



May 2017

## The Supreme Court's Decision in *TC Heartland* Likely to Mark the End of an Era

Texas-sized verdicts and favorable plaintiff success rates, as perceived by some, have catapulted the Eastern District of Texas to the top of the list for patent infringement filings. The Supreme Court's May 22, 2017, decision in *TC Heartland LLC v. Kraft Food Group Brands LLC*, 581 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2017), which held "that a domestic corporation 'resides' only in its State of incorporation for purposes of the patent venue," is seen by many as the case that will likely put an end to that trend.

The patent venue statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b), permits actions for patent infringement to be filed "in the judicial district where the defendant *resides*, or where the defendant has committed acts of infringement and has a regular and established place of business." (emphasis added). In 1964, the Supreme Court held that for domestic corporations the term "resides," as used in § 1400(b), refers to the corporation's State of incorporation. *Fourco Glass Co. v. Transmirra Products Corp.*, 353 U. S. 222, 226 (1957).

But the Federal Circuit subsequently interpreted 1988 amendments to the general venue statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c), which provided that for "purposes of venue under this chapter," corporations "shall be deemed to reside in any judicial district in which it is subject to personal jurisdiction at the time the action is commenced," as redefining the term "resides" in § 1400(b). *VE Holding Corp. v. Johnson Gas Appliance Co.*, 917 F.2d 1574, 1578 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Trial courts in Texas's Eastern District followed the Federal Circuit's precedent, and more than 40 percent of the nation's patent cases were filed there last year, with a single court within the EDTX overseeing more than a quarter of all patent cases – more than the federal district courts of New York, California, and Florida combined. *Amici* from all quarters – including tech companies and law professors, weighed in favoring more restrictive venue limitations, with perhaps the most notable of those efforts led by Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton, who filed a brief joined by the Attorneys General of 16 other states.

In *TC Heartland*, the Federal Circuit found that 2011 amendments to § 1391, which now provides that “[e]xcept as otherwise provided by law, . . . this section shall govern the venue of all civil actions brought in district courts of the United States,” did not disturb its earlier *VE Holding* decision. (slip. op. at 7). The Supreme Court disagreed. In reversing the Federal Circuit, the Court found the 2011 amendments to § 1391 did not evidence a congressional intent to disturb its prior decision in *Fourco*, particularly in view of the savings clause that makes clear the current version of § 1391 does not apply when “otherwise provided by law.” (slip. op. at 8). Thus, a corporation is now less susceptible to patent cases being asserted against it outside its State of incorporation or where it does not have a regular and established place of business.

The Supreme Court’s *TC Heartland* decision will likely have a significant impact on the venue distribution of patent cases across the country. The perceived “favored” forums of patentees—most notably the Eastern District of Texas—will likely see a significant decrease in filings; and, conversely, Delaware (a preferred State for incorporation) and judicial districts that are centers for technology will likely see a significant increase in filings. In addition, it will likely be more difficult for nonpracticing entities to generate economies of scale by suing multiple accused infringers in a single forum. District courts will likely see a wave of motions to dismiss for improper venue, particularly in recently-filed cases. In any event, for many, this case represents a long-awaited sea change.

This *GT Alert* was prepared by **James J. DeCarlo** and **James L. Ryerson**. Questions about this information can be directed to:

- > [James J. DeCarlo](mailto:decarloj@gtlaw.com) | +1 973.360.7938 | [decarloj@gtlaw.com](mailto:decarloj@gtlaw.com)
- > [James L. Ryerson](mailto:ryersonj@gtlaw.com) | +1 973.443.3246 | [ryersonj@gtlaw.com](mailto:ryersonj@gtlaw.com)
- > Or your [Greenberg Traurig](#) attorney

<b>Amsterdam</b> + 31 20 301 7300	<b>Denver</b> +1 303.572.6500	<b>Northern Virginia</b> +1 703.749.1300	<b>Tallahassee</b> +1 850.222.6891
<b>Atlanta</b> +1 678.553.2100	<b>Fort Lauderdale</b> +1 954.765.0500	<b>Orange County</b> +1 949.732.6500	<b>Tampa</b> +1 813.318.5700
<b>Austin</b> +1 512.320.7200	<b>Houston</b> +1 713.374.3500	<b>Orlando</b> +1 407.420.1000	<b>Tel Aviv<sup>^</sup></b> +03.636.6000
<b>Berlin<sup>-</sup></b> +49 (0) 30 700 171 100	<b>Las Vegas</b> +1 702.792.3773	<b>Philadelphia</b> +1 215.988.7800	<b>Tokyo<sup>⌘</sup></b> +81 (0)3 4510 2200
<b>Berlin-GT Restructuring<sup>-</sup></b> +49 (0) 30 700 171 100	<b>London<sup>*</sup></b> +44 (0)203 349 8700	<b>Phoenix</b> +1 602.445.8000	<b>Warsaw<sup>~</sup></b> +48 22 690 6100
<b>Boca Raton</b> +1 561.955.7600	<b>Los Angeles</b> +1 310.586.7700	<b>Sacramento</b> +1 916.442.1111	<b>Washington, D.C.</b> +1 202.331.3100
<b>Boston</b> +1 617.310.6000	<b>Mexico City<sup>+</sup></b> +52 55 5029.0000	<b>San Francisco</b> +1 415.655.1300	<b>Westchester County</b> +1 914.286.2900
<b>Chicago</b> +1 312.456.8400	<b>Miami</b> +1 305.579.0500	<b>Seoul<sup>∞</sup></b> +82 (0) 2.369.1000	<b>West Palm Beach</b> +1 561.650.7900
<b>Dallas</b> +1 214.665.3600	<b>New Jersey</b> +1 973.360.7900	<b>Shanghai</b> +86 (0) 21.6391.6633	

*This Greenberg Traurig Alert is issued for informational purposes only and is not intended to be construed or used as general legal advice nor as a solicitation of any type. Please contact the author(s) or your Greenberg Traurig contact if you have questions regarding the currency of this information. The hiring of a lawyer is an important decision. Before you decide, ask for written information about the lawyer's legal qualifications and experience. Greenberg Traurig is a service mark and trade name of Greenberg Traurig, LLP and Greenberg Traurig, P.A. <sup>-</sup>Greenberg Traurig's Berlin office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Germany, an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. <sup>-</sup> Berlin - GT Restructuring is operated by Köhler-Ma Geiser Partnerschaft Rechtsanwälte, Insolvenzverwalter. <sup>\*</sup>Operates as a separate UK registered legal entity. <sup>\*\*</sup>Greenberg Traurig is not responsible for any legal or other services rendered by attorneys employed by the strategic alliance firms. <sup>+</sup>Greenberg Traurig's Mexico City office is operated by Greenberg Traurig, S.C., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. <sup>∞</sup>Operates as Greenberg Traurig LLP Foreign Legal Consultant Office. <sup>^</sup>Greenberg Traurig's Tel Aviv office is a branch of Greenberg Traurig, P.A., Florida, USA. <sup>⌘</sup>Greenberg Traurig Tokyo Law Offices are operated by GT Tokyo Horitsu Jimusho, an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. <sup>~</sup>Greenberg Traurig's Warsaw office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Grzesiak sp.k., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. Certain partners in Greenberg Traurig Grzesiak sp.k. are also shareholders in Greenberg Traurig, P.A. Images in this advertisement do not depict Greenberg Traurig attorneys, clients, staff or facilities. No aspect of this advertisement has been approved by the Supreme Court of New Jersey. ©2017 Greenberg Traurig, LLP. All rights reserved.*