Kirkland & Ellis LLP’s intellectual property team helped Intel overturn a $10 million Ericsson standard essential patent verdict, nabbed a rare injunction for C.R. Bard in a patent infringement suit and fought off a $13 million claim for Samsung from “the original patent troll,” landing the group a spot on Law360’s list of IP Groups of the Year.

With 190 attorneys spread mainly across the firm’s New York, Washington, D.C., Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco and Palo Alto offices, Kirkland’s IP group notched a number of major wins over the last year, including taking a leading role fighting Ericsson Inc.’s effort to collect damages from Intel Corp. and other companies using standardized WiFi technology.

In that case — part of a broader series of suits in the U.S. and elsewhere where Kirkland was hired to represent Intel in litigation brought against its customers — Ericsson sued a number of tech companies that used Intel’s WiFi chips in their products. Ericsson said the items infringed several of its patents, and won a $10 million infringement verdict in Texas.

But on appeal, the Federal Circuit ruled in December 2014 that the district court hadn’t properly instructed the jury on Ericsson’s promise to license the patents on reasonable and nondiscriminatory terms. The opinion also laid down some valuable case law about how to figure out what royalties should be for standard essential patents, according to Gregg LoCascio, a co-leader of the firm’s IP group.

“Finally, the opinion said if the defendant’s product ‘was developed by the SEP owner, or by a willing licensor, in order to avoid licensing fees for the SEP, the court must consider awarding royalty credits in the amount of such fees when valuing the royalty rate for the SEP.’”

Kirkland’s IP team also scored a preliminary injunction for C.R. Bard Inc. unit Medafor Inc. in a patent case against CryoLife Inc. in March, landing Medafor the relatively rare remedy after a judge concluded that CryoLife’s PerClot blood-clotting powder would likely infringe the Bard unit’s patent.

At the time, the judge noted that a preliminary injunction is an “extraordinary remedy” that should be granted only in “limited circumstances,” but held that Medafor had met the standard, both with regard to infringement and irreparable harm. CryoLife had an argument that the patent was invalid, but that was denied.

“Finally, the opinion said if the defendant’s product ‘was developed by the SEP owner, or by a willing licensor, in order to avoid licensing fees for the SEP, the court must consider awarding royalty credits in the amount of such fees when valuing the royalty rate for the SEP.’”
initially planned to appeal the ruling, but ultimately dropped the challenge.

“The district of Delaware has historically not granted a lot of preliminary injunctions in patent cases, and it sees an enormous number of patent cases, the second highest in the country after the Eastern District of Texas,” LoCascio said. “What made this case all the more unusual was that the firm and Bard ... sought the injunction in a forum chosen by the other side and then succeeded.”

The firm further led Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. to victory in September in a jury trial over patent infringement claims brought by Cascades Computer Ventures, a company dubbed “the original patent troll.”

Cascades sued Samsung and a host of others in 2011 for supposedly infringing a patent through sales of smartphones using Google Inc.’s Android operating system. While most of those targeted struck deals to halt the litigation, Samsung forged ahead to trial and beat Cascades’ efforts to collect $13 million in damages.

“That was a jury trial where [Cascades] had a business model of trying to get people to pay a license because it's cheaper than litigation, and after that happens, parties build up a stable of licenses that people wave around and say, ‘People paid a license, so the patent must be valuable,’” LoCascio said. “The jury smartly saw through that and recognized just because there are licenses out there from Cascades didn’t mean they had a valuable invention or any invention at all.”

Kirkland also scored another victory for Samsung in October over a patent infringement suit brought by computer graphics card maker Nvidia from an administrative law judge at the U.S. International Trade Commission.