



SDIPLA
The San Diego Intellectual
Property Law Association

For Immediate Release
June 9, 2011

CONNECT Contact: Timothy Tardibono, CONNECT Policy Director
202.412.7791; timothy@connect.org

SDIPLA Contact: Douglas Olson
dougolson@sandiegoplw.com

CONNECT and SDIPLA applaud the U.S. Supreme Court's unanimous ruling in favor of innovation

The two organizations filed a joint amicus brief in support of winning position

San Diego, CA—Today, two San Diego organizations celebrated a victory before the United States Supreme Court in a ruling in favor of innovation. CONNECT and the San Diego Intellectual Property Lawyer's Association applauded the Supreme Court's ruling which upheld innovation by keeping the current high standard for determining patent validity. The two organizations filed a joint amicus brief ("Friend of the Court" brief) arguing that innovation and innovation-related investment would be harmed if the Court lowered the current "clear and convincing" standard to determine a patent's validity in patent infringement lawsuits as was being argued by tech giant Microsoft.

Timothy Tardibono, Policy Director for CONNECT and Douglas Olson, counsel of record for the SDIPLA on the Amicus Brief released the following joint statement:

"We are excited that the U.S. Supreme Court agreed with the joint position of CONNECT and SDIPLA in today's important intellectual property ruling in the Microsoft v. i4i case. The ruling supports innovation by upholding the standard for determining patent validity that innovators and investors have come to rely on over the last two decades.

We think it was an important partnership for SDIPLA and CONNECT to join forces and help the Supreme Court understand the critical role a strong validity standard plays in spurring innovation. Sometimes judges in courtrooms far removed from the cutting edge of innovation don't appreciate the importance of intellectual property to America's innovation economy. Our amicus brief helped inform the Court of the negative consequences of adopting a standard that would upset the delicate and fragile innovation ecosystem and the investment capital resources that support the ecosystem.

It is encouraging that the decision was unanimous. The Court clearly understood the pro-innovation arguments."

###