



## Intellectual Property Advisory: **U.S. Supreme Court Decides Patent Exhaustion Case in *Quanta Computer, Inc. et al. v. LG Electronics, Inc.***

By [Timothy C. Meece](#)<sup>1</sup>

On June 9, 2008, the U.S. Supreme Court issued its decision in *Quanta Computer, Inc. et al. v. LG Electronics, Inc.* In reversing the Federal Circuit, the Supreme Court held that patent exhaustion (1) can apply to method patents and (2) can apply to the sale of components of a patented system that must be combined with additional components in order to practice the patented methods.

### The LGE Patents

Respondent LG Electronics, Inc. (LGE) purchased a portfolio of computer technology patents. One patent disclosed an efficient method of organizing read and write requests while maintaining accuracy by allowing the computer to execute only read requests until it needs data for which there is an outstanding write request. Another patent described methods that establish a rotating priority system under which devices alternatively have access to a computer bus for varying periods of cycles, depending on whether the user was a “heavy user.”

### The License Agreement and Master Agreement

LGE licensed a patent portfolio, including the LGE Patents, to Intel Corporation (Intel). The License Agreement permitted Intel to manufacture and sell microprocessors and chipsets that use the LGE Patents. The License Agreement authorized Intel to “make, use, sell (directly or indirectly), offer to sell, import or otherwise dispose of” its own products practicing the LGE Patents. Notwithstanding this broad language, the License Agreement stated that no license “is granted by either party hereto . . . to any third party for the combination by a third party of

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Meece is a shareholder of Banner & Witcoff, Ltd. in Chicago, IL, where he practices intellectual property law with a concentration on litigation in patent and copyright matters. A copy of his bio can be view at <http://www.bannerwitcoff.com/bios.cfm?attorney=59>. Banner & Witcoff, Ltd. is dedicated to excellence in the specialized practice of intellectual property law, including patent, trademark, copyright, trade secret, computer, franchise and unfair competition law. The firm has over 90 attorneys and agents in its Chicago, Washington, DC, Boston and Portland, OR offices.

Licensed Products of either party with items, components, or the like acquired . . . from sources other than a party hereto, or for the use, import, offer for sale or sale of such combination.” The License Agreement purported not to alter the usual rules of patent exhaustion, however, providing that, “[n]otwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in this Agreement, the parties agree that nothing herein shall in any way limit or alter the effect of patent exhaustion that would otherwise apply when a party hereto sells any of its Licensed Products.”

In a separate agreement (*i.e.*, the Master Agreement), Intel agreed to give written notice to its own customers informing them that, while it had obtained a broad license “ensur[ing] that any Intel product that you purchase is licensed by LGE and thus does not infringe any patent held by LGE,” the license “does not extend, expressly or by implication, to any product that you make by combining an Intel product with any non-Intel product.” The Master Agreement also provided that “a breach of this Agreement shall have no effect on and shall not be grounds for termination of the Patent License.”

### The District Court and Federal Circuit Proceedings

Petitioners Quanta Computer, Inc. *et al.* (collectively Quanta), are a group of computer manufacturers who purchased microprocessors and chipsets from Intel and received the notice required by the Master Agreement. Nonetheless, Quanta manufactured computers using Intel parts in combination with non-Intel memory and buses in ways that practiced the LGE Patents. LGE sued Quanta for patent infringement. As an affirmative defense, Quanta argued patent exhaustion (*i.e.*, the longstanding doctrine that the initial authorized sale of a patented item terminates all patent rights to that item).

The District Court granted summary judgment to Quanta, holding that, for purposes of the patent exhaustion doctrine, the license LGE granted to Intel resulted in forfeiture of any potential infringement actions against legitimate purchasers of the Intel Products. The District Court found that, although the Intel Products do not fully practice any of the patents at issue, they have no reasonable noninfringing use and therefore their authorized sale exhausted patent rights in the completed computers under *United States v. Univis Lens Co.*, 316 U. S. 241 (1942). The District Court further held that patent exhaustion applied *only* to apparatus or composition-of-matter claims that describe a physical object, and did not apply to process or method claims that describe operations to make or use a product. Because each of the LGE Patents included method claims, the District Court held that exhaustion did not apply.

The Federal Circuit agreed that the doctrine of patent exhaustion did not apply to method claims. In the alternative, it concluded that exhaustion did not apply because LGE did not license Intel to sell the Intel Products to Quanta for use in combination with non-Intel products.

### The Supreme Court Holds That Method Patents Can Be Exhausted

LGE argued that the exhaustion doctrine was inapplicable because it does not apply to method claims. LGE reasoned that, because method patents are linked not to a tangible article but to a process, they can never be exhausted through a sale. Rather, practicing the patent—which occurs upon each use of an article embodying a method patent—is permissible only to the extent rights are transferred in an assignment contract.

The Supreme Court expressed a concern that eliminating exhaustion for method patents would seriously undermine the exhaustion doctrine, because patentees seeking to avoid patent exhaustion could simply draft their patent claims to describe a method rather than an apparatus. Consequently, the Court rejected LGE's argument that method claims, as a category, are never exhaustible.

### The Supreme Court Holds That an Authorized Sale of an Article That Substantially Embodies a Patent Exhausts the Patent Holder's Rights

The Supreme Court next considered the extent to which a product must embody a patented method in order to trigger exhaustion. The Court decided that its prior decision in *Univis* governed this case. The Court explained that exhaustion is triggered by a sale of a product if the only reasonable and intended use was to practice the patent and because the product embodied essential features of the patented invention.

First, LGE suggested no reasonable use for the Intel Products other than incorporating them into computer systems that practice the LGE Patents. The Court reasoned that the only apparent object of Intel's sales to Quanta was to permit Quanta to incorporate the Intel Products into computers that would practice the patents.

Second, the Court explained that the Intel Products constituted a material part of the patented invention and all but completed practiced the patent. This Court reasoned that the incomplete article substantially embodied the patent, because the only step necessary to practice the patent was application of common processes or the addition of standard parts. Everything inventive about each patent was embodied in the Intel Products.

The Court further explained that while each Intel microprocessor and chipset practiced thousands of individual patents, including some LGE patents not at issue in this case, the exhaustion analysis was not altered by the fact that more than one patent was practiced by the same product. Rather, the relevant consideration was whether the Intel Products that partially practice a patent—by, for example, embodying its essential features—exhaust *that* patent.

Having concluded that the Intel Products embodied the patents, the Supreme Court next considered whether the sale to Quanta exhausted LGE's patent rights. In its analysis, the Court explained that the License Agreement authorized Intel to sell products that practiced the LGE Patents and that no conditions limited Intel's authority to sell products substantially embodying the patents. Because Intel was authorized to sell its products to Quanta, the doctrine of patent

exhaustion prevented LGE from further asserting its patent rights with respect to the patents substantially embodied by those products.

The Court further explained that exhaustion turned *only on Intel's own license* to sell products practicing the LGE Patents. Because nothing in the License Agreement limited Intel's ability to sell its products practicing the LGE Patents, Intel's authorized sale to Quanta thus took its products outside the scope of the patent monopoly, and as a result, LGE could no longer assert its patent rights against Quanta.

### Author's Opinion

In this author's opinion, the Supreme Court's decision makes clear that method claims can be exhausted by the sale of a product. Whether patent exhaustion is triggered depends on the extent to which the product embodies the claimed method. Exhaustion likely will be found if (1) the only reasonable and intended use is to practice a patented method and the product embodies essential features of the patented invention; (2) the only apparent object of the product sales is to permit the products to practice the patents; and (3) the products constitute a material part of the patented invention and all but completely practiced the patented method;

However, the limited holding in this case does not affect current Federal Circuit law that—by virtue of an appropriately worded restricted license and notice—a patent owner can reserve patent rights that would otherwise be exhausted by an unrestricted sale. See, e.g., *Mallinckrodt, Inc. v. Medipart, Inc.*, 976 F.2d 700 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Consequently, this decision reinforces the importance of careful drafting by an experienced attorney of language included in patent licenses, especially in limited licenses that attempt to reserve patent rights that would otherwise be exhausted by an unrestricted sale.

To subscribe or unsubscribe to this Intellectual Property Advisory, please send a message to Chris Hummel at [chummel@bannerwitcoff.com](mailto:chummel@bannerwitcoff.com)



[www.bannerwitcoff.com](http://www.bannerwitcoff.com)

© Copyright 2008 Banner & Witcoff, Ltd. All Rights Reserved. No distribution or reproduction of this issue or any portion thereof is allowed without written permission of the publisher except by recipient for internal use only within recipient's own organization. The opinions expressed in this publication are for the purpose of fostering productive discussions of legal issues and do not constitute the rendering of legal counseling or other professional services. No attorney-client relationship is created, nor is there any offer to provide legal services, by the publication and distribution of this advisory. This publication is designed to provide reasonably accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is provided with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, counseling, accounting or other professional services. If legal advice or other professional assistance is required, the services of a competent professional person in the relevant area should be sought.