

# EXHIBIT 17

*Lex Machina*  
*2013 Patent Litigation*  
*Year in Review*



*Owen Byrd*  
*Chief Evangelist & General Counsel*

*Brian Howard*  
*Legal Data Scientist*

 Lex Machina

## Introduction

The world of U.S. patent litigation has changed dramatically in the last five years: total patent cases filed in district courts have more than doubled since 2008, the American Invents Act was passed in 2011 and took effect in 2012, and cases such as Apple-Samsung have captured headlines with eye-popping damages awards for patent infringement in widely used products.

This report draws on Lex Machina's unique and rich Legal Analytics data on U.S. District Courts and judges, law firms, parties, patents, case merits decisions, damages awards, and International Trade Commission (ITC) investigations and Administrative Law Judges (ALJs).

## Executive Summary

Plaintiffs filed 6,092 new patent cases in U.S. District Courts in 2013, compared to 5,418 new cases filed in 2012, a 12.4% increase.

A plurality of these new cases were filed in the Eastern District of Texas (1,495 cases, 20% increase over 2012) and the District of Delaware (1,336 cases, 33% increase over 2012). The Central District of California saw the greatest decrease in new cases filed (399 cases, 20% decrease over 2012).


Trials were held in 128 patent cases in 2013, including 52 bench trials and 63 jury trials. Thirteen cases involved both bench and jury trials. Over half of all trials were held in the District of Delaware (25), the Eastern District of Texas (25) or the Southern District of New York (17). Cases went to trial fastest in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania; its 255-day median time to trial was approximately 12 times faster than the 2,423 days it took a case to get to trial in the Western District of New York, the slowest district.

Judge Rodney Gilstrap in the Eastern District of Texas was assigned 941 new patent cases in 2013, far outpacing the 399 cases assigned to his Delaware colleague Judge Leonard Stark, who ranked second.

Seven judges issued more than ten decisions on the merits of patent cases. Judge Gilstrap, along with District of Delaware Judges Richard Andrews and Sue Robinson, each issued 15 decisions. Seven other judges each issued four or five summary judgment decisions.

Fish & Richardson, with 308 cases, led all national law firms when ranked by number of open cases in 2013 (filed 2009-2013). Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell led all Delaware firms, with 604 open cases in 2013. Ward & Smith led all Texas firms, with 245 open cases.

Not surprisingly, all ten plaintiffs that filed the most new patent cases in 2013 are patent monetization entities (PMEs). Melvino/ArrivalStar, Wyncomm and Thermolife each filed more than 100 cases. But seven of the ten plaintiffs with the most patents asserted in open cases are operating companies, including Ericsson, Finisar, Motorola Mobility, Apple, Philips and Pfizer.



The top defendant named in cases filed in 2013 was Apple (59 cases), followed by Amazon (50 cases). Other tech companies, including AT&T (45 cases), Google (39 cases), Dell (38 cases), HTC (38 cases), Samsung (38 cases); Microsoft (35 cases), LG (34 cases), and HP (34 cases), rounded out the top ten.

PMEs ArrivalStar and Melvino jointly asserted six of the ten most frequently asserted patents, all involving systems for monitoring or tracking vehicle status, travel or proximity.

4,917 patents were at issue in all cases filed during 2013. Of these, 3,032, or 61%, had not been litigated in the past 10 years.

The number of merits decisions by district courts invalidating patents under 35 U.S.C. § 101, for lack of patentable subject matter, continued to increase, from two in 2010 to 14 in 2013.

The 10 largest damages awards ranged from \$1 billion, to Monsanto from DuPont for infringement of a patent for genetically modified seeds, to just over \$15 million, to Tomita from Nintendo for infringement of a video camera image system.

Damages generally increased from 2012 to 2013, although headline-stealing damages caused the average damages to increase more (28%) than the median damages (22%).

Finally, the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) remains an important venue for resolving patent disputes. Total new ITC investigations in 2013 stabilized at 41, almost identical to 2012's 42 new investigations, after spiking to 70 in 2011.

Of the six currently-serving ITC Administrative Law Judges (ALJs), Charles Bullock has disposed of the largest number of investigations, 125 in total. Theodore Essex has resolved 86 investigations, Edwards Gildea has resolved 57, David Shaw has resolved 29, Thomas Pender has resolved 23, and Sandra Lord has resolved three.

**Table of Contents:**

<b><i>New Cases Filed in U.S. District Courts</i></b>	<b>1</b>
<i>Figure 1: New Cases Filed in 2013, by Month</i> .....	1
<i>Figure 2: New Cases Filed 2005-2013</i> .....	1
<b><i>U.S. District Courts</i></b>	<b>2</b>
New Cases, by District.....	2
<i>Figure 3: Districts With Most New Cases Filed</i> .....	2
Net Change in New Cases Filed, by District.....	2
<i>Figure 4: Net Increase in New Cases Filed</i> .....	2
<i>Figure 5: Net Decrease in New Cases Filed</i> .....	2
Bench and Jury Trials.....	3
<i>Figure 6: All Trials, All Districts</i> .....	3
<i>Figure 7: Trials, by District (districts with more than two trials)</i> .....	3
Time to Trial.....	4
<i>Figure 8: Fastest Median Time to Trial, 2013</i> .....	4
<i>Figure 9: Fastest Median Time to Trial, 2012</i> .....	4
<i>Figure 10: Slowest Median Time to Trial, 2013</i> .....	4
<i>Figure 11: Slowest Median Time to Trial, 2012</i> .....	4
<i>Figure 12: Average Time to Trial, by Year and Quarter of Trial Date</i> .....	5
<b><i>U.S. District Court Judges</i></b>	<b>6</b>
New Cases.....	6
<i>Figure 13: Most New Cases</i> .....	6
Merits Decisions.....	6
<i>Figure 14: Most Merits Decisions</i> .....	6
Summary Judgment Decisions.....	6
<i>Figure 15: Most Summary Judgment Decisions</i> .....	6
<b><i>Law Firms</i></b>	<b>7</b>
<i>Figure 16: National Law Firms, Ranked by Open Cases in 2013 (Filed 2009-2013)</i> .....	7
<i>Figure 17: Delaware Law Firms, Ranked by Open Cases in 2013 (Filed 2009-2013)</i> .....	7
<i>Figure 18: Texas Law Firms, Ranked by Open Cases in 2013 (Filed 2009-2013)</i> .....	7
<b><i>Parties</i></b>	<b>8</b>
<i>Figure 19: Plaintiffs Filing Most New Cases</i> .....	8
<i>Figure 20: Plaintiffs With Most Patents Asserted in Cases Open During 2013</i> .....	8
<i>Figure 21: Defendants in Most New Cases</i> .....	8
<b><i>Patents</i></b>	<b>9</b>
<i>Figure 22: Most Frequently Asserted Patents</i> .....	9
<i>Figure 23: Titles of Most Frequently Asserted Patents</i> .....	9
<b><i>Merits Decisions in District Court Cases</i></b>	<b>10</b>
<i>Figure 24: Patent Invalidation Merits Decisions 2007-2013</i> .....	10
<i>Figure 25: Merit Decisions for Lack of Patentable Subject Matter (35 U.S.C. § 101) 2007-2013</i> .....	11
<b><i>District Court Damages Awards</i></b>	<b>12</b>
<i>Figure 26: Largest Damages Awards</i> .....	12
<i>Figure 27: Average and Median Damages, 2013 v. 2012</i> .....	12
<b><i>U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC)</i></b>	<b>13</b>
<i>Figure 28: New ITC Investigations Filed, 2007-2013</i> .....	13
<i>Figure 29: All Dispositive Outcomes by Current ALJs, through 2013</i> .....	13
<i>Figure 30: Pending Investigations, by current ALJ</i> .....	13
<b><i>Lex Machina's Data</i></b>	<b>14</b>
<b><i>Appendix 1: All Pending ITC Investigations, as of December 31, 2013</i></b>	<b>15</b>

## New Cases Filed in U.S. District Courts

Plaintiffs filed 6,092 new patent cases in U.S. District Courts in 2013, compared to 5,418 new cases filed in 2012, a 12.4% increase.

Figure 1: New Cases Filed in 2013, by Month





Figure 2: New Cases Filed, 2005-2013



## U.S. District Courts

### *New Cases, by District*

**Figure 3: Districts With Most New Cases Filed**

Rank	District	2013	2012	Net Change
1	Eastern District of Texas	1,495	1,247	+248
2	District of Delaware	1,336	1,002	+334
3	Central District of California	399	499	-100
4	Northern District of California	249	260	-11
5	Southern District of California	227	141	+86

The first four of the top five districts with the most new cases filed remained the same from 2012 to 2013. The Southern District of California (227 cases in 2013, 141 cases in 2012, with a net change +86) overtook the Northern District of Illinois as the fifth most popular district for new cases filed.

Total new cases filed increased for the Eastern District of Texas (1), the District of Delaware (2), and the Southern District of California (5), but decreased for the Central District of California (3) and Northern District of California (4).

### *Net Change in New Cases Filed, by District*

**Figure 4: Net Increase in New Cases Filed**

Rank	District	2013	2012	Net Increase	Net Increase (%)
1	District of Delaware	1,336	1,002	+334	33%
2	Eastern District of Texas	1,495	1,247	+248	20%
3	Southern District of California	227	141	+86	61%
4	Southern District of Florida	185	133	+52	39%
5	District of Massachusetts	124	80	+44	55%

**Figure 5: Net Decrease in New Cases Filed**

Rank	District	2013	2012	Net Decrease	Net Decrease (%)
1	Central District of California	399	499	-100	20%
2	Eastern District of Pennsylvania	23	53	-30	57%
3	District of Maryland	21	42	-21	50%
4	Western District of Pennsylvania	19	39	-20	51%
5	Middle District of Florida	59	76	-17	22%

The District of Delaware experienced the largest increase in case filings, with 334 more cases filed in 2013 than in 2012. The Eastern District of Texas also experienced a surge, with 248 more cases filed in 2013 than 2012.

The Central District of California experienced the largest decrease in case filings, with 100 fewer cases filed in 2013 than 2012, a 20% drop.

## Bench and Jury Trials

**Figure 6: All Trials, All Districts**

	Bench	Jury	Bench & Jury*	Total
	52	63	13	128

**Figure 7: Trials, by District (districts with more than two trials)**

District	Bench	Jury	Bench & Jury	Total
District of Delaware	17	8	0	25
Eastern District of Texas	11	22	8	25
Southern District of New York	11	7	1	17
Northern District of California	4	6	1	9
District of New Jersey	6	1	0	7
Central District of California	3	3	1	5
Northern District of Texas	2	4	2	4
District of Massachusetts	0	3	0	3
Middle District of Florida	0	3	0	3
Southern District of Florida	2	0	0	2
Northern District of Illinois	1	1	0	2
Southern District of Indiana	1	1	0	2
Western District of Texas	0	2	0	2
				<b>106</b>

\* Cases in which at least a portion of both bench and jury trials occurred in 2013.

## Time to Trial

**Figure 8: Fastest Median Time to Trial, 2013**

Rank	District	Cases	Median Days
1	Eastern District of Pennsylvania	1	212
2	Southern District of Florida	2	401
3	Western District of Virginia	1	587
4	Eastern District of Texas	24	677
5	Eastern District of Missouri	1	714

**Figure 9: Fastest Median Time to Trial, 2012**

Rank	District	Cases	Median Days
1	Eastern District of Pennsylvania	2	255
2	Eastern District of Virginia	3	459
3	Northern District of Ohio	1	560
4	Central District of California	4	582
5	Middle District of Florida	4	616

**Figure 10: Slowest Median Time to Trial, 2013**


Rank	District	Cases	Median Days
1	Western District of New York	1	2,423
2	Eastern District of Louisiana	1	2,308
3	Eastern District of California	1	2,044
4	Southern District of Iowa	1	1,642
5	District of Utah	1	1,532

**Figure 11: Slowest Median Time to Trial, 2012**

Rank	District	Cases	Median Days
1	District of Connecticut	1	3,052
2	District of Nevada	1	2,064
3	Eastern District of Louisiana	1	1,852
4	Northern District of Alabama	1	1,504
5	Western District of Pennsylvania	2	1,293

The Eastern District of Pennsylvania led all districts with the fastest time to trial in both 2013 and 2012. In 2013, its 255-day median time to trial was approximately 12 times faster than the 2,423 days to trial in the Western District of New York, the slowest district.

Figure 12: Average Time to Trial, by Year and Quarter of Trial Date



Time to trial, by the date of trial, is not correlated with the volume of cases filed, seasonal variations, or other discernable trends.

## U.S. District Court Judges

### *New Cases*

**Figure 13: Most New Cases**

Rank	Judge	District	Cases
1	Rodney Gilstrap	Eastern District of Texas	941
2	Leonard Stark	District of Delaware	399
3	Gregory Sleet	District of Delaware	395
4	Richard Andrews	District of Delaware	371
5	Leonard Davis	Eastern District of Texas	263
6	Sue Robinson	District of Delaware	248
7	Michael Schneider	Eastern District of Texas	186
8	Janis Sammartino	Southern District of California	104
9	Marilyn Huff	Southern District of California	75
10	Kevin Moore	Southern District of Florida	63

### *Merits Decisions*

**Figure 14: Most Merits Decisions\***

Rank	Judge	District	Decisions
1	Richard Andrews	District of Delaware	15
2	Rodney Gilstrap	Eastern District of Texas	15
3	Sue Robinson	District of Delaware	15
4	Leonard Davis	Eastern District of Texas	13
5	Leonard Stark	District of Delaware	12
6	Susan Illston	Northern District of California	12
7	Sidney Stein	Southern District of New York	11

### *Summary Judgment Decisions*

**Figure 15: Most Summary Judgment Decisions**

Rank	Judge	District	Decisions
1	Mariana Pfaelzer	Central District of California	5
2	Sue Robinson	District of Delaware	5
3	John Darrah	Northern District of Illinois	5
4	Susan Illston	Northern District of California	5
5	Leonard Davis	Eastern District of Texas	4
6	Richard Seeborg	Northern District of California	4
7	Ronald Whyte	Northern District of California	4

\* Merits decisions exclude stipulated, voluntary, or agreed dismissals, as well as transfer, severance or consolidation terminations.

## Law Firms

**Figure 16: National Law Firms, Ranked by Open Cases in 2013 (Filed 2009-2013)**

Rank	Firm	Open Cases	Total Cases
1	Fish & Richardson	308	1,027
2	Farney Daniels	216	590
3	DLA Piper	188	599
4	Winston & Strawn	165	477
5	Kirkland & Ellis	154	498
6	Perkins Coie	150	501
7	Finnegan Henderson	141	398
8	Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton	136	436
9	Cooley Godward Kronish	135	384
10	McCarter & English	133	384

**Figure 17: Delaware Law Firms, Ranked by Open Cases in 2013 (Filed 2009-2013)**

Rank	Firm	Open Cases	Total Cases
1	Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell	604	1,369
2	Bayard	390	794
3	Stamoulis & Weinblatt	277	828
4	Farnan	270	585
5	Potter Anderson & Corroon	270	679

The top five Delaware law firms all have more open cases than the top five national firms except Fish & Richardson.

**Figure 18: Texas Law Firms , Ranked by Open Cases in 2013 (Filed 2009-2013)**

Rank	Firm	Open Cases	Total Cases
1	Ward & Smith	245	629
2	Capshaw DeRieux	172	525
3	Tadlock Law Firm	171	465
4	Gillam & Smith	165	591
5	Spangler	148	483

## Parties\*

**Figure 19: Plaintiffs Filing Most New Cases†**

Rank	Plaintiff	Cases
1	Melvino Technologies/ArrivalStar	137
2	Wyncomm	131
3	Thermolife International	117
4	Eclipse IP	67
5	Innovative Wireless Solutions	63
6	UbiComm	61
7	Long Corner Security	53
8	Princeton Digital Image	49
9	e.Digital	47
10	Data Carriers	47

All top 10 plaintiffs are patent monetization entities (PMEs).

**Figure 20: Plaintiffs With Most Patents Asserted in Cases Open During 2013**

Rank	Plaintiff	Patents
1	Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson	103
2	Intellectual Ventures I	100
3	Intellectual Ventures II	81
4	Ericsson, Inc.	73
5	Finisar	59
6	Ronald A. Katz Technology Licensing	65
7	Motorola Mobility	52
8	Apple	52
9	Philips Electronics	41
10	Pfizer	30

Intellectual Ventures I and II and Ronald A. Katz Technology Licensing are PME. The remaining seven plaintiffs are operating companies.

**Figure 21: Defendants in Most New Cases\*\***

Rank	Defendant	Cases
1	Apple	59
2	Amazon	50
3	AT&T	45
4	Google	39
5	Dell	38
6	HTC	38
7	Samsung	38
8	Microsoft	35
9	LG	34
10	HP	34

\* Parties as listed do not include subsidiaries, or serious misspellings.

† Excludes declaratory judgment cases.

\*\* Excludes declaratory judgment cases.

## Patents

**Figure 22: Most Frequently Asserted Patents\***

Rank	Patent	Cases	Original Assignee	Plaintiff(s)*
1	6,952,645	133	ArrivalStar	ArrivalStar/Melvino
2	6,904,359	130	ArrivalStar	ArrivalStar/Melvino
3	7,400,970	118	Melvino	ArrivalStar/Melvino
4	5,506,866	113	AT&T	Delaware Radio/Wyncomm
5	6,714,859	83	ArrivalStar	ArrivalStar/Melvino
6	7,030,781	68	ArrivalStar	ArrivalStar/Melvino
7	6,117,872	66	Stanford University	ThermoLife
8	6,486,801	64	ArrivalStar	ArrivalStar/Melvino
9	5,603,054	60	Xerox	UbiComm
10	8,346,894	59	Lakshmi Arunachalam	Pi-Net/Arunachalam

**Figure 23: Titles of Most Frequently Asserted Patents**


Rank	Patent	Title
1	6,952,645	System and method for activation of an advance notification system for monitoring and reporting status of vehicle travel
2	6,904,359	Notification systems and methods with user-definable notifications based upon occurrence of events
3	7,400,970	System and method for an advance notification system for monitoring and reporting proximity of a vehicle
4	5,506,866	Side-channel communications in simultaneous voice and data transmission
5	6,714,859	System and method for an advance notification system for monitoring and reporting proximity of a vehicle
6	7,030,781	Notification system and method that informs a party of vehicle delay
7	6,117,872	Enhancement of exercise performance by augmenting endogenous nitric oxide production or activity
8	6,486,801	Base station apparatus and method for monitoring travel of a mobile vehicle
9	5,603,054	Method for triggering selected machine event when the triggering properties of the system are met and the triggering conditions of an identified user are perceived
10	8,346,894	Real-time web transactions from web applications


4,917 patents were at issue in all cases filed during 2013. Of these, 3,032, or 61%, had not been litigated in the past 10 years.

\* Plaintiff here refers to the party asserting, or claiming infringement of, the patent. In cases with declaratory judgment claims of non-infringement or invalidity, a defendant is counted here as a plaintiff.

## Merits Decisions in District Court Cases

Figure 24: Patent Invalidity Merits Decisions 2007-2013



**Figure 25: Merit Decisions for Lack of Patentable Subject Matter (35 U.S.C. § 101) 2007-2013**

As the U.S. Supreme Court considers what constitutes patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101 in *CLS Bank v. Alice*, it is important to note that district courts have issued an increasing number of decisions invalidating patents on § 101 grounds.

## District Court Damages Awards

**Figure 26: Largest Damages Awards\***

Rank	Case	Damages	Against	To	Subject
1	Monsanto v. Dupont	\$1,000,000,000	DuPont	Monsanto	GMO Seed
2	Apple v. Samsung	\$598,908,892	Samsung	Apple	Software
3	Apple v. Samsung	\$290,456,793	Samsung	Apple	Software
4	Stryker v. Zimmer	\$228,326,677	Zimmer	Stryker	Medical Device
5	Tyco Healthcare v. Ethicon Endo-Surgery	\$140,080,000	Ethicon Endo-Surgery	Tyco Healthcare	Medical Device
6	Syntrix v. Illumina	\$95,795,507	Illumina	Syntrix	BioTech
7	Astrazeneca v. Apotex	\$76,021,994	Apotex	Astrazeneca	Pharma
8	Two-Way Media v. AT&T	\$27,500,000	AT&T	Two-Way Media	Telecom
9	Pact XPP v. Xilinx	\$23,099,850	Avnet, Xilinx	Pact XPP	Processor
10	Tomita v. Nintendo	\$15,100,000	Nintendo	Tomita	Camera

**Figure 27: Average and Median Damages, 2013 v. 2012<sup>†</sup>**

Year	Average Damages	Change (%)	Median Damages	Change (%)
2012	\$27,209,176.99		\$1,027,447.34	
2013	\$34,694,527.11	28%	\$1,256,920.00	22%

Damages generally increased from 2012 to 2013, although headline-stealing damages dragged the average higher than the median.

\* Excludes costs, fees, and pre/post-judgment interest.

<sup>†</sup> Excludes costs, fees, and pre/post-judgment interest, cases terminated before Jan. 1, 2014.

## U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC)

Figure 28: New ITC Investigations Filed, 2007-2013




Figure 29: All Dispositive Outcomes by Current ALJs, through 2013\*

Outcome	Charles Bullock	Theodore Essex	Edward Gildea	Sandra Lord	Thomas Pender	David Shaw
Settlement	40	22	23	1	7	7
Complaint Withdrawn	10	10	6	1	8	2
No Violation Found	21	13	8	0	2	3
Violation Found	15	11	5	0	1	2
Limited Exclusion Order	16	8	4	0	2	4
General Exclusion Order	10	6	3	0	1	2
Cease & Desist Order	0	9	2	0	2	2
Consent Order	9	5	6	1	0	1
Other	4	2	0	0	0	2
<b>Totals</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>25</b>

Figure 30: Pending Investigations, by current ALJ

Rank	ALJ	Investigations
1	Essex	12
2	Shaw	11
3	Bullock	10
4	Pender	9
5	Gildea	7
6	Lord	7
<b>Total</b>		<b>56</b>

\* Investigations may result in multiple dispositions.

## Lex Machina's Data

This report draws on data from Lex Machina's specialized intellectual property litigation database. Although most of our data is derived from litigation information publicly available from PACER (federal court system) or EDIS (the ITC system), Lex Machina applies additional layers of intelligence to bring consistency to, and ensure the completeness of, the data.

For example, this report analyzes trends in patent litigation. To determine whether a case is a patent case, others may blindly trust the Cause-of-Action (CoA) and Nature-of-Suit (NoS) codes entered in PACER. But Lex Machina actively analyzes complaints to ensure that patent cases filed under mistaken CoA/NoS codes (or a CoA/NoS code corresponding to a different claim, e.g. contract in a combined patent/contract case) are not missed. This same system also allows Lex Machina to filter out the many spurious cases that have no claim of patent infringement despite bearing a patent CoA/NoS code (e.g. false marking cases).

Moreover, due to inherent design limitations, PACER often shows inaccurate or corrupted information for older terminated cases. For example, when a lawyer leaves one firm for another, PACER may show closed cases that the lawyer worked on at his old firm as having been handled by his new firm. When combined with law firm splits, acquisitions, and mergers, these inaccuracies accumulate to render PACER data less reliable for older cases. Lex Machina, however, has a historic record going back to the first days of electronic filing on PACER (and other data going back even further). These snapshots, unique to Lex Machina, give us access to normalized contemporary data and enable us to provide more accurate data for older cases than someone using PACER today.

**Appendix 1: All Pending ITC Investigations, as of December 31, 2013**

<b>Investigation Number</b>	<b>Matter</b>	<b>ALJ</b>	<b>Initial Notice Date</b>
337-TA-501	Encapsulated Integrated Circuit Devices and Products Containing Same	Bullock	12/19/03
337-TA-800	Wireless Devices with 3G Capabilities and Components Thereof	Shaw	8/31/11
337-TA-800	Wireless Devices with 3G Capabilities and Components Thereof	Essex	8/31/11
337-TA-816	Wiper Blades	Bullock	11/29/11
337-TA-830	Dimmable Compact Fluorescent Lamps and Products Containing Same	Pender	2/27/12
337-TA-833	Digital Models, Digital Data, and Treatment Plans for Use in Making Incremental Dental Positioning Adjustment Appliances, the Appliances Made Therefrom, and Methods of Making the Same	Rogers	4/5/12
337-TA-837	Audiovisual Components and Products Containing the Same	Shaw	4/17/12
337-TA-847	Electronic Devices, Including Mobile Phones and Tablet Computers, and Components Thereof	Pender	6/8/12
337-TA-849	Rubber Resins and Processes for Manufacturing Same	Rogers	6/26/12
337-TA-849	Rubber Resins and Processes for Manufacturing Same	Bullock	6/26/12
337-TA-850	Electronic Imaging Devices	Essex	6/29/12
337-TA-859	Integrated Circuit Chips and Products Containing the Same	Rogers	10/23/12
337-TA-859	Integrated Circuit Chips and Products Containing the Same	Lord	10/23/12
337-TA-859	Integrated Circuit Chips and Products Containing the Same	Bullock	10/23/12
337-TA-860	Optoelectronic Devices for Fiber Optic Communications, Components Thereof, and Products Containing the Same	Essex	10/30/12
337-TA-861	Cases for Portable Electronic Devices	Pender	11/16/12
337-TA-862	Electronic Devices, Including Wireless Communication Devices, Tablet Computers, Media Players, and Televisions, and Components Thereof	Shaw	1/8/13
337-TA-863	Paper Shredders, Certain Processes for Manufacturing or Relating to Same and Certain Products Containing Same and Certain Parts Thereof	Pender	1/25/13
337-TA-866	Wireless Communications Equipment and Articles Therein	Gildea	1/31/13
337-TA-867	Cases for Portable Electronic Devices	Pender	1/31/13
337-TA-868	Wireless Devices With 3G and/or 4G Capabilities and Components Thereof	Lord	2/5/13
337-TA-868	Wireless Devices With 3G and/or 4G Capabilities and Components Thereof	Rogers	2/5/13
337-TA-868	Wireless Devices With 3G and/or 4G Capabilities and Components Thereof	Essex	2/5/13
337-TA-868	Wireless Devices With 3G and/or 4G Capabilities and Components Thereof	Bullock	2/5/13
337-TA-871	Wireless Communications Base Stations and Components Thereof	Essex	3/1/13

<b>Investigation Number</b>	<b>Matter</b>	<b>ALJ</b>	<b>Initial Notice Date</b>
337-TA-871	Wireless Communications Base Stations and Components Thereof	Gildea	3/1/13
337-TA-872	Compact Fluorescent Reflector Lamps, Products Containing Same and Components Thereof	Shaw	3/5/13
337-TA-873	Integrated Circuit Devices and Products Containing the Same	Gildea	3/15/13
337-TA-876	Microelectromechanical Systems (“MEMs Devices”) and Products Containing Same	Gildea	4/15/13
337-TA-876	Microelectromechanical Systems (“MEMs Devices”) and Products Containing Same	Essex	4/15/13
337-TA-877	Omega-3 Extracts from Marine or Aquatic Biomass and Products Containing the Same	Essex	4/17/13
337-TA-877	Omega-3 Extracts from Marine or Aquatic Biomass and Products Containing the Same	Shaw	4/17/13
337-TA-880	Linear Actuators	Bullock	5/6/13
337-TA-881	Windshield Wiper Devices and Components Thereof	Shaw	6/11/13
337-TA-882	Digital Media Devices, Including Televisions, Blu-Ray Disc Players, Home Theater Systems, Tablets and Mobile Phones, Components Thereof and Associated Software	Shaw	6/18/13
337-TA-883	Opaque Polymers	Pender	6/21/13
337-TA-884	Consumer Electronics with Display and Processing Capabilities	Gildea	6/25/13
337-TA-885	Portable Electronic Communications Devices, Including Mobile Phones and Components Thereof	Essex	6/26/13
337-TA-885	Portable Electronic Communications Devices, Including Mobile Phones and Components Thereof	Shaw	6/26/13
337-TA-885	Portable Electronic Communications Devices, Including Mobile Phones and Components Thereof	Lord	6/26/13
337-TA-886	TV Programs, Literary Works for TV Production and Episode Guides Pertaining to Same	Bullock	7/15/13
337-TA-886	TV Programs, Literary Works for TV Production and Episode Guides Pertaining to Same	Lord	7/15/13
337-TA-887	Crawler Cranes and Components Thereof	Shaw	7/17/13
337-TA-888	Silicon Microphone Packages and Products Containing Same	Gildea	7/26/13
337-TA-889	Wireless Devices, Including Mobile Phones and Tablets	Essex	8/5/13
337-TA-890	Sleep-Disordered Breathing Treatment Systems and Components Thereof	Pender	8/23/13
337-TA-893	Flash Memory Chips and Products Containing Same	Gildea	9/9/13
337-TA-892	Point-to Point Network Communication Devices and Products Containing Same	Shaw	9/9/13
337-TA-894	Tires and Products Containing Same	Bullock	9/20/13
337-TA-895	Multiple Mode Outdoor Grills and Parts Thereof	Lord	9/26/13
337-TA-895	Multiple Mode Outdoor Grills and Parts Thereof	Essex	9/26/13
337-TA-895	Multiple Mode Outdoor Grills and Parts Thereof	Shaw	9/26/13

<b>Investigation Number</b>	<b>Matter</b>	<b>ALJ</b>	<b>Initial Notice Date</b>
337-TA-896	Thermal Support Devices for Infants, Infant Incubators, Infant Warmers, and Components Thereof	Pender	10/3/13
337-TA-897	Optical Disc Drives, Components Thereof, and Products Containing the Same	Lord	10/25/13
337-TA-898	Marine Sonar Imaging Devices, Products Containing the Same, and Components Thereof	Essex	11/13/13
337-TA-899	Vision-Based Driver Assistance System Cameras and Components Thereof	Bullock	11/14/13
337-TA-901	Handheld Magnifiers and Products Containing Same	Pender	11/15/13
337-TA-900	Navigation Products, Including GPS Devices, Navigation and Display Systems, Radar Systems, Navigational Aids, Mapping Systems and Related Software	Lord	11/15/13
337-TA-902	Windshield Wipers and Components Thereof	Essex	11/26/13
337-TA-903	Antivenom Compositions and Products Containing the Same	Bullock	12/11/13



Lex Machina  
1010 Doyle Street, Suite 200  
Menlo Park, CA 94025  
Phone: (650) 390-9500  
[www.lexmachina.com](http://www.lexmachina.com)

© 2014 Lex Machina