

that a commercial use that qualifies under this section occurred, except that the defense shall also extend to variations in the quantity or volume of use of the claimed subject matter, and to improvements in the claimed subject matter that do not infringe additional specifically claimed subject matter of the patent.

(4) ABANDONMENT OF USE.—A person who has abandoned commercial use (that qualifies under this section) of subject matter may not rely on activities performed before the date of such abandonment in establishing a defense under this section with respect to actions taken on or after the date of such abandonment.

(5) UNIVERSITY EXCEPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A person commercially using subject matter to which subsection (a) applies may not assert a defense under this section if the claimed invention with respect to which the defense is asserted was, at the time the invention was made, owned or subject to an obligation of assignment to either an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)),¹ or a technology transfer organization whose primary purpose is to facilitate the commercialization of technologies developed by one or more such institutions of higher education.

(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply if any of the activities required to reduce to practice the subject matter of the claimed invention could not have been undertaken using funds provided by the Federal Government.

(f) UNREASONABLE ASSERTION OF DEFENSE.—If the defense under this section is pleaded by a person who is found to infringe the patent and who subsequently fails to demonstrate a reasonable basis for asserting the defense, the court shall find the case exceptional for the purpose of awarding attorney fees under section 285.

(g) INVALIDITY.—A patent shall not be deemed to be invalid under section 102 or 103 solely because a defense is raised or established under this section.

(Added Pub. L. 106–113, div. B, §1000(a)(9) [title IV, §4302(a)], Nov. 29, 1999, 113 Stat. 1536, 1501A–555; amended Pub. L. 112–29, §5(a), Sept. 16, 2011, 125 Stat. 297.)

AMENDMENTS

2011—Pub. L. 112–29 amended section generally. Prior to amendment, section related to defense to infringement based on earlier inventor.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 2011 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 112–29, §5(c), Sept. 16, 2011, 125 Stat. 299, provided that: “The amendments made by this section [amending this section] shall apply to any patent issued on or after the date of the enactment of this Act [Sept. 16, 2011].”

EFFECTIVE DATE

Pub. L. 106–113, div. B, §1000(a)(9) [title IV, subtitle C, §4303], Nov. 29, 1999, 113 Stat. 1536, 1501A–557, provided

¹ So in original. Another closing parenthesis probably should precede the comma.

that: “This subtitle [enacting this section and provisions set out as a note under section 1 of this title] and the amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act [Nov. 29, 1999], but shall not apply to any action for infringement that is pending on such date of enactment or with respect to any subject matter for which an adjudication of infringement, including a consent judgment, has been made before such date of enactment.”

CHAPTER 29—REMEDIES FOR INFRINGEMENT OF PATENT, AND OTHER ACTIONS

Sec.

- 281. Remedy for infringement of patent.
- 282. Presumption of validity; defenses.
- 283. Injunction.
- 284. Damages.
- 285. Attorney fees.
- 286. Time limitation on damages.
- 287. Limitation on damages and other remedies; marking and notice.
- 288. Action for infringement of a patent containing an invalid claim.
- 289. Additional remedy for infringement of design patent.
- 290. Notice of patent suits.
- 291. Derived patents.
- 292. False marking.
- 293. Nonresident patentee, service and notice.¹
- 294. Voluntary arbitration.
- 295. Presumption: Product made by patented process.
- 296. Liability of States, instrumentalities of States, and State officials for infringement of patents.
- 297. Improper and deceptive invention promotion.
- 298. Advice of counsel.
- 299. Joinder of parties.

AMENDMENTS

- 2011—Pub. L. 112–29, §19(d)(2), Sept. 16, 2011, 125 Stat. 333, added item 299.
- Pub. L. 112–29, §17(b), Sept. 16, 2011, 125 Stat. 329, added item 298.
- Pub. L. 112–29, §3(h)(2), Sept. 16, 2011, 125 Stat. 289, amended item 291 generally, substituting “Derived patents” for “Interfering patents”.
- 1999—Pub. L. 106–113, div. B, §1000(a)(9) [title IV, §4102(b)], Nov. 29, 1999, 113 Stat. 1536, 1501A–554, added item 297.
- 1992—Pub. L. 102–560, §2(b), Oct. 28, 1992, 106 Stat. 4230, added item 296.
- 1988—Pub. L. 100–418, title IX, §§9004(b), 9005(b), Aug. 23, 1988, 102 Stat. 1566, inserted “and other remedies” in item 287 and added item 295.
- 1982—Pub. L. 97–247, §17(b)(2), Aug. 27, 1982, 96 Stat. 323, added item 294.

§ 281. Remedy for infringement of patent

A patentee shall have remedy by civil action for infringement of his patent.

(July 19, 1952, ch. 950, 66 Stat. 812.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on Title 35, U.S.C., 1946 ed., §§67 and 70, part (R.S. 4919; R.S. 4921, amended (1) Mar. 3, 1897, ch. 391, §6, 29 Stat. 694, (2) Feb. 18, 1922, ch. 58, §8, 42 Stat. 392, (3) Aug. 1, 1946, ch. 726, §1, 60 Stat. 778).

The corresponding two sections of existing law are divided among sections 281, 283, 284, 285, 286 and 289 with some changes in language. Section 281 serves as an introduction or preamble to the following sections, the modern term civil action is used, there would be, of course, a right to a jury trial when no injunction is sought.

¹ So in original. Does not conform to section catchline.

§ 282. Presumption of validity; defenses

(a) IN GENERAL.—A patent shall be presumed valid. Each claim of a patent (whether in independent, dependent, or multiple dependent form) shall be presumed valid independently of the validity of other claims; dependent or multiple dependent claims shall be presumed valid even though dependent upon an invalid claim. The burden of establishing invalidity of a patent or any claim thereof shall rest on the party asserting such invalidity.

(b) DEFENSES.—The following shall be defenses in any action involving the validity or infringement of a patent and shall be pleaded:

(1) Noninfringement, absence of liability for infringement or unenforceability.

(2) Invalidity of the patent or any claim in suit on any ground specified in part II as a condition for patentability.

(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.

(4) Any other fact or act made a defense by this title.

(c) NOTICE OF ACTIONS; ACTIONS DURING EXTENSION OF PATENT TERM.—In an action involving the validity or infringement of a patent the party asserting invalidity or noninfringement shall give notice in the pleadings or otherwise in writing to the adverse party at least thirty days before the trial, of the country, number, date, and name of the patentee of any patent, the title, date, and page numbers of any publication to be relied upon as anticipation of the patent in suit or, except in actions in the United States Court of Federal Claims, as showing the state of the art, and the name and address of any person who may be relied upon as the prior inventor or as having prior knowledge of or as having previously used or offered for sale the invention of the patent in suit. In the absence of such notice proof of the said matters may not be made at the trial except on such terms as the court requires. Invalidity of the extension of a patent term or any portion thereof under section 154(b) or 156 because of the material failure—

(1) by the applicant for the extension, or
(2) by the Director,

to comply with the requirements of such section shall be a defense in any action involving the infringement of a patent during the period of the extension of its term and shall be pleaded. A due diligence determination under section 156(d)(2) is not subject to review in such an action.

(July 19, 1952, ch. 950, 66 Stat. 812; Pub. L. 89-83, § 10, July 24, 1965, 79 Stat. 261; Pub. L. 94-131, § 10, Nov. 14, 1975, 89 Stat. 692; Pub. L. 97-164, title I, § 161(7), Apr. 2, 1982, 96 Stat. 49; Pub. L. 98-417, title II, § 203, Sept. 24, 1984, 98 Stat. 1603; Pub. L. 104-41, § 2, Nov. 1, 1995, 109 Stat. 352; Pub. L. 106-113, div. B, § 1000(a)(9) [title IV, §§ 4402(b)(1), 4732(a)(10)(A)], Nov. 29, 1999, 113 Stat. 1536, 1501A-560, 1501A-582; Pub. L. 107-273, div. C, title III, § 13206(b)(1)(B), (4), Nov. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 1906;

Pub. L. 112-29, §§ 15(a), 20(g), (j), Sept. 16, 2011, 125 Stat. 328, 334, 335.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Derived from Title 35, U.S.C., 1946 ed., § 69 (R.S. 4920, amended (1) Mar. 3, 1897, ch. 391, § 2, 29 Stat. 692, (2) Aug. 5, 1939, ch. 450, § 1, 53 Stat. 1212).

The first paragraph declares the existing presumption of validity of patents.

The five defenses named in R.S. 4920 are omitted and replaced by a broader paragraph specifying defenses in general terms.

The third paragraph, relating to notice of prior patents, publications and uses, is based on part of the last paragraph of R.S. 4920 which was superseded by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure but which is reinstated with modifications.

AMENDMENTS

2011—Pub. L. 112-29, § 20(g)(1), (2)(A), (C), (3), (j), designated first to third pars. as subsecs. (a) to (c), respectively, inserted headings, in subsec. (a), struck out third sentence which read “Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, if a claim to a composition of matter is held invalid and that claim was the basis of a determination of nonobviousness under section 103(b)(1), the process shall no longer be considered nonobvious solely on the basis of section 103(b)(1).”, in par. (2) of subsec. (b), struck out “of this title” after “II” and substituted “patentability.” for “patentability.”, and in introductory provisions of subsec. (c), struck out “of this title” after “156” and substituted “In an action involving the validity or infringement of a patent” for “In actions involving the validity or infringement of a patent” and “Court of Federal Claims” for “Claims Court”.

Pub. L. 112-29, § 20(g)(2)(B), which directed substitution of “unenforceability.” for “unforceability.” in par. (1) of former second par. which was designated subsec. (b), was executed by making the substitution for “unenforceability.”, to reflect the probable intent of Congress.

Pub. L. 112-29, § 15(a), amended second par. by substituting “(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.”

for “(3) Invalidity of the patent or any claim in suit for failure to comply with any requirement of sections 112 or 251 of this title.”.

2002—Third par. Pub. L. 107-273, § 13206(b)(4), made technical correction to directory language of Pub. L. 106-113, § 1000(a)(9) [title IV, § 4402(b)(1)]. See 1999 Amendment note below.

Pub. L. 107-273, § 13206(b)(1)(B), made technical correction to directory language of Pub. L. 106-113, § 1000(a)(9) [title IV, § 4732(a)(10)(A)]. See 1999 Amendment note below.

1999—Third par. Pub. L. 106-113, § 1000(a)(9) [title IV, § 4732(a)(10)(A)], as amended by Pub. L. 107-273, § 13206(b)(1)(B), substituted “(2) by the Director,” for “(2) by the Commissioner.”.

Pub. L. 106-113, § 1000(a)(9) [title IV, § 4402(b)(1)], as amended by Pub. L. 107-273, § 13206(b)(4), substituted “154(b) or 156 of this title” for “156 of this title”.

1995—First par. Pub. L. 104-41 inserted after second sentence “Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, if a claim to a composition of matter is held invalid and that claim was the basis of a determination of non-obviousness under section 103(b)(1), the process shall no longer be considered nonobvious solely on the basis of section 103(b)(1).”

1984—Pub. L. 98-417 inserted provision at end that the invalidity of the extension of a patent term or any portion thereof under section 156 of this title because of the material failure by the applicant for the extension, or by the Commissioner, to comply with the require-