful that legislation is rarely without its imperfections, and we have a tremendous chance to take much needed action. To those who believe

otherwise, rest assured my intent is to do no harm. But I want the legislative process to move forward. It is long overdue.

I urge my colleagues to participate in the debate and vote on the amendments they think will strengthen the bill. There are some proposals that I believe merit serious consideration by all of us. At the end of the day, the passage of this bill will update our patent system, help strengthen our economy, and provide a springboard for further improvements to our intellectual property laws.

I have every confidence that we can come together and act in a bipartisan manner. The stakes are simply too high for us not to seize this moment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak on S. 23. We probably have a lot of amendments, but right now we are talking about the bill. The America Invents Act is what it is called. I should express my gratitude to those others who have helped so much on this and, quite frankly, more involved on this bill than I have been, including Chairman LEAHY, Senator HATCH, Senator SESSIONS, and Senator KYL.

This is a bipartisan bill. Over the past 5 years or so, the Senate Judiciary Committee has been considering comprehensive patent reform. Chairman LEAHY has engaged Senators on both sides of the aisle as well as a wide range of groups on the outside. His efforts have been pivotal in bringing together diverse views and crafting a reasonable compromise bill. In fact, the bill is supported by a large number of industries and other stakeholders from the U.S. patent community.

I commend the leadership of Chairman LEAHY as well as the leadership of Senator HATCH for getting us to where we are at this point. Intellectual property rights are extremely important to our Nation's economy. An effective and efficient patent system will help promote innovation and technological advancement in America and make life better for us all. An effective and efficient patent system also will help provide stimulus for businesses and obviously generate many new jobs. Everyone agrees we need a well-functioning patent and trademark office within our government so that it can complete its work in a timely manner.

We should find ways to help the Patent and Trademark Office speed up the patent application process and eliminate the current backlog it is experiencing. We should reduce costs and decrease abusive litigation and improve certainty in the patent process and strengthen patent quality. The America Invents Act will help do all of these things.

The bipartisan bill before us will update and upgrade the U.S. patent system. It will enhance transparency and patent quality, and it will ensure that the Patent and Trademark Office has

the tools and funding it needs to cut its backlog and process patent applications more quickly.

The improvements to the patent system contained in our bill will help spur economic prosperity and job creation. I am pleased to support it.

Specifically, the bill would improve patent quality by establishing the opportunity for third parties to submit prior art and other information related to a pending application for consideration by a patent examiner. By allowing prior art to be submitted earlier in the process and explained to the office, patent examiners will be able to issue higher quality patents.

The bill would create a “first window” post-grant opposition proceeding open for 9 months after the grant of a patent. This would allow the Patent and Trademark Office to weed out patents that should not have been issued in the first place.

This new post-grant review process—which was recommended in a 2004 report issued by the National Academy of Sciences—would enable early challenges to patents, but also protect the rights of inventors and patent owners against endless litigation. The reason we want to ensure that the Patent and Trademark Office issues high quality patents is to incentivize investment in truly innovative technological advances and provide more certainty for investors in these inventions.

In addition, the bill would improve the current inter partes administrative process for challenging the validity of a patent. It would establish an adversarial inter partes review, with a higher threshold for initiating a proceeding and procedural safeguards to prevent a challenger from using the process to harass patent owners. It also would include a strengthened estoppel standard to prevent petitioners from raising in a subsequent challenge the same patent issues that were raised or reasonably could have been raised in a prior challenge. The bill would significantly reduce the ability to use post-grant procedures for abusive serial challenges to patents. These new procedures would also provide faster, less costly alternatives to civil litigation to challenge patents.

The bill would institute a gatekeeping role for the court to assess the legal basis for damages and jury instructions. This would provide more certainty in damages calculation and promote uniformity and fairness. The bill also would transition the United States to a first-inventor to file system, simplifying the application process and coordinating it with our trading partners. This change will reduce costs and help improve the competitiveness of American inventors abroad.

Further, the bill would provide fee setting authority for the Patent Trademark Office Director to ensure that the Patent and Trademark Office is properly funded and can reduce its current backlog of patent applications.

The bill also would mandate a reduction of fees by 50 percent for small entities and 75 percent for micro-entities.

I want to particularly thank Chairman LEAHY for working with me and Senator BAUCUS on a provision that would curtail patents on tax strategies. These patents encumber the ability of taxpayers and their advisers to use the tax law freely, interfering with the voluntary tax compliance system. Tax strategy patents undermine the fairness of the Federal tax system by removing from the public domain ways to satisfy a taxpayer's legal obligations. If firms or individuals hold patents for these strategies, some taxpayers could face fees simply for complying with the Tax Code. Moreover, tax patents provide windfalls to lawyers and patent holders by granting them exclusive rights to use tax loopholes, which could provide some businesses with an unfair advantage in our competitive market system.

Our provision would ensure that all taxpayers will have equal access to strategies to comply with the Tax Code.

This provision was carefully drafted with the help of the Patent and Trademark Office not to cover software preparation and other software, tools or systems used to prepare tax or information returns or manage a taxpayer's finances.

In conclusion, the America Invents Act will protect inventors' rights and encourage innovation and investment in our economy. The bill will improve transparency and third party participation in the patent application review process. This, in turn, will strengthen patent quality and result in more fairness for both patent holders and patent challengers. The bill will institute beneficial changes to the patent process to curb litigation abuses and improve certainty for investors and innovators. It will help companies do business more efficiently on an international basis.

The bill also will enhance operations of the Patent and Trademark Office with administrative reforms and will give the office fee setting authority to reduce backlogs and better manage its business.

I am pleased to support this hard fought bipartisan legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa. As I noted before he got on the floor, he has been extremely important in working on this issue.

Mr. President, just so I can have a moment to speak with the Senator from Louisiana, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 112

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, pursuant to a conversation with the distinguished committee chairman, I ask unanimous consent to temporarily set aside the pending amendment to call up the Toomey-Vitter amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER], for himself and Mr. TOOMEY, proposes an amendment numbered 112.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require that the Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . FULL FAITH AND CREDIT ACT.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Full Faith and Credit Act”.

(b) **PRIORITIZE OBLIGATIONS ON THE DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—In the event that the debt of the United States Government, as defined in section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, reaches the statutory limit, the authority of the Department of the Treasury provided in section 3123 of title 31, United States Code, to pay with legal tender the principal and interest on debt held by the public shall take priority over all other obligations incurred by the Government of the United States.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, this Toomey-Vitter amendment is the Full Faith and Credit Act—the concept that has been discussed for several weeks prior to this week. It is very timely, as we are all rightly focused on the spending and debt issue with the Thursday deadline coming up.

No one that I know of wants the government to be shut down in any way, shape, or form. No one that I know of wants any massive, significant disruption. But lots of people that I know of, including many in Louisiana, want us to change business as usual in Washington, starting with spending and debt. This full faith and credit amendment is an important step in that regard. Because of the time limitations in front of us before we move to other pending business at 4:30, I have agreed to come back at a later time to fully lay out this Toomey-Vitter amendment, as well as a second-degree Vitter amendment that I will advance with regard to Social Security.

It is very important to discuss this spending, to put it on the floor and start this debate with vigor about spending and debt, changing the fiscal policy of this country so that we can get on a more sustainable path. There is only one thing certain about this debate; that is, if we don't change the fiscal path we are on, it will lead to an economic disaster.

I urge us to debate these important proposals immediately, well before the Thursday deadline, and come to a strong, positive resolution. I will be back on the floor soon with Senator TOOMEY to fully explain this amendment, as well as the Vitter second-degree amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I send a motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I understand we have a unanimous consent agreement at 4:30 p.m. to go to two judicial nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask for the regular order.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF AMY TOTENBERG TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DIS- TRICT OF GEORGIA

NOMINATION OF STEVE C. JONES TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DIS- TRICT OF GEORGIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Amy Totenberg, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia and Steve C. Jones, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 1 hour of debate, equally and divided and controlled in the usual form.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. There is both good news and bad news represented by today's debate. The good news is that we begin another week by considering two of President Obama's judicial nominations. With judicial vacancies remaining over 100, nearly half of them judicial emergencies, the Senate's action today on 2 outstanding nominees to fill judicial emergency vacancies in Georgia is much needed.

The bad news is that we did not consider these nominations earlier, and that we are not considering any of the other 8 judicial nominees awaiting final Senate consideration and confirmation. Two of those nominees, Sue Myerscough and James Shadid, were each nominated to fill emergency vacancies on the Central District of Illinois. Their confirmations would help relieve the chief judge of that district, who is the only active judge in the en-

tire district. Chief Judge McCuskey wrote to Senator DURBIN in November urging the Senate to take action to fill those vacancies, but we did not. Despite the desperate need in that district, neither of these nominations received final Senate votes when they were reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee last year. Both have now been reported unanimously again, and we should not further delay taking care of this overburdened court and the hard-working Americans who depend on it.

I do thank, in particular, the majority leader for scheduling this time, and also thank the Republican leader for his cooperation. I also commend our ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee. Senator GRASSLEY has worked with me on each of the judicial nominations that President Obama re-nominated this January.

All 13 of the judicial nominations that were unanimously reported last year have now been unanimously reported, again, this year. To date, five of those nominations have been confirmed and with the confirmation of Amy Totenberg and Steve Jones, we will have reconsidered and confirmed 7 of those 13 unanimously reported judicial nominees.

The Judiciary Committee has also now considered the renomination of Susan Carney of Connecticut to the Second Circuit and Michael Simon to be a district court judge in Oregon. More than half of the Republicans on the Judiciary Committee voted in favor of those nominations. They should be debated and confirmed without delay, as well.

Working with Senator GRASSLEY, I also expect to be able to move forward with Judiciary Committee consideration of the renominations of two district court nominees, Edward Chen of California and Jack McConnell of Rhode Island, in the next few weeks. The renomination of Goodwin Liu of California to the Ninth Circuit will be reexamined at a Judiciary Committee hearing this week, at the request of our Republican members, and then reconsidered by the committee, as well.

We will be holding our third confirmation hearing of the year this week. It will include Professor Liu and four other judicial nominees from Tennessee, Florida, and New Jersey. At the earlier two hearings we considered eight additional judicial nominees who now await committee approval and Senate consideration. We are holding hearings every 2 weeks and hope finally to begin to bend the curve and start to lower judicial vacancies across the country.

I also commend the Senator from Iowa for his statement on February 14 during which he urged the Senate to turn the page and not revisit the re-terminations from administrations past. I agree.

The nominees we consider today are both from Georgia. They were both reported unanimously by the Judiciary

Committee this year. Actually, they were also reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee last year. They were among the 19 judicial nominees who were ready to be confirmed by the Senate last year but were not. When there was objection to proceeding last year, the vacancies persisted, the President had to renominate them and the Judiciary Committee had to reconsider their nominations. I expect the Senate will confirm them both tonight. I hope we do so unanimously. Both have the support of their home State Senators. Senators ISAKSON and Senator CHAMBLISS worked with me and with President Obama in connection with these nominations.

While I am encouraged that the Senate is proceeding today, I am disappointed that we did not consider these nominees and other nominees from California, North Carolina, and the District of Columbia before the Presidents Day recess. We used to be able to clear the calendar of nominations before a recess. All six of these judicial nominees were approved unanimously by every Republican and every Democrat on the Judiciary Committee weeks before the recess. When they are considered, I fully expect they will be confirmed unanimously by the Senate. With persistently high judicial vacancies around the country, the Senate should be considering judicial nominations without unnecessary delays. Litigants all over the country are having a hard time getting their cases heard in court because of the high number of vacancies. There are nominees pending on the calendar with unanimous support by both Republicans and Democrats on the Senate Judiciary Committee. We ought to at least vote on these nominations to fill the vacancies.

In fact, when these 2 nominations are confirmed, there will still be nearly 100 Federal judicial vacancies around the country. That is too many and they have persisted for too long. That is why Chief Justice Roberts, Attorney General Holder, White House Counsel Bob Bauer, and many others, including the President of the United States, have spoken out and urged the Senate to act.

Nearly one out of every eight Federal judgeships is vacant. That puts at serious risk the ability of Americans all over the country to have a fair hearing in court. The real price being paid for these unnecessary delays is that the judges who remain are overburdened and the American people who depend on them are being denied hearings and justice in a timely fashion. These delays affect everyone; whether you are a plaintiff, a prosecutor, or a defendant.

Regrettably, the progress we made during the first 2 years of the Bush administration has not been duplicated, and the progress we made over the 8 years from 2001 to 2009 to reduce judicial vacancies from 110 to a low of 34 was reversed. The vacancy rate we reduced from 10 percent at the end of