

# Who Took My IP?—Defending the Availability of Injunctive Relief for Patent Owners

Paul M. Schoenhard\*

“Few issues are as important to the current and future economic strength of the United States as our ability to create and protect intellectual property.”<sup>1</sup>

I. Introduction.....	188
II. Background to the Protection of Patent Rights.....	191
A. Patents Provide Inventors with a Right to Exclude .....	191
B. Permanent Injunctive Relief Has Been the Norm.....	194
III. Patent Rights Should Be Protected by Property Rules .....	196
A. Patent Rights Properly Rest with Inventors .....	197
B. Patent Rights Incentivize Efficient Investment.....	198
C. Patent Rights Serve Distributional Goals .....	199
D. Patent Rights Are Properly Protected by Property Rules .....	200
1. Property Rules Further Foster Efficient Investment.....	201
2. Property Rules Promote Judicial Efficiency .....	204
3. Property Rules Are Necessary in the Global Marketplace.....	206
IV. Takings Doctrine Provides a Legal Tool to Protect the Availability of Permanent Injunctive Relief.....	208
A. Patent Rights Are Fifth Amendment Property Rights .....	209
B. Judicial Actions May Be Takings .....	211
C. The Takings Analysis .....	213
1. Physical/ <i>Loretto</i> -style takings .....	215

---

\* J.D., Harvard Law School (2003); B.A., Dartmouth College (2000). The author is a visiting professor at the University of Utah, S.J. Quinney College of Law, and an associate at Ropes & Gray LLP in Washington, D.C. He may be contacted at [schoenhard@gmail.com](mailto:schoenhard@gmail.com). Many thanks to Kevin J. Post, Kristofer D. Cheney, Amy E.L. Schoenhard, Christopher L. May, Martha L. Minow, John G. Palfrey, Jr., David Abrams, John A. Schoenhard, and the participants in a faculty workshop at George Mason University School of Law for their invaluable comments; and to David M. Ellis and Cassandra H. Welch for their excellent research assistance. The thoughts and positions expressed in this article are those of the author and do not represent the views of the *Journal* or Ropes & Gray LLP or its clients.

<sup>1</sup> NAT’L INTELL. PROP. LAW ENFORCEMENT COORDINATION COUNCIL, REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS ON COORDINATION OF INTELL. PROP. ENFORCEMENT AND PROTECTION 1 (2006) [hereinafter NIPLECC Report].