



The University of Texas System
Nine Universities. Six Health Institutions. Unlimited Possibilities.

Office of Research and Technology Transfer

September 11, 2009

U.S. Department of Commerce
Secretary Gary Locke
1401 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20230

Dear Secretary Locke:

The University of Texas System is committed to fostering scientific innovation, commercialization and economic prosperity as part of our public mission. As you are aware, congressional mandate requires our institutions to transfer those innovations to the commercial marketplace. In this context, we are writing to make you aware of the potential consequences that could result from the patent-reform legislation currently before the Congress. We should note that some versions of the legislation proposed this session would improve the patent process. In its current form, however, patent reform legislation contains some parts that could result in adverse and disproportionately unintended harmful consequences to university technology-transfer operations, programs that contribute both to our nation's scientific leadership and to local economic development.

The two most contentious issues in the patent reform debate relate to patent damages and the expansion of administrative challenges to patent validity through a new post-grant review process and modifications to the existing inter partes re-examination process. We believe the current Senate legislation (S. 515) resolves the damages issue wisely by its inclusion of the so-called "gatekeeper" compromise. Any effort to go back to previous proposals will, in our view, endanger the entire patent reform effort.

On the other hand, the provisions in the bill expanding post-grant review and inter partes re-examination provisions will have a disproportionately adverse impact on university technology-transfer programs and the smaller technology companies they "spin-off." The most troubling aspect of these post-grant review and inter partes re-examination provisions is that, as written, they are susceptible to a high level of abusive misuse. Scientific innovation, as distinguished from the incremental innovation practiced by many proponents of

The University of Texas at Arlington

The University of Texas at Austin

The University of Texas at Brownsville

The University of Texas at Dallas

The University of Texas at El Paso

The University of Texas - Pan American

The University of Texas
of the Permian Basin

The University of Texas at San Antonio

The University of Texas at Tyler

The University of Texas
Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas

The University of Texas
Medical Branch at Galveston

The University of Texas
Health Science Center at Houston

The University of Texas
Health Science Center at San Antonio

The University of Texas
M. D. Anderson Cancer Center

The University of Texas
Health Center at Tyler

www.utssystem.edu

patent reform, is often economically disruptive. Indeed, solving problems in new ways lies at the heart of technologies developed at universities, which make them particularly susceptible to the tactic of delays to derail technologies that appear to threaten competitors from established industries. Such conduct is often deemed by these business sectors as economically and legally required. Moreover, whether or not such tactics are ever used, their mere availability is enough to deter the private investment necessary to develop and commercialize early-stage innovation. Discussion with colleagues in the VC community lead us to conclude that post-grant review raises uncertainty and thus reduced VC's willingness to invest in early-stage university start-ups where there was little more than a prototype, a patent and a couple of people with an idea.

Technology-transfer programs are thus particularly vulnerable to any expanded pathways to patent ineffectiveness caused by added costs, challenges or other delays. Specifically, the current proposed provisions will allow infringers to subject valid patents to lengthy and repeated challenges at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office and will authorize an increased capacity to combine inter partes re-examinations with court-ordered stays. At some point, patents delayed are patents denied, and at that point technology-transfer programs lose their ability to execute their public mission.

Additionally, these provisions would create a substantial risk for the Patent and Trademark Office, which, as you know, is already under severe strain. Layering on new procedural obligations is very likely to result in further costs and delays for patent applicants and holders, a situation that will, in particular, harm early-stage innovation more than most others in the intellectual property community. The basic patent examination function will be hamstrung, resulting in even longer patent pendency and lower patent quality. University technology-transfer programs cannot thrive in such an environment. The sound and efficient operation of the Patent and Trademark Office is absolutely critical to the successful execution of our public mission.

These concerns are not hypothetical. Firms like "Patent Assassins" market the *existing* re-examination procedure as a way to "create uncertainty about a problem patent by tying it up in a long re-examination process" (see www.patentassassins.com). And foreign intellectual property experts have publicly noted the abusive possibilities of the new proposals. For example, writing for a Chinese IP publication, former Chinese intellectual property judge Yongshun Cheng analyzed the House-passed bill from the last Congress as:

The newly created post-grant review procedure is alleged to provide an economic and fast way to challenge a patent before litigation becomes necessary. However, the proposed post-grant review procedure would also enable infringers to easily subject legitimate patents to consecutive attacks, creating much expense and uncertainty for the patent holder and those investing in the patent holder's business. ("The Greatest Changes in the U.S. Patent System in the Last 50 Years," *China Intellectual Property News*, November 7, 2007)

The mere possibility of such abuse will be harmful to university-based innovation, much of which is stimulated and supported by federal and state monetary grants, then developed pursuant to the provisions of Bayh Dole, a process that has provided a proven path to economic development and scientific progress for years, and is uniformly praised by economic development experts and the Congress itself.

We agree on the goal of reducing the amount and cost of patent litigation. The post-grant and expanded inter partes provisions, as drafted, will not achieve this goal. Improvements to these provisions would limit the ability of infringers to undermine the very system the legislation attempts to strengthen.

Thank you for considering our views in this crucial matter and for your expressed interest in improving the entire patent process. We look forward to working with you to ensure that United States' patent protections remain the strongest in the world.

Sincerely,



Keith McDowell, Ph.D.
Vice Chancellor for Research &
Technology Transfer



Arjun Sanga, J.D.
Associate Vice Chancellor for
Research & Technology Transfer
USPTO Registration No. 40,797

cc: Barry Burgdorf, Vice Chancellor and General Counsel
Bill Schute, Vice Chancellor for Federal Relations