

# EXHIBIT A

The New York Times

---

June 4, 2013

# Make Patent Trolls Pay in Court

By RANDALL R. RADER, COLLEEN V. CHIEN and DAVID HRICIK

FROM an early age we are taught the importance of fighting fairly. But as the vast number of frivolous patent lawsuits have shown, too many people are rewarded for doing just the opposite.

The onslaught of litigation brought by “patent trolls” — who typically buy up a slew of patents, then sue anyone and everyone who might be using or selling the claimed inventions — has slowed the development of new products, increased costs for businesses and consumers, and clogged our judicial system.

Their business plan is simple: trolls (intellectual-property lawyers use less evocative terms like “non-practicing entities” and “patent-assertion entities”) make money by threatening companies with expensive lawsuits and then using that cudgel, rather than the merits of a case, to extract a financial settlement. In the apt summary of President Obama, who on Tuesday announced a plan to stave off frivolous patent litigation, trolls just want to “hijack somebody else’s idea and see if they can extort some money.”

So far, legislative action against the practice has been meager. In May, Gov. Peter Shumlin, Democrat of Vermont, signed legislation — the first of its kind — that amends the state’s consumer protection laws to empower its attorney general and others to sue patent holders who assert infringement claims against a Vermont business or resident in bad faith. But lawmakers in the remaining 49 states and in Congress, where no less than four bills now sit in various committees, have yet to legislate specifically against patent trolling.

Mr. Obama’s latest proposals echo those in several bills, including making it harder for patent litigants to set up shell companies to hide their activities.

In the meantime, vexatious patent litigation continues to grind through our already crowded courts, costing defendants and taxpayers tens of billions of dollars each year and delaying justice for those who legitimately need a fair hearing of their claims. Trolls, in fact, filed the

majority of the roughly 4,700 patent suits in 2012 — and many of those were against small companies and start-ups that often can't afford to fight back.

The problem stems largely from the fact that, in our judicial system, trolls have an important strategic advantage over their adversaries: they don't make anything. So in a patent lawsuit, they have far fewer documents to produce, fewer witnesses and a much smaller legal bill than a company that does make and sell something.

Because they don't manufacture products, they need not fear a counterclaim for infringing some other patent. They need not be concerned with reputation in the marketplace or with their employees being distracted from business, since litigation is their business.

Trolls, moreover, often use lawyers to represent them on a contingent-fee basis (lawyers get paid only when they win), allowing trolls to defer significant legal costs that manufacturers, who generally must pay high hourly fees, cannot.

With huge advantages in cost and risk, trolls can afford to file patent-infringement lawsuits that have just a slim chance of success. When they lose a case, after all, they are typically out little more than their own court-filing fees. Defendants, on the other hand, have much more to lose from a protracted legal fight and so they often end up settling.

Lost in the debate, however, is that judges already have the authority to curtail these practices: they can make trolls pay for abusive litigation.

Section 285 of the Patent Act, as well as Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, give judges the authority they need to shift the cost burden of litigation abuse from the defendant to the troll. But remarkably, judges don't do so very often: by our count, fees were shifted under Section 285 in only 20 out of nearly 3,000 patent cases filed in 2011.

Our judicial system's bias against shifting fees partly explains that reluctance, but Section 285 is flexible enough to help defend against trolls. And even though many cases settle, the prospect of paying fees will discourage aggressive suits and frivolous demands.

To make sure Section 285 is implemented with appropriate vigor, judges must look more closely for signs that a patent lawsuit was pursued primarily to take improper advantage of a defendant — that is, using the threat of litigation cost, rather than the merits of a claim, to bully

a defendant into settling.

One sign of potential abuse is when a single patent holder sues hundreds or thousands of users of a technology (who know little about the patent) rather than those who make it — or when a patent holder sues a slew of companies with a demand for a quick settlement at a fraction of the cost of defense, or refuses to stop pursuing settlements from product users even after a court has ruled against the patentee.

Other indications of potential bullying include litigants who assert a patent claim when the rights to it have already been granted through license, or distort a patent claim far beyond its plain meaning and precedent for the apparent purpose of raising the legal costs of the defense.

Judges know the routine all too well, and the law gives them the authority to stop it. We urge them to do so.

*Randall R. Rader is chief judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Colleen V. Chien is an assistant professor of law at Santa Clara University. David Hricik is a professor of law at Mercer University.*