September 10, 2019

The Honorable Thom Tillis  
United States Senate  
185 Dirksen Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Chris Coons  
United States Senate  
218 Russell Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Lindsey Graham  
United States Senate  
290 Russell Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Dianne Feinstein  
United States Senate  
331 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Chair Tillis, Ranking Member Coons, Chair Graham, and Ranking Member Feinstein:

The undersigned write this letter to express serious concerns about the STRONGER Patents Act of 2019, which will not only undermine vital congressional reforms that American businesses have relied on to fight back against frivolous, abusive patent litigation, but also embolden litigation abusers and significantly worsen the ability of American companies of all sizes to grow, innovate, and create jobs.

Congress overwhelmingly passed the America Invents Act (AIA) of 2011 after years of careful bipartisan consideration, debate and negotiation. Among the most significant advancements made possible by the AIA was the creation of new post-grant review procedures, including the Inter Partes Review (IPR) program at the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO). The intent of Congress in creating IPR was to improve patent quality by allowing the PTO to take another look at patents of questionable validity, which erode public confidence in the patent system and are the primary fuel of patent litigation abuse.

Since its inception, IPR has proven to be a fair and successful program that improves the patent system. For example, through the IPR program the PTO has reconsidered and invalidated patents on basic processes like sending an email when a new real estate listing is posted, scanning a document and sending it to email, and posting a podcast. Each of these invalid patents fueled abusive litigation against American companies, many of which were small businesses and startups that could not afford to fight in court. The STRONGER Patents Act would dismantle this beneficial program, allowing licensing demands and litigation on poor quality patents that would continue to drain precious resources away from job creation and the development of new products and services.
Among the many destructive proposed changes, the bill would create a bright-line rule that only one IPR petition can be filed against a patent regardless of how many businesses a patent owner sues. This unnecessary restriction is based on unfounded complaints of "multiple petitions" being used to harass patent holders--claims that the PTO’s own study has debunked. Instead of preventing abuse, this change would do the opposite, promoting gamesmanship by patent owners protecting invalid patents from careful review.

The actions of the PTO over the past year have already significantly weakened IPR, contrary to Congress’s intent for the program. Through new regulations, precedential decisions, and guidance to its judges, the PTO has made it harder to invalidate low quality patents. Through regular use of its unfettered discretion to deny IPRs, the PTO has turned away challenges to invalid patents for procedural reasons, forcing businesses to choose between fighting expensive district court litigation or settling. The non-practicing entities have noticed, and the frequency of abusive patent litigation is rising as a direct result. We urge Congress to defend IPR, not destroy it through the STRONGER Patents Act.

Beyond dismantling IPR, the STRONGER Patents Act would overturn the Supreme Court’s unanimous 2006 eBay decision, a case that clarified and brought balance to the patent landscape. This change would usher in the return of automatic injunctions at district courts, allowing the non-practicing entities who make no competing products and only want licensing payments to halt the availability of complex products covered by thousands of patents based on infringement of one patent by a trivial feature. Additionally, it would once again provide the non-practicing entities with, as Justice Kennedy noted in his concurring opinion in the eBay case, a "bargaining tool to charge exorbitant fees" because of the threat of an injunction.

The STRONGER Patents Act would significantly weaken the U.S. patent system to the detriment of American businesses. Congress should instead be evaluating how to defend IPR, improve patent quality and decrease abusive patent litigation that drains the resources of U.S. businesses.

Sincerely,

Acushnet
Adobe Systems
Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers
Amazon
American Apparel & Footwear Association
American Association of Advertising Agencies: 4A's
American Gaming Association
American Hotel & Lodging Association

American Public Power Association
American Society of Travel Agents
American Trucking Associations
Association for Accessible Medicines
Association of Global Automakers
AT&T
BrandsMart U.S.A.
California Technology Council
Capstone Photography  
CEDIA  
Cisco Systems  
Coalition for Patent Fairness  
Comcast  
Computer & Communications Industry Association  
Consumer Technology Association  
Culver’s  
Demand Progress  
Developers Alliance  
Dillard’s  
Direct Marketing Association  
Dropbox  
Electronic Transaction Association  
Engine Advocacy  
Entertainment Software Association  
Facebook  
Food Marketing Institute  
General Motors  
Google Inc.  
High Tech Inventors Alliance  
Home Builders Association of Iowa  
HTC America, Inc.  
Independent Bankers Association of Texas  
Intel  
International Franchise Association  
Internet Association  
Internet Infrastructure Coalition  
iZi Survey LLC  
JCPenney  
Johnson Controls  
Kickstarter  
Medici Ventures, Inc.  
Motorola Solutions  
MPA - The Association of Magazine Media  
Mylan  
National Apartment Association  
National Association of Convenience Stores  
National Association of Home Builders  
National Association of REALTORS®  
National Council of Chain Restaurants  
National Grocers Association  
National Multifamily Housing Council  
National Restaurant Association  
National Retail Federation  
NCTA – The Internet & Television Association  
Overstock.com, Inc.  
Printing Industries of America  
Qurate Retail Group  
R Street Institute  
Rackspace  
Red Hat, Inc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association/Company</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail Industry Leaders Association</td>
<td>Texas Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesforce.com, Inc.</td>
<td>tZERO Group, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsung Electronics</td>
<td>US*MADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seagate Technology LLC</td>
<td>U.S. Travel Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Industry Association</td>
<td>Verizon Communications Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software and Information Industry Association</td>
<td>Vizio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Employment Services</td>
<td>Wisconsin Grocers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprint</td>
<td>Yum! Brands, Inc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cc: The Honorable Members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary
The Honorable Jerry Nadler, Chair, House Committee on the Judiciary
The Honorable Doug Collins, Ranking Member, House Committee on the Judiciary
The Honorable Hank Johnson, Chair, House Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet
The Honorable Martha Roby, Ranking Member, House Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet