Kluwer Patent Blog

Patent case: Inventor Holdings, LLC v. Bed Bath & Beyond, Inc., USA

Thomas Long (Wolters Kluwer Legal & Regulatory US) · Thursday, December 14th, 2017

Patent-owner Inventor Holdings, LLC, was properly ordered by the federal district court in Wilmington, Delaware, to pay attorney fees and costs incurred by retailer Bed Bath & Beyond in successfully defending against infringement claims, after the asserted patent was found to be ineligible under Section 101 of the Patent Act, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has held. The district court determined in an August 2015 decision that the patent embodied the ineligible abstract idea of paying for remote orders at local retailers. Bed Bath & Beyond subsequently filed a motion for an award of attorney fees, which the district court granted. Affirming the district court's decision, the Federal Circuit agreed with the district court's reasoning that, once the Supreme Court issued its decision in Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International in June 2014. 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014), the patent infringement claims were objectively without merit and should have been voluntarily withdrawn. It was not an abuse of discretion for the fee award to include fees incurred during the appeal of the ineligibility ruling, the Federal Circuit determined (Inventor Holdings, LLC v. Bed Bath & Beyond, Inc., December 8, 2017, Chen, R.).

Case date: 08 December 2017 Case number: No. 2016-2442

Court: United States Court of Appeals, Federal Circuit

A full summary of this case has been published on Kluwer IP Law.

Kluwer Patent Blog - 1 / 2 - 02.11.2021

To make sure you do not miss out on regular updates from the Kluwer Patent Blog, please subscribe here.

Want to improve your IP strategy? Manual of Industrial Property IP Analytics Visser - Annotated European Patent Convention Page 1004 Request a free demo now KluwerIPLaw.com Jurisdictions 36,000+ Cases 100+ books 600+ IP law professionals as authors

This entry was posted on Thursday, December 14th, 2017 at 3:56~pm and is filed under Case Law, United States of America

You can follow any responses to this entry through the Comments (RSS) feed. Both comments and pings are currently closed.