

A. Applicable Circuit Law

“Finally, we address ParkerVision’s request that on remand this case be reassigned to a different judge. Our review is governed by the law of the applicable regional circuit” ParkerVision, Inc. v. Qualcomm Inc., 2026-1033, 9/30/26.

B. Preclusion

“The statute equates the cause of action with the patent as a whole, and not with each individual claim of a patent.” “These statutory provisions and these cases support our view that, in most if not all instances, each patent can be the basis for a *single* cause of action for patent infringement, but not more.” ParkerVision, Inc. v. Qualcomm Inc., 2026-1033, 9/30/26 (emphasis in original).

C. JMOL (Rule 50) / Summary Judgment (Rule 56)

JMOL affirmed where patentee identified evidence, “[b]ut that evidence does not answer the relevant question.” Wyeth LLC v. Astrazeneca Pharms. LP, 2024-2325, 7/9/26.

“[T]he jury could reasonably find that LiveNote’s express disclosure of an interface operable with a tablet pen comes within the ordinary meaning of “touch-sensitive input interface.”” TrackTime, LLC v. Amazon.com Services LLC, 2024-1102, 7/2/26.

D. Pleadings/Parties

“And to the extent VDPP argues the proposed amended complaint should not be dismissed simply because it states “Plaintiff has pled all statutory requirements to obtain presuit damages” and “all conditions precedent to recovery are met,” these statements are bare legal conclusions we need not—and do not—accept as true in view of the proposed amended complaint’s lack of any supporting factual allegations.” VDPP, LLC v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc., 2024-2226, 8/19/26 (citation omitted).

“Because A&M has transferred “all substantial rights” in the asserted patents to TexasLDPC, its absence does not “impair or impede” A&M’s ability to protect its interest, nor does it leave Defendants “subject to a substantial risk of incurring double, multiple or otherwise inconsistent obligations.” TexasLDPC Inc. v. Broadcom Inc., 2025-1074, 9/14/26 (citations omitted).

“Defendants and the district court both suggest that TexasLDPC’s reliance upon a damages theory consisting of a reasonable royalty based on a hypothetical negotiation—assessed using the *GeorgiaPacific* factors—has made evidence controlled by A&M essential to the district court’s damages calculation.” “First, Rule 19 is not a discovery tool.” “Second, Defendants’ alleged need for evidence from A&M is undercut by evidence in the record and Defendants’ filings.” TexasLDPC Inc. v. Broadcom Inc., 2025-1074, 9/14/26

E. Discovery/Evidence

“We do not conclude that a district court, as a matter of law, abuses its discretion when it strikes as untimely documents disclosed during the fact discovery period but only shortly before the close of that period such that it prevents any meaningful opportunity for the opposing party to prepare how to respond to that newly disclosed discovery.” NCS Multistage Inc. v. Nine Energy Serv., Inc., 2025-1000, 9/14/26.