

**Issue Editors:**

Ralph A. Dengler
radengler@Venable.com
212.503.0655

Martin L. Saad
mlsaad@Venable.com
202.344.4345

Mark R. Shanks
mrshanks@Venable.com
202.344.4436

Meaghan Hemmings Kent
mhkent@Venable.com
202.344.4481

Elissa Brockbank Reese
ebreese@Venable.com
202.344.4530

Honors and Awards**IP LEGAL NEWS AND UPDATES**

USPTO Guidance on Computer-Implemented Inventions and Abstract Ideas

Authors: [Michael A. Sartori](#) and [Todd R. Farnsworth](#)

On January 27, 2015, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office released a list of examples to supplement the 2014 Interim Guidance on Patent Subject Matter Eligibility. The examples are directed towards computer-implemented inventions, and include four claim sets that the USPTO suggests are patent eligible and four that are not. The examples apply the test for subject matter eligibility as described by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Alice Corporation Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank International, et al.*

[Click here to learn more about the PTO's guidance.](#)

Tracking the Evolving Abstract Idea Doctrine: How Courts Have Applied the Two-Part Test for Computer-Implemented Inventions post-*Alice*

Authors: [Trent B. Ostler](#), [Robert Kinberg](#), and [Michael A. Sartori](#)

The Supreme Court's decision in *Alice v. CLS Bank* provides a framework for determining when a patent claim is directed to one of the long-standing exceptions to patent eligibility, namely, laws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract ideas. In particular, *Alice* addresses whether computer-implemented inventions are patent-ineligible abstract ideas, but the framework set forth in *Alice* is broadly applicable to each of the long-standing exceptions.

[Click here to read about how the *Alice* framework affects patent eligibility.](#)

In re Cuozzo: The Federal Circuit Affirms the PTAB's Finding of Unpatentability

Authors: [Fabian Koenigbauer](#) and [Steven J. Schwarz](#)

The first Federal Circuit decision from an appeal of a Final Written Decision in an *Inter Partes* Review affirmed the Patent Trial and Appeal Board on all grounds. The decision clarifies several issues affecting AIA Trials, including whether a PTAB decision to institute IPR is appealable; the claim construction standard in IPR; and whether a motion to amend the patent in an IPR may introduce substitute claims that "would encompass any apparatus or claim that would not have been covered by the original claims."

[Click here to read the details of this decision.](#)

The Battle of the Two Flanax's and the Power of the

Mexico-United States Border

Author: [Kimberly Culp](#)

There are two Flanax's. Belmora LLC distributes Flanax, a brand of pain relief medicine, in the United States while Bayer has distributed a brand of pain medicine, Flanax, in Mexico for decades. Bayer sought to cancel Belmora's registered trademark for Flanax in the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board. Bayer won in that venue. Then, the parties sought review of that decision and brought additional causes of action in the Eastern District of Virginia. Belmora filed a motion to dismiss Bayer's counterclaims, which the District Court had granted, and a motion to reverse the TTAB opinion.

[Click here to learn about this outcome.](#)

Too Much of a Good Thing Can Hurt You

Author: [Joshua J. Kaufman](#)

In every contract, parties try to limit their liability. As a result, drafters include very broad limitations of liability, which, up to a point, are fine and should be used. However, problems arise when an entity tries to draft a limitation of liability that is so broad that it goes against public policy and state statutes. This is what recently happened in the case of *Rossi v. Photoglou*.

[Click here to read the full article.](#)

To keep abreast of changes in the IP world affecting your business, subscribe to our new RSS feed. To subscribe, please visit www.Venable.com/rss/

If you have friends or colleagues who would find this alert useful, please invite them to subscribe at www.Venable.com/subscriptioncenter.

CALIFORNIA DELAWARE MARYLAND NEW YORK VIRGINIA WASHINGTON, DC

1.888.VENABLE | www.Venable.com

© 2015 Venable LLP. This newsletter is published by the law firm Venable LLP. It is not intended to provide legal advice or opinion. Such advice may only be given when related to specific fact situations that Venable has accepted an engagement as counsel to address. Further, each newsletter article has been prepared by the named author or authors, and does not represent the views of Venable LLP or unnamed Venable attorneys. This newsletter may be reproduced without the express permission of Venable LLP as long as it is reproduced in its entirety, including the Venable name and logo. ATTORNEY ADVERTISING.

575 7th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20004

© 2015 Venable LLP | www.Venable.com | 1.888.VENABLE