

# MODERNIZING PATENT LAW'S INEQUITABLE CONDUCT DOCTRINE

*By Christopher A. Cotropia<sup>†</sup>*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION .....	725
II. CURRENT THINKING ON THE INEQUITABLE CONDUCT DOCTRINE .....	729
A. BASICS OF PATENT PROSECUTION .....	729
B. REQUIREMENTS OF THE INEQUITABLE CONDUCT DOCTRINE .....	733
1. Materiality .....	733
2. Intent .....	734
3. Disclosure .....	735
4. Remedy .....	737
C. RECENT CRITIQUES OF THE DOCTRINE .....	737
1. Creation of Unnecessary Litigation Costs and the Legislative Response .....	739
2. Lack of an Expanded Duty and the Legislative and USPTO Response .....	741
D. DISCONNECTS IN THE CURRENT DISCOURSE .....	744
III. FRAMING THE INEQUITABLE CONDUCT DOCTRINE AS A PATENT QUALITY MECHANISM .....	746
A. PATENT QUALITY AND INFORMATION .....	748
1. Patent Quality Problem Defined .....	748
2. Disincentives for Those Outside the USPTO to Solve the Quality Problem .....	751
B. DOCTRINE'S ABILITY TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF INFORMATION BEFORE USPTO .....	753
1. Produces Relevant Information to the USPTO .....	753
2. Verifies Information Provided to the USPTO .....	755

---

© 2009 Christopher A. Cotropia.

<sup>†</sup> Professor of Law, Intellectual Property Institute, University of Richmond School of Law. I would like to thank Dawn-Marie Bey, Jim Gibson, Mary Heen, Corinna Lain, Shari Motro, Michael Risch, Sean Seymore, and the participants at the 2007 Works in Progress Intellectual Property Colloquium at the American University Washington College of Law and a Richmond Law School Colloquium for their comments on an earlier draft of this Article.