



Post-Grant Patent Proceedings

Post-grant patent proceedings, as well as reexaminations conducted by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), can be a highly effective and less costly alternative to litigation. These procedures are extremely useful in maintaining or increasing market share by providing a mechanism to challenge a competitor's patent or to strengthen an already issued patent.

COJK's post-grant proceedings practice combines the technical knowledge and legal vision required to successfully represent both patent owners and third parties in the various mechanisms available to challenge patents within the USPTO. Guided by our clients' goals, our team relies on decades of patent prosecution, patent appeals, reexamination, and federal court litigation experience to craft cost-effective and proven strategies to leverage favorable settlements, licensing terms, or freedom to operate. As needed, our post-grant proceedings team is deftly skilled in coordinating with litigation counsel in concurrent or imminent infringement litigation.

The attorneys at COJK are well positioned to navigate all aspects of the USPTO post-issuance proceedings, including:

- Post-grant review
- *Ex parte* reexamination
- *Inter partes* review
- Reissues
- Covered business methods review
- Derivation proceedings
- Interferences
- Associated appeals to the Court of Appeals of the Federal Circuit (CAFC)

Representative matters include:

- *Yita LLC et al. v. MacNeil IP LLC* (IPR2023-00172)
Representing patent owner MacNeil IP LLC in an *inter partes* review proceeding of US Patent No. 8,899,655 related to vehicle floor trays.
- *Yita LLC et al. v. MacNeil IP LLC* (IPR2023-00173)
Representing patent owner MacNeil IP LLC in an *inter partes* review proceeding of US Patent No. 9,138,917 related to vehicle floor trays.
- *3BTech, Inc. v. Jingle Master International Ltd.* (IPR2018-00663)
Represented patent owner Jingle Master International Ltd. in an *inter partes* review proceeding for a certain claim of US Patent No. 7,882,986 related to liquid dispensing devices.
- *Taser International, Inc. v. Digital Ally, Inc.* (IPR2017-00515)
Represented petitioner Taser International in an *inter partes* review proceeding for certain claims of US Patent No. 9,253,452 related to surveillance systems.
- *Taser International, Inc. v. Digital Ally, Inc.* (IPR2017-00376)
Represented petitioner Taser International in an *inter partes* review proceeding for certain claims of US Patent No. 8,781,292 related to surveillance systems.
- *Taser International, Inc. v. Digital Ally, Inc.* (IPR2017-00375)
Represented petitioner Taser International in an *inter partes* review proceeding for certain claims of US Patent No. 8,781,292 related to surveillance systems.
- *Dorman Products, Inc. v. PACCAR, Inc.* (IPR2014-00542)
Represented patent owner PACCAR Inc in an *inter partes* review proceeding that challenged the invalidity of US Patent No. D525,731 related to a truck headlight.
- *Dorman Products, Inc. v. PACCAR, Inc.* (IPR2014-00555)
Represented patent owner PACCAR Inc in an *inter partes* review proceeding that challenged the invalidity of US Patent No. D526,429 related to a truck headlight.