

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1. ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DAMAGES EXPERT

- § 1:1 Damages and other financial remedies
- § 1:2 Reconciling the role of the expert and the advocate
- § 1:3 Respective roles of the accounting, economic and licensing experts
- § 1:4 Consultation provided by the damages expert to counsel
- § 1:5 Requirements of the expert report
- § 1:6 —A complete statement of all opinions
- § 1:7 —Explanation of the bases and reasons for the opinions
- § 1:8 —Data or other information considered in forming the opinions
- § 1:9 —Exhibits used as support for the opinions
- § 1:10 —Qualifications of the witness
- § 1:11 —Testimony of the expert in the preceding four years
- § 1:12 —Compensation
- § 1:13 —Signature of the witness
- § 1:14 —Compliance with prior disclosure

CHAPTER 2. TYPES OF DAMAGES AND REMEDIES IN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LITIGATION

- § 2:1 Measures of damages and financial remedies in intellectual property matters
- § 2:2 Patent remedies: technology or utility patents
- § 2:3 Compensatory damages on utility patents
- § 2:4 Life of patents and duration of the damages period
- § 2:5 Damages from contributory or induced patent infringement
- § 2:6 Infringement involves sales having nexus with the United States

CALCULATING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DAMAGES

- § 2:7 Computing patent damages when multiple patents or multiple claims are involved
- § 2:8 Increased or enhanced damages in patent matters
- § 2:9 Damages from infringement of design patents
- § 2:10 Damages from infringement of trademarks and trade dress
- § 2:11 Corrective advertising under the Lanham Act
- § 2:12 Damages from copyright infringement
- § 2:13 Damages from misappropriation of trade secrets
- § 2:14 Preliminary and permanent injunctions in patent matters
- § 2:15 The *eBay* ruling in context
- § 2:16 Irreparable injury and adequacy of compensation
- § 2:17 Nexus between irreparable harm and the patented feature
- § 2:18 Evidence for and against irreparable harm
- § 2:19 Injunctions for patentees not practicing the asserted patent
- § 2:20 The effect of the patentee's licensing on irreparable harm
- § 2:21 Considering the balance of hardships between plaintiff and defendant, a remedy in equity is warranted
- § 2:22 The public interest would not be disserved by an injunction
- § 2:23 Future damages and ongoing royalties

CHAPTER 3. PATENT INFRINGEMENT: LOST PROFITS

A. LOST PROFITS ANALYSIS

- § 3:1 Economic and financial evidence of lost profits—A reasonable probability
- § 3:2 Market reconstruction and the varieties of but-for proof
- § 3:3 Lost profits damages on accelerated entry of non-infringing products
- § 3:4 The competitive situation in the market for the patented product or technology
- § 3:5 Lost profits claims in a two-supplier market
- § 3:6 The *Panduit* four-factor test

TABLE OF CONTENTS

B. DEMAND FOR THE PATENTED PRODUCT

- § 3:7 The First *Panduit* Factor: Demand for the patented product
- § 3:8 Evidence against the existence of demand for the patented product

C. NON-INFRINGEMENT ALTERNATIVES AND EVALUATION OF MARKET CONDITIONS

- § 3:9 The Second *Panduit* Factor: Absence of acceptable noninfringing alternatives
- § 3:10 What is an “acceptable” noninfringing alternative?
- § 3:11 Apportionment in the context of lost profits
- § 3:12 Surveys and other sources of information on product features, performance, and other determinants of demand
- § 3:13 Implications of source of non-infringing alternative for lost profits claims
- § 3:14 The availability of an acceptable non-infringing alternative might preclude lost profits
- § 3:15 Infringer’s failure to use potential alternative as evidence that alternative was not desirable
- § 3:16 Alternatives not historically sold may be acceptable substitutes
- § 3:17 Economic, financial, and market issues to consider
- § 3:18 Evaluating causation in the presence of multiple competing suppliers can be complex
- § 3:19 The market share approach in a lost profits claim
- § 3:20 Defining the market and adjusting the market shares—Accounting for infringing alternatives
- § 3:21 —Accounting for other market factors
- § 3:22 Defining the market and segmenting
- § 3:23 Non-infringing substitutes must have been available to the infringer

D. PRODUCTION AND MARKETING CAPACITY

- § 3:24 The Third *Panduit* Factor: Production and marketing capacity to have made but-for sales

E. PROOF OF LOST PROFITS

- § 3:25 The Fourth *Panduit* Factor: Patentee must prove

CALCULATING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DAMAGES

the amount of lost profits in a non-speculative way

- § 3:26 Measuring and quantifying lost profits
- § 3:27 Data sources for lost profits calculations—
Contemporaneous financial records
- § 3:28 Product line profit statement—Product line
revenues
- § 3:29 —Cost of the goods sold
- § 3:30 —Other operating costs
- § 3:31 Computing lost profit—A simplified approach
- § 3:32 Comprehensive approach to lost profits—
Incorporating price changes and incremental
costs

F. PROOF OF LOST PROFITS—QUANTITY OF SALES

- § 3:33 Estimating the quantity of lost sales
- § 3:34 Lost profits analysis—Incorporating price changes
- § 3:35 But-for prices and quantities—The elasticity of
demand
- § 3:36 Evidence on elasticity of demand
- § 3:37 Historical markets with inelastic demand
- § 3:38 Adjusting but-for quantities—The entire market
value rule
- § 3:39 Inclusion of lost profits on convoyed sales

G. PROOF OF LOST PROFITS—INCREMENTAL COSTS

- § 3:40 Lost profits analysis—Incorporating incremental
costs
- § 3:41 Defining and identifying incremental costs
- § 3:42 Estimating incremental costs using historical
financial data
- § 3:43 Incremental costs—An example
- § 3:44 Analyzing incremental costs
- § 3:45 Measuring incremental costs—Internal systems
- § 3:46 —Regression analysis
- § 3:47 Decisions involving regression analysis and
incremental costs
- § 3:48 Using regressions to distinguish fixed and
incremental costs
- § 3:49 Use of regressions to control for multiple factors

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 3:50 How use of regression analysis can lead to incorrect or inaccurate estimates of underlying relationships

H. PROOF OF LOST PROFITS—FUTURE PROFITS

- § 3:51 Damages for future lost profits

CHAPTER 4. PATENT DAMAGES: LOST PROFITS FROM PRICE EROSION

- § 4:1 The basis for a price erosion claim
§ 4:2 Causation and price erosion
§ 4:3 Identifying the price effects of infringement
§ 4:4 Economic and financial evidence of price erosion
§ 4:5 Evidence from testimony and contemporaneous records
§ 4:6 Evidence from statistical analysis
§ 4:7 Evaluating the significance of other factors
§ 4:8 Comparisons of projected data
§ 4:9 Causation and the presence of other competing suppliers
§ 4:10 Using market share to account for other competitors
§ 4:11 Considering elasticity: the effect of prices on quantity
§ 4:12 Considering elasticity: limits on price increases
§ 4:13 Considering elasticity: theoretical and actual markets
§ 4:14 Determining the but-for price
§ 4:15 Computing the amount of price erosion
§ 4:16 Elasticity effects can limit price erosion claims
§ 4:17 Effects of product announcements on prices
§ 4:18 Future price erosion
§ 4:19 Foreign sales' effect on domestic markets

CHAPTER 5. PATENT INFRINGEMENT DAMAGES MEASURED BY A REASONABLE ROYALTY

A. REASONABLE ROYALTY ANALYSIS

- § 5:1 The statutory basis for reasonable royalty damages

CALCULATING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DAMAGES

- § 5:2 Reasonable royalty awards are intended to be compensatory
- § 5:3 Reasonable royalty awards should be limited to the value produced by the patent
- § 5:4 Reasonable royalty awards can equal or exceed lost profits claims or infringer's profits
- § 5:5 Forms of reasonable royalty awards
- § 5:6 Lump-sum royalties as the basis for a reasonable royalty

B. INFRINGING SALES AND APPORTIONMENT

- § 5:7 Determining the proper royalty base
- § 5:8 The reasonable royalty amount and the entire market value rule
- § 5:9 The entire market value rule and evidentiary rule on the infringer's total sales
- § 5:10 Apportionment—Smallest saleable patent-practicing unit (SSPPU)
- § 5:11 Apportionment methods

C. HYPOTHETICAL NEGOTIATION

- § 5:12 Reasonable royalty based on a hypothetical negotiation
- § 5:13 Comparison of hypothetical and actual licensing negotiations
- § 5:14 The “willing licensor and willing licensee” concept
- § 5:15 Timing of the hypothetical negotiation and damages period
- § 5:16 Parties at the hypothetical negotiation
- § 5:17 Looking beyond the date of the hypothetical negotiation—The Book of Wisdom
- § 5:18 Limitations on the Book of Wisdom

D. MARKET APPROACH—USE OF COMPARABLE LICENSES

- § 5:19 Comparable licenses—The market approach
- § 5:20 An established royalty as the basis for a reasonable royalty
- § 5:21 Use of licensing information from public sources and databases
- § 5:22 Use of litigation-related licenses for determining a reasonable royalty

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 5:23 Apportionment “Built-in” to comparable licenses

E. INCOME APPROACH—VALUE OF TECHNOLOGY TO INFRINGER

- § 5:24 Reasonable royalty—The income approach
- § 5:25 Quantitative considerations in determining a reasonable royalty
- § 5:26 Measuring the benefits of the patented technology
- § 5:27 The analytical approach
- § 5:28 Assessment of next-best alternatives
- § 5:29 Cost savings from the patented technology
- § 5:30 Reliance on sale of business in determining a reasonable royalty
- § 5:31 Use of a survey in determining a reasonable royalty
- § 5:32 The 25 percent “rule” and other rules of thumb for profit splits
- § 5:33 Profit split using the Nash Bargaining Solution

F. GEORGIA-PACIFIC FACTORS

- § 5:34 The *Georgia-Pacific* factors
- § 5:35 *Georgia-Pacific* factor 1 (*G-P 1*): the royalties received by the patentee for the licensing of the patent-in-suit, proving or tending to prove an established royalty
- § 5:36 *Georgia-Pacific* factor 2 (*G-P 2*): the rates paid by the licensee for the use of other patents comparable to the patent-in-suit
- § 5:37 *Georgia-Pacific* factor 3 (*G-P 3*): the nature and scope of the license, as exclusive or nonexclusive; or as restricted or nonrestricted in terms of territory or with respect to whom the manufactured product may be sold
- § 5:38 *Georgia-Pacific* factor 4 (*G-P 4*): the licensor’s established policy and marketing program to maintain his patent monopoly by not licensing others to use the invention or by granting licenses under special conditions designed to preserve that monopoly
- § 5:39 *Georgia-Pacific* factor 5 (*G-P 5*): the commercial relationship between the licensor and licensee, such as whether they are competitors in the same territory in the same line of business, or whether they are inventor and promoter

CALCULATING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DAMAGES

- § 5:40 *Georgia-Pacific* factor 6 (*G-P 6*): the effect of selling the patented specialty in promoting sales of other products of the licensee, the existing value of the invention to the licensor as a generator of sales of his non-patented items, and the extent of such derivative or convoyed sales
- § 5:41 *Georgia-Pacific* factor 7 (*G-P 7*): the duration of the patent and the term of the license
- § 5:42 *Georgia-Pacific* factor 8 (*G-P 8*): the established profitability of the product made under the patent, its commercial success, and its current popularity
- § 5:43 *Georgia-Pacific* factor 9 (*G-P 9*): the utility and advantages of the patent property over the old modes or devices, if any, which had been used for working out similar results
- § 5:44 *Georgia-Pacific* factor 10 (*G-P 10*): the nature of the patented invention, the character of the commercial embodiment of it as owned and produced by the licensor, and the benefits to those who have used the invention
- § 5:45 *Georgia-Pacific* factor 11 (*G-P 11*): the extent to which the infringer has made use of the invention, and any evidence probative of the value of that use
- § 5:46 *Georgia-Pacific* factor 12 (*G-P 12*): the portion of the profit or of the selling price that may be customary in the particular business or in comparable businesses to allow for the use of the invention or analogous inventions
- § 5:47 *Georgia-Pacific* factor 13 (*G-P 13*): the portion of the realizable profit that should be credited to the invention as distinguished from non-patented elements, the manufacturing process, business risks, or significant features or improvements added by the infringer
- § 5:48 *Georgia-Pacific* factor 14 (*G-P 14*): the opinion testimony of qualified experts
- § 5:49 *Georgia-Pacific* factor 15 (*G-P 15*): the royalty that a licensor (such as the patentee) and a licensee (such as the infringer) would have agreed upon if both had been reasonably and voluntarily trying to reach an agreement; that is, the amount which a prudent licensee—Who desired, as a business proposition, to obtain a license to manufacture and sell a particular

TABLE OF CONTENTS

article embodying the patented invention—
Would have been willing to pay as a royalty and
yet be able to make a reasonable profit and
which amount would have been acceptable by a
prudent patentee who was willing to grant a
license

G. ADDITIONAL TOPICS IN DEVELOPING A REASONABLE ROYALTY

- § 5:50 Imports and extraterritoriality
- § 5:51 A reasonable royalty when the United States is
the infringer
- § 5:52 The “Panduit kicker”
- § 5:53 Reasonable royalties in the case of standard
essential patents

CHAPTER 6. TRADEMARKS, TRADE DRESS, DESIGN PATENTS, COPYRIGHTS AND TRADE SECRETS

- § 6:1 Actual damages and reasonable royalties as
remedies for infringement of intellectual
property assets
- § 6:2 Actual damages and reasonable royalties: lost
profits, lost value, price erosion, and reasonable
royalties
- § 6:3 Proving causation for actual damages and
reasonable royalty
- § 6:4 Demonstrating damages from lost sales
- § 6:5 Computing lost revenue: diverted sales
- § 6:6 Market share and price effects on sales
- § 6:7 Lost profits damages from price erosion
- § 6:8 Forgone licenses, franchise fees and royalties
- § 6:9 Reasonable royalty on hypothetical licenses as a
measure of damages
- § 6:10 Reasonable royalties as an estimate of market
value in trade secret cases
- § 6:11 Reasonable royalties (and corrective advertising)
based on fair market value of the infringement
- § 6:12 Value of an entire business as a reasonable
royalty
- § 6:13 Injunctions in trademarks, design patents, trade
secrets and copyrights

CHAPTER 7. INFRINGER'S PROFITS AND UNJUST ENRICHMENT

- § 7:1 Unjust enrichment and infringer's profits as remedies in intellectual property matters
- § 7:2 Calculation issues and burdens in determining infringer's profits
- § 7:3 Infringer's profits: the nexus between infringer's profits and the complained of activities
- § 7:4 Attributing defendant's profit to infringing activities
- § 7:5 Plaintiff's burden to show the relationship between infringement and profits
- § 7:6 Both parties typically consider apportionment
- § 7:7 Attribution of profits to multiple claims of misappropriation
- § 7:8 The defendant's burden to prove deductions from revenue
- § 7:9 Design patents: total profits on infringing article of manufacture
- § 7:10 Unjust enrichment from increased goodwill and appreciation of business value
- § 7:11 Deductions for infringer's incremental costs
- § 7:12 Measuring the infringer's incremental costs
- § 7:13 The courts have granted flexibility in applying cost deductions
- § 7:14 Cases in which overhead costs have not been deducted
- § 7:15 Cases in which indirect costs and overhead have been deducted
- § 7:16 Calculation issues in determining infringer's profits: deduction of income tax paid by the infringer

CHAPTER 8. PREJUDGMENT AND POST-JUDGMENT INTEREST

- § 8:1 Prejudgment interest awards in intellectual property matters
- § 8:2 Courts and statutes do not provide a standard rate or methodology for computing prejudgment interest
- § 8:3 Using commercial borrowing rates or treasury rates for prejudgment interest
- § 8:4 Interest awards based on "risk-free" rates

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 8:5	Cases using risk-free rates in prejudgment interest awards
§ 8:6	Use of federal post judgment statutory rate for prejudgment interest
§ 8:7	Interest awards based on general commercial rates
§ 8:8	Use of the parties' borrowing rates, rates of return, or cost of capital for prejudgment interest
§ 8:9	Use of state statutory rates for prejudgment interest
§ 8:10	Income tax considerations

APPENDICES

Appendix A.	Intellectual Property Expert Damages Admissibility by Deepa Sundararaman
Appendix B.	Other citations from cases involving damages
Appendix C.	Panduit factors citations

Table of Cases

Index