In recent times, there exists a lot of confusion as to the patent exhaustion doctrine and its implications on conditional sales and international patent exhaustion. Current patent exhaustion laws do not allow for international patent exhaustion, whereas current copyright exhaustion laws favor removal of geographical boundaries and facilitate commerce. This comment examines the evolution of the patent exhaustion doctrine and compares the Lexmark Int’l, Inc. v. Impression Prods. case to Kirtsaeng v. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. and proposes solution in favor of international patent exhaustion.
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IMPACT OF LEXMARK CASE ON PATENT EXHAUSTION

GOUTHAMI VANAM*

I. INTRODUCTION

There is a wide disparity in laws for copyright exhaustion and patent exhaustion. The leading case in patent exhaustion is Lexmark Int'l v. Impression Prods.¹ Lexmark is a Federal Circuit case decided in February, 2016.² The United States Supreme Court granted certiorari on December 2, 2016 to clear the confusion caused due to the holding in Lexmark and provide additional guidance for the issue of patent exhaustion.³ The Federal Circuit incorrectly held in Lexmark that an authorized foreign sale did not exhaust the patentee's rights.⁴ Recent case in copyright exhaustion held that foreign sales exhausted the copyright holder's rights.⁵ Prior to delving into the intricacies of copyright and patent exhaustion doctrines, it is important to understand where it all started.

A patent for an invention grants property rights to the inventor, issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.⁶ Generally, the term of a patent is twenty years from filing the application at the United States Patent and Trademark Office.⁷ A patent grants the right to exclude others from making, using, offering for sale, or selling the invention in the United States, or “importing the invention to the United States.”⁸ The patenting process is so important that the United States Supreme Court declared that without a patent, an inventor owns his or her invention only so long as it is kept a secret.⁹

---

¹ Lexmark Int'l, Inc. v. Impression Prods., 816 F.3d 721 (Fed. Cir. 2016).
² Id.
⁴ Id. The Court held that the overseas sales of the cartridges did not exhaust U.S. patentees' rights “even when no reservation of rights accompanied the sale.”
⁷ Id.
⁸ 35 U.S.C §154 (a) (1) provides that:
   Every patent shall contain a short title of the invention and a grant to the patentee, his heirs or assigns, of the right to exclude others from making, using, offering for sale, or selling the invention throughout the United States or importing the invention into the United States, and, if the invention is a process, of the right to exclude others from using, offering for sale or selling throughout the United States, or importing into the United States, products made by that process, referring to the specification for the particulars thereof.
⁹ Gayler v. Wilder, 51 U.S. 477, 493 (1851) (holding that an inventor of a new right does not have the exclusive right to his improvement unless he obtains a patent).
A patent owner can transfer a bundle of rights, which is less than the entire ownership interest to a licensee via a patent license. A patent license is an agreement between the patent owner and the licensee that the owner will not sue the licensee if he/she makes, uses, offers for sale, sells or imports the claimed invention, as long as the licensee fulfills its obligations and operates within the bounds delineated by the license agreement. The first authorized sale of a patented product by the patent owner or a licensee exhausts the patent rights covering the product. This doctrine is called exhaustion or first sale. It permits the purchaser to use and resell the product free of patent infringement claims. The policy behind the doctrine of patent exhaustion is to prevent patent holder from controlling the post-sale use of the patented item and extracting double recoveries for an invention. The doctrine of patent exhaustion is a defense to patent infringement, not a cause of action.

This comment explores how patent exhaustion evolved over time. In particular, this comment looks at the Lexmark case and its impact on the Patent Exhaustion Doctrine. Part I will introduce patent exhaustion and the cases which define it. Part II will analyze how Lexmark changed or expanded upon the existing doctrine. Part III will propose how the Supreme Court needs to overrule the Federal Circuit and clarify the law regarding conditional sales and international patent exhaustion. Part IV will summarize and conclude that the Supreme Court should overrule Jazz Photo and Mallinckrodt. Moreover, Part IV will summarize and support international patent exhaustion.

---

10 MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE, § 301 ("As compared to assignment of patent rights, the licensing of a patent transfers a bundle of rights which is less than the entire ownership interest, e.g., rights that may be limited as to time, geographical area, or field of use.")

11 Id.

12 Forest Labs., Inc. v. Abbott Labs., No. 96-CV-159-A, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23215, at 66 (W.D.N.Y. June 23, 1999) ("The Patent Exhaustion Doctrine applies as well to the disposition of a product under a license as it does to outright sale.")

13 Id. at 67.


16 Quanta Computer, Inc. v. LG Electronics, Inc., 128 S. Ct. 2122, 2109 (2008). (noting that patent exhaustion "prevents the patent holder from invoking patent law to control post-sale use of the article"); Cyrix Corp., 846 F. Supp. at 539 (recognizing that the purpose of the patent exhaustion doctrine is to "prevent patentees from extracting double recoveries for an invention").

17 ExcelStor Tech., Inc. v. Papst Licensing GMBH & Co. KG, 541 F.3d 1373, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

18 Lexmark, 816 F.3d at 721.
II. BACKGROUND

A. Patent Licenses

Before directly addressing patent exhaustion, it is important to understand the relationship between patent licensing agreements and patent exhaustion doctrine. Licenses can be implied, non-exclusive, exclusive, sub-licenses, sole licenses etc.

Implied licenses waive patentee’s statutory right to exclude others from making, using or selling the patented invention.\(^{19}\) A non-exclusive license assures immunity from suit with respect to acts done within the scope of the license.\(^{20}\) In exclusive licensing agreements, the patent owner promises not to practice under the patent and not to grant further licenses.\(^{21}\) This type of license addresses the problem the dissent laid out in *Adams v. Burke*.\(^{22}\) Exclusive and non-exclusive licenses are polar opposites, having a non-exclusive license will invalidate the exclusive license.\(^{23}\) Exclusive rights under exclusive licenses only apply when the patent owner has not granted any nonexclusive licenses previously.\(^{24}\) There are other types of specific licenses, one of which is a sub-license. To grant sublicenses, a licensor of a patent may appoint a licensee to act as his or her agent.\(^{25}\) This right must be granted within the licensing agreement.\(^{26}\) This type of license takes control from the licensor by allowing contracts between the licensee and sublicensee. Additionally, adding post-sale restrictions to the licenses, make it harder for the licensees to improve on the product.

B. Evolution of Patent Exhaustion

The doctrine of Patent Exhaustion is not new. In 1852, the doctrine became first recognized by the United States Supreme Court in *Bloomer v. McQuewan*.\(^{27}\) In

\(^{19}\) Wang Labs., Inc. v. Mitsubishi Elecs. Am., Inc., 103 F.3d 1571, 1580 (Fed. Cir. 1997).


\(^{21}\) A licensee can be sued if the terms of the non-exclusive license are violated.

\(^{22}\) *W. Elec. Co. v. Pacent Reproducer Corp.*, 42 F.2d 116, 118 (2d Cir. 1930). The court defined practicing it within the field of use wherein the licensee is given leave.

\(^{23}\) *TransCore*, 563 F.3d at 1275.

\(^{24}\) Compare *W. Elec. Co.*, 42 F.2d at 118; *TransCore*, 563 F.3d at 1275.

\(^{25}\) *Rubber Co. v. Goodyear*, 76 U.S. 788 (1869) (noting how the true meaning and purpose authorized the licensee to make and sell India-rubber cloth).

\(^{26}\) *Id.*

\(^{27}\) *Bloomer v. McQuewan*, 55 U.S. 539 (1853). In this case, the Court discussed in detail “make and vend” and “use” rights. The Court determined that the “make and vend” right is a license that does not trigger patent exhaustion, while the “use” rights is a sale that does trigger patent exhaustion. The Court also distinguished between a purchaser of the right to manufacture and sell patented articles and end users of those articles. The key distinction was that a purchaser purchases a portion of rights conferred by a patent, however, when it switches hands from the purchaser, to the end user,
Bloomer, the question before the Supreme Court involved whether the purchasers of licenses to use or sell the patented invention during the patent term can continue to use those licenses through the extended term. The Court held that the “use” right triggers patent exhaustion. Thereafter, in 1873 the Court in *Adams v. Burke* found that an authorized sale of the patented product essentially liberates the product from patent monopoly. The dissent in *Adams* makes a very important observation regarding geographic limitations. Justice Bradley explains the doctrine allows the patentee to sell the invention in another location despite assigning his patent. *Boesch v. Graff* followed *Adams*, which involved a patent issued to the assignors first in Germany and then in United States. The court held that despite the operation of German laws, the appellants infringed the patent by importing them and selling them in the United States, without a license or consent from the appellees. The Second Circuit made three more important decisions after *Boesch*. All three decisions focused on the sales transaction, rather than on the location to make the determination on patent exhaustion. The first of those three cases is *Dickerson v. Matheson* in 1893. In *Dickerson*, an American assignee of a German patent involving an improvement in dye coloring matter. The German company gave a license to sell the patented dye color in Europe and in the United States to another German
company. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant bought the color from the German licensee, imported and sold it in United States. The court held that the defendants failed to obtain proper permission to import and sell patented product in United States. It also said that if someone purchases a patent in a different country as well as in United States, without any restrictions, they acquire an unrestricted ownership, and can use or sell it in United States. In Daimler Mfg. Co v. Conklin (1909), the defendant purchased an automobile abroad from a person authorized to sell the patented improvements there. The overseas seller did not have any U.S. Patent rights. The court concluded that “the use of articles covered by a United States patent within the United States could no more be controlled by foreign law than could the sale.” Finally, in Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corp. v. United Aircraft Engineering Corp, the court held an overseas sale exhausted U.S. Patent rights. In that case, the defendant obtained charges for “selling and offering for sale in the United States aeroplanes manufactured in Canada pursuant to certain agreements between plaintiff and the British government.” The court held the sale as unrestricted, which resulted in the purchaser becoming free to use the airplanes in the United States.

In 2001, the Federal Circuit considered the scope of geographic limitations in patent exhaustion doctrine in Jazz Photo Corp. v. ITC. In Jazz Photo, the Federal Circuit held that “United States patent rights are not exhausted by products of foreign

---

40 Id.
41 Id.
42 Id. at 527. Dickerson drew parallels to the Boesch case in which the dealer purchased patented articles from an authorized dealer in Germany. The Court in Boesch held that the dealer cannot import and sell the patented invention in United States without the license or consent of the United States patent. Similarly, in Dickerson, the court held that the defendant obtained consent to import and sell in United States from a company which had the right to sell under both German and United States patents, he could have imported and sold the patented article in United States.
43 Id. A purchaser in a foreign country of an article patented in that country and also in the United States, from the owner of each patent, or from a licensee under each patent, who purchases without any restrictions upon the extent of his use or power of sale, acquires an unrestricted ownership in the article, and can use or sell it in this country.
44 Daimler Mfg. Co., 170 F. 70 (2d Cir. 1909).
45 Id.
46 Id. at 72-73 (noting that “[t]he purchaser abroad cannot get [greater] rights than the patentee has from whom he buys.”
47 Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corp., 266 F. 71 (2d Cir. 1920).
48 Id. at 72.
49 Id. (noting that a monopoly in a patent ends when the patented article passes hands in a rightful manner and that a valid sale and purchase makes a patent an individual’s personal property and they are free to do whatever they want with the patented article—i.e., repair, use, sell etc.).
50 Jazz Photo Corp. v. ITC, 264 F.3d 1094 (Fed. Cir. 2001.) This case deals with single use cameras called “lens-fitted film packages” (LFFP). Id. These cameras were originally manufactured by Fuji Photo Film Co. and sold by them to consumers. Id. These cameras were brought to China to be refurbished, and Jazz Photo imported them into United States. Id. United States Customs Service intercepted two of the shipments and sought to prevent their entry into United States as they violated Fuji’s patents. Id. Jazz Photo argued that the patents were not infringed because they essentially built new cameras. Id. The Federal Circuit held that Jazz photo was correct in its interpretation. Id. It looked at the common-law repair-reconstruction law and determined that Jazz’s actions counted as repairs. Id. The court held that Jazz photo legally acquired these cameras and refurbished them to extend their lives. Id. “The judgment of patent infringement is reversed with respect to LFFPs for which the patent right was exhausted by first sale in the United States, and that were permissibly repaired.” Id.
provenance.”51 It also held that “to invoke the protection of the first sale doctrine, the authorized first sale must have occurred under the United States patent.”52 The court also noted that imported products of “solely foreign provenance are not immunized from infringement of United States patents by the nature of their refurbishment.”53 This holding also applied to patent exhaustion scenarios where a patentee grants a worldwide license to sell products embodying a patent.54 In STMicroelectronics, Inc. v. Sandisk Corp., the court found that Jazz Photo does not stand for the proposition that patent exhaustion doctrine can only be triggered within United States when there is a valid license covering the products.55 Based on this, the court concluded that since STM gave Toshiba a license in all types of patents with respect to the licensed products in all countries of the world, Toshiba had the right to sell any of the licensed products under the patents in the United States or anywhere in the world.56

The next big case in the evolution of patent exhaustion doctrine became Quanta Computer in 2008.57 In Quanta, LGE acquired a portfolio of computer patents relating to data transfers between components within a computer58 and Intel acquired a license to the LGE patents.59 Quanta then purchased microprocessors from Intel and combined these components with other components to manufacture computers.60 LGE sued Quanta for infringing its method claims of the patent.61 The Supreme Court unanimously held that patent exhaustion applies to method claims and that “[a]n authorized sale of an article that substantially embodies a patent exhausts the patent holder’s rights and prevents the patent holder from invoking patent law to control post-sale use of the article.”62 Basically, the Supreme Court said that the initial authorized sale of a patented item terminates all patent rights to that item.63 The rationale behind this holding is that the patentee received the reward for the use of his invention by the sale of the article.64

Another important case to consider does not address patent exhaustion, but copyright exhaustion. In Kirtsaeng v. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., the Supreme Court abandoned the geographic location of the sale and went back to focusing on unrestricted sale of intellectual property.65 In a 6-3 decision, the Court held that

---

51 Id. at 1105. (citing Boesch, 133 U.S. 697 at 701-703) (noting that “a lawful foreign purchase does not obviate the need for license from the United States patentee before importation into and sale in the United States”).
52 Id.
53 Id.
55 Id. (noting that “The Jazz Photo case does not stand for the proposition that only sales within the United States can trigger the doctrine when there is a valid license covering the products”)
56 Id. at *12.
58 Id.
59 Id. at 623-24.
60 Id.
61 Id.
62 Id. at 638.
63 Id.
64 See id.; Jazz Photo, 264 F.3d at 1094.
65 Kirtsaeng, 133 S. Ct. 1351 (2013). Kirtsaeng a native of Thailand, was sued by John Wiley & Sons, Inc. for selling foreign edition textbooks made outside United States. Id. These books were marked for sale exclusively abroad. Id. Kirtsaeng imported these books into United States and sold
Kirtsaeng could import and resell textbooks that had been lawfully made and sold by the copyright holder abroad. In this case, the Court created a new standard for copyright exhaustion and did not follow the standard for patent exhaustion in Jazz Photo, which held that lawful sales of patented goods outside the United States did not give rise to patent exhaustion inside the United States. This difference is important because these cases laid the groundwork for the differences in international exhaustion of patents and copyrights.

This split will be further examined in the analysis section by using Lexmark, decided en banc by the Federal Circuit in 2016. The Federal Circuit rejected arguments that foreign sales and sales under a single-use license automatically exhaust patent rights in a patented article. The Federal Circuit held that the patent rights were not exhausted by either domestic sales subject to the single-use condition, or by foreign sales absent the patentee's express release of rights.

C. Problems after Lexmark

Lexmark decision has pros and cons. The biggest pro is that it is pro-competitive. However, as the dissenting judge in Lexmark said, “[e]xhaustion does
not turn on whether a post-sale restriction is desirable or undesirable, pro-competitive or anti-competitive, but whether the authorized sale and the item passed beyond the scope of patent monopoly.”74 Two important issues arose after the Federal Circuit decided Lexmark: “conditional sales” and the difference in patent exhaustion and copyright exhaustion. First is whether the “conditional sale” of a patented item permits enforcement of post-sale restrictions and avoids the application of patent exhaustion doctrine. The second issue arises from the Supreme Court’s holding in Kirtsaeng.75 The issue is whether court decides to harmonize patent and copyright exhaustion doctrines and paves the way for international patent exhaustion.

III. ANALYSIS

A. Comparison of Lexmark with Precedent

Lexmark’s holding, regarding patent exhaustion doctrine, is inconsistent with what the Supreme Court previously held in Quanta and it gave rise to two issues mentioned above.76 In Quanta, the Supreme Court held that the initial authorized sale of a patented item terminates or exhausts the patent holder’s rights and prevents the patent holder to control the post-sale use of the patented article.77 However, in Lexmark, the Federal Circuit held the patent rights were not exhausted by either domestic sales subject to the single-use condition, or by foreign sales absent the patentee’s express release of rights.78 This raises the issue of patentees’ ability to circumvent patent exhaustion by expressly stating conditions or placing post-sale restrictions on the use or resale of a patented article at the time of first sale.79

Lexmark’s holding regarding international exhaustion is inconsistent with the Supreme Court’s Kirtsaeng decision.80 While Kirtsaeng revolved around copyright, the Supreme Court dealt with the idea of international exhaustion in it.81 In Kirtsaeng, the Supreme Court held that a sale made by a copyright holder outside the United

74 Id. at 783.
75 Kirtsaeng, 133 S. Ct. 1351 (2013).
76 Lexmark, 816 F.3d at 731. These issues were considered, but not resolved in Federal Circuit’s 2016 en banc opinion, the questions that the court raised can be summarized as follows:

1. The first issue dealt with how patent exhaustion rule differs from copyright exhaustion in Kirtsaeng v. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 133 S. Ct. 1351 (2013) where the Court ruled that foreign sale of a patented item does not exhaust a patent in United States.

2. The second issue dealt with whether end-user restrictions and single-use-and-return restrictions have any impact on patent exhaustion.

77 Quanta, 553 U.S. at 638.
78 Lexmark, 816 F.3d at 726 (noting that it adhered to the holding of Mallinckrodt, Inc. v. Medipart, Inc., 976 F.2d 700 (Fed. Cir. 1992).
79 See also Lexmark 816 F. 3d at 731 (The two issues considered but left unresolved in Lexmark dealt with placing post-sale restrictions on a patented invention and their implications on patent exhaustion doctrine.)
80 Id.
81 Id.
States exhausts its U.S. rights. However, in *Lexmark*, the Federal Circuit upheld *Jazz Photo* and held that an overseas sale exhausts U.S. Patent rights. This duality gave rise to the second issue of international patent exhaustion, whether *Lexmark* gives rise to international patent exhaustion like international copyright exhaustion.

**B. The Federal Circuit Wrongly Decided the Issue of Conditional Sale**

The doctrine of patent exhaustion is intended to terminate patentee’s rights to the patented article at the time of first sale. The idea behind patent exhaustion is to ensure that the patentees do not extract double recoveries for an invention. According to the U.S. Patent Statute, “whoever” without authorization uses, sells, or offers to sell a patented article is liable for patent infringement. This language infers that without patent exhaustion doctrine, everyone who purchases from the party who purchased from the patent owner is infringing the patent and is liable for patent infringement unless, there is an explicit authorization from the patentee or licensee to purchase, sell, or offer for sale. This would essentially create a monopoly with the patented product for the patent term, in addition to, the sales that can be made overseas without reserving U.S. patent rights. This monopoly is created by repeated sales from one person. For example, say a person received a patent for a product, and he decides to sell the product outside of United States; he is probably able to sell the product at a lower price because, he can sell it over a longer period of time, and still make a profit from the patented product. It is because of *Lexmark*’s holding that foreign sales do not lead to patent exhaustion; the seller can essentially sell the product overseas for a long time without reserving U.S. patent rights. Moreover, the buyers of the product would prefer to buy it from the patentee of the product than someone else, especially if the patented product is at a lower price. So, in this hypothetical, it is very much possible to create a monopoly by selling a product outside of united states at a lower price than others while not exhausting the patent in United States. Creating a monopoly for a long period of time is not the intention of having a patent system; it only gives exclusive rights to the patentee for twenty years. Patent law is designed to encourage innovation and facilitate commerce. Therefore, the Federal Circuit’s

---

82 Kirtsaeng, 133 S. Ct. 1351, 1355-56 (2013) ("We hold that the “first sale” doctrine applies to copies of a copyrighted work lawfully made abroad.)
83 Lexmark, 816 F.3d at 727 (holding that by selling or authorizing a sale of a U.S. patented article overseas, the patent owner does not authorize importing and selling the same product in U.S. without patentee’s authority).
84 Quanta, 128 S. Ct. at 2122 (noting that patent exhaustion “prevents the patent holder from invoking patent law to control post[]sale use of the article”).
85 35 U.S.C. § 271 (a) (“Except as otherwise provided in this title, whoever without authority makes, uses, offers to sell, or sells any patented invention, within the United States or imports into the United States any patented invention during the term of the patent therefor, infringes the patent.”).
86 Id.
87 Id.
88 Adams, 84 U.S. at 453.
89 U.S. CONST. art I, § 8, Cl. 8 (“The Congress shall have power . . . To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.”).
holding which encourages avoiding patent exhaustion by imposing conditions on the sale of a patented product goes against the fundamental idea of having a patent system and against the policy behind having the patent exhaustion doctrine.\textsuperscript{90}

Secondly, the Federal Circuit relied on \textit{Mallinckrodt}, though not overruled by \textit{Quanta}, could be implied to be overruled due to their exact opposite conclusions.\textsuperscript{91} \textit{Mallinckrodt} was a Federal Circuit decision from 1992.\textsuperscript{92} \textit{Mallinckrodt} held that restrictions on reuse were enforceable under patent law.\textsuperscript{93} However, \textit{Quanta}, decided by the Supreme Court in 2008, came to an opposite conclusion.\textsuperscript{94} Therefore, it is clear that the Supreme Court did not intend for the consumers of patented articles to go around the doctrine of patent exhaustion.\textsuperscript{95} It is also clear that the Supreme Court overruled \textit{Mallinckrodt} in \textit{Quanta} without expressly stating so.\textsuperscript{96} The Supreme Court went around expressly overruling \textit{Mallinckrodt} because it concluded that the licensing issue in \textit{Quanta}, did not broadly relate to the conditional licensing agreements.\textsuperscript{97} \textit{Mallinckrodt} did not state what exactly constitutes as “authority” when it comes to conditional sale, while \textit{Lexmark} briefly considers the issue of “authority”.

Finally, \textit{Lexmark} relies on the wrong precedent of \textit{General Talking Pictures} which does not involve an authorized sale. The Supreme Court, relying on \textit{General Talking Pictures}, came to a conclusion as to what constitutes authority when it comes to making, selling, or using a patented invention.\textsuperscript{98} \textit{General Talking Pictures} does not deal with an initial authorized sale—the first sale by the licensee was outside the terms of the license.\textsuperscript{99}

\section*{C. International Patent Exhaustion}

There is a difference between patent exhaustion\textsuperscript{100} and copyright exhaustion.\textsuperscript{101} The holding in \textit{Lexmark} is contrary to the Supreme Court’s decision in \textit{Kirtsaeng}.\textsuperscript{102} The Court in \textit{Kirtsaeng} talks about international exhaustion in general.\textsuperscript{103} \textit{Kirtsaeng} delves into the realm of copyright, but keeps the idea of international exhaustion.

\textsuperscript{90} Id.
\textsuperscript{91} \textit{Quanta}, 128 S. Ct. at 2122.
\textsuperscript{92} \textit{Mallinckrodt}, 976 F.2d at 700.
\textsuperscript{93} Id. at 709 (stating that “We conclude that the district court erred in holding that the restriction on reuse was, as a matter of law, unenforceable under the patent law”).
\textsuperscript{94} \textit{Quanta}, 128 S. Ct. at 2122.
\textsuperscript{95} Id.
\textsuperscript{96} See id.
\textsuperscript{97} See, \textit{Mallinckrodt}, 976 F.2d at 700.
\textsuperscript{98} \textit{Lexmark}, 816 F.3d at 735. (It is undisputed and clear under Supreme Court precedent—most prominently, the 1938 decision in General Talking Pictures—that Lexmark’s patent rights in the cartridges would not have been exhausted upon manufacturing licensee’s sale (the first sale), if a buyer with knowledge of the restrictions resold or reused them in violation of the restrictions.).
\textsuperscript{99} Id.
\textsuperscript{100} According to \textit{Lexmark}, sales by the U.S. Patent holder outside United States does not exhaust U.S. Patent rights. \textit{Lexmark}, 816 F. 3d at 774.
\textsuperscript{101} According to \textit{Kirtsaeng}, sales outside United States exhausts U.S copyright rights. \textit{See}, \textit{Kirtsaeng}, 133 S. Ct. 1351.
\textsuperscript{102} See id.
\textsuperscript{103} Id.
The Supreme Court held that there are no geographical limitations when it comes to international exhaustion.\textsuperscript{105} The concept of international exhaustion is very complex. It cannot be decided solely based on whether something is a copyright or a patent. The best way to approach this issue is to examine the arguments made by both cases while keeping in mind the broad implications of them on the concept of international exhaustion.

In \textit{Kirtsaeng}, the Supreme Court first delved into the common law history of the first sale doctrine where it explained how “A law that permits a copyright holder to control the resale or other disposition of a chattel once sold is similarly ‘against Trade and Traff[ic], and bargaining and contracting.’”\textsuperscript{106} The court then talks about how this relates to competition in markets and how the freedom to sell would be advantageous to a consumer.\textsuperscript{107} The court’s take on this is consumers benefit if the buyers freely dispose lawfully acquired goods without having to worry about patent infringement.\textsuperscript{108} Another reason the court mentions is the “administrative burden of trying to enforce restrictions upon difficult-to-trace, readily movable goods.”\textsuperscript{109} The Supreme Court clearly stated that “(t)he common-law doctrine makes no geographical distinctions.”\textsuperscript{110} Patent exhaustion is a common law doctrine, so the decision of international patent exhaustion rests with the court.\textsuperscript{111} It is clear from the analysis of general international exhaustion and common law international exhaustion, \textit{Kirtsaeng} wants to remove the geographic boundaries and facilitate commerce.\textsuperscript{112}

The \textit{Kirtsaeng} court also looked at the impact of geographic limitation of exhaustion and determined that it will injure a large portion of used book business.\textsuperscript{113} It then expanded its reach to technology, automobiles, etc., and concluded that if first overseas sale did not exhaust U.S. patent rights, then the purchaser of the products will not be able to sell them in United States.\textsuperscript{114} The court noted that a geographic

\begin{thebibliography}{99}

\bibitem{114} “Technology companies tell us that "automobiles, microwaves, calculators, mobile phones, tablets, and personal computers" contain copyrightable software programs or packaging . . . Many of these items are made abroad with the American copyright holder's permission and then sold and imported (with that permission) to the United States . . . Many of these items are made abroad with the American copyright holder's permission and then sold and imported (with that permission) to

\end{thebibliography}
limitation would subject many industries to the disruptive impact of the threat of infringement suits. Thus, it is clear that *Kirtsaeng* considered the pros and cons of having geographical limitations to goods prior to holding that geographic limitations should not apply to international exhaustion.

Finally, the *Kirtsaeng* court looks at multiple arguments made by the dissent in *Lexmark*. One of those arguments is about copyright owners’ ability to charge different market prices for foreign and domestic markets. The *Kirtsaeng* court looked at Art. I Sec. 8 of United States Constitution, and concluded that the language regarding exclusive right does not suggest the right to divide markets or the right to charge different purchasers different prices. This analysis makes it clear that the *Kirtsaeng* court approached the idea of international exhaustion in a general manner, and not just limiting it to copyright as stated in *Lexmark*.

*Lexmark* quickly to dismissed *Kirtsaeng* as a copyright case, and also failed to recognize the broader meaning. Additionally, *Lexmark* looked at the portions of *Kirtsaeng* where the court talked about museums, libraries and booksellers, but ignored the portions where the court talked about the impact of geographical limitations on automobiles, technology, which is applicable to patents as well. *Lexmark* narrowly interpreted *Kirtsaeng*; granted that *Kirtsaeng* is a copyright case, but not a patent case, same theory and logic apply in both cases and should be dealt with in a similar manner.
D. Impact of Lexmark on Patent Exhaustion

Lexmark went against the long-standing doctrine of patent exhaustion laid out in Quanta.\footnote{Quanta v. LGE, 553 US 617, 625 (2008) (noting that “The longstanding doctrine of patent exhaustion provides that the initial authorized sale of a patented item terminates all patent rights to that item”).} The court in Lexmark said that the initial sale of patented item does not terminate patent rights of the patent owner if the sale is associated with conditions.\footnote{See Lexmark (noting that if a sale is made under lawful restriction which is within the sale scope of the patent act does not give rise to patent exhaustion).}

The Lexmark case drastically changed the landscape of patent law and patent exhaustion doctrine by saying that foreign sales do not exhaust patent rights.\footnote{Lexmark, 816 F. 3d at 774.} If the trends in exhaustion jurisprudence continue it would be hard to regulate how far down the stream of commerce the patent infringement can go.\footnote{Comparing with what was said in Kirtsang, the Kirtsaeng court said that it would be an administrative burden to track how far the movable goods go—if it is just hard to track them, it is almost impossible to determine if the goods have been infringed or not.}

Non-exhaustion of patent rights due to foreign sales makes it administratively difficult to track down goods whether domestically or internationally.\footnote{Considering all the technology around us, and how easy it is to hack into software or computers, it would become very difficult from an administrative perspective to track down every single individual who is infringing a patent—so it is important to impose conditional sales and remove geographical boundaries when it comes to patent exhaustion.} The second issue is the issue of international patent exhaustion. The Lexmark easily dismissed Kirtsaeng as a copyright case, but it failed to note that copyrights are also territorial, so the benefits of having geographical boundaries (if any) would apply to copyrights as well. Despite knowing that, the Supreme Court removed the geographical boundaries with respect to patents. Therefore, the Supreme Court must consider the far-reaching implications of removing geographical boundaries for patent exhaustion when hearing the oral arguments.

IV. PROPOSAL

The logic laid out in Kirtsaeng can be expanded to patent exhaustion. We live in a world where something as simple as a laptop comprises of parts that have been manufactured all around the world and most of these parts are patented. Moreover, United States is one of the countries that allows business method patents\footnote{Tariq Hafiz, Patent Business Methods, USPTO http://www.uspto.gov/patents-getting-started/patent-basics/types-patent-applications/utility-patent/patent-business} and software patents.\footnote{David Kappos, An Examination of Software Patents, USPTO (Nov. 20, 2012), http://www.uspto.gov/about-us/news-updates/examination-software-patents.} Putting geographic limitations on patent exhaustion is as harmful as putting geographic limitations on copyrighted technological products.

This section deals with two questions: Should the Supreme Court overrule Jazz Photo in light of Kirtsaeng to the extent it ruled that a sale of a patented item outside the United States never gives rise to United States patent exhaustion? Should the Supreme Court overrule Mallinckrodt in light of Quanta Computer Inc., to the extent

\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{Quanta v. LGE, 553 US 617, 625 (2008) (noting that “The longstanding doctrine of patent exhaustion provides that the initial authorized sale of a patented item terminates all patent rights to that item”).}
\item \footnote{Lexmark, 816 F. 3d at 774.}
\item \footnote{Comparing with what was said in Kirtsaeng, the Kirtsaeng court said that it would be an administrative burden to track how far the movable goods go—if it is just hard to track them, it is almost impossible to determine if the goods have been infringed or not.}
\item \footnote{Tariq Hafiz, Patent Business Methods, USPTO http://www.uspto.gov/patents-getting-started/patent-basics/types-patent-applications/utility-patent/patent-business}
\item \footnote{David Kappos, An Examination of Software Patents, USPTO (Nov. 20, 2012), http://www.uspto.gov/about-us/news-updates/examination-software-patents.}
\end{itemize}
that it ruled that a sale of a patented article, when the sale is made under a restriction that is otherwise lawful and within the scope of the patent grant does not give rise to patent exhaustion? The remainder of the comment briefly explains where the Federal Circuit erred in its decision and proposes the following answers to these questions: 1) the Supreme Court should overrule Jazz Photo in light of Kirtsaeng; 2) the Supreme Court should overrule Mallinckrodt; 3) United States patent law should adapt to the current economic environment and adopt international patent law.

A. Overrule Jazz Photo

Jazz Photo held that if a patented article is sold outside United States, it does not exhaust the patent. The Federal Circuit in Lexmark upheld this decision. When one looks at this decision in the perspective of the latest technological advancement, it does not add up. The American public has the ability to purchase goods made anywhere in the world using the internet. If foreign sales do not exhaust U.S. patent rights, patentees can sell goods at a lower price overseas without exhausting their U.S. rights. This ability creates a loophole in the doctrine of patent exhaustion as laid out in Lexmark, it however does not allow for people in United States to import or sell those products.

In Kirtsaeng, the Supreme Court interpreted the Copyright exhaustion doctrine and determined that the sale of a copyrighted work outside the United States exhausts the copyright owner's right under the doctrine of first sale. It is important to note that the idea of both patent exhaustion doctrine and copy right exhaustion doctrine evolved from the same common law idea of first sale doctrine. Moreover, the Supreme Court in Kirtsaeng considered legislative intent prior to arriving to the non-geographical interpretation of the first sale doctrine.

The second issue is related to the manner in which the patent exhaustion doctrine kicks in under Jazz Photo—after the first sale in United States. The Court's

---

130 Jazz Photo, 264 F.3d at 1105.
131 See, Lexmark Int'l, Inc., 816 F.3d at 727 (Fed. Cir. 2016).
132 Id. (holding that one cannot import U.S. patented articles from overseas and sell them in domestic markets without authorization from the patent owner).
133 Kirtsaeng, 133 S. Ct. at 1351. This decision was based on the first sale doctrine 17 U.S.C § 109, which states:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section § 106(3) the section that grants the owner exclusive distribution rights, the owner of a particular copy or phonorecord lawfully made under this title . . . is entitled, without the authority of the copyright owner, to sell or otherwise dispose of the possession of that copy or phonorecord.

This doctrine is a common-law doctrine, and it clearly states that once s copyrighted work is sold, the purchaser of the copyrighted work can sell or distribute that copyrighted work in any manner that the purchaser wants. Id.

134 Kirtsaeng, 133 S. Ct. at 1351.
135 Id.
136 Jazz Photo, 264 F.3d at 1105. The court considered Fuji's argument that some of the imported cameras were sold only overseas but were included in the refurbished importation. Id. The court then said that "United States patent rights are not exhausted by products of foreign provenance. Id.
reasoning involved that a foreign sale of a patented product did not relieve the purchaser of the need to obtain a license if that product became imported back into United States.\footnote{137 If the purchaser did not obtain a license in the United States, he would be held liable for patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271.}

If one were to follow the concept of only obtaining licenses, the patent owner would be unjustly enriched from the imported patented product.\footnote{138 A patent owner can sell their goods for an unlimited time outside United States without having to worry about patent exhaustion. Also, this rule blurs the concept of international patent exhaustion even more when we look at it from the perspective of Hague Agreements. A Hague agreement ‘governs the international registration of industrial designs. First adopted in 1925, the agreement effectively establishes an international system—the Hague System—that allows industrial designs to be protected in multiple countries or regions with minimal formalities.” Hague Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Industrial Designs, World Intellectual Property Organization, http://www.wipo.int/treaties/en/registration/haguel/}. This allows for the patent owner to benefit multiple times from selling his or her goods internationally. Domestically, the patent owner gets licensing fees and royalties from sales in United States, and can freely sell the product overseas.

The Supreme Court should overrule \textit{Jazz Photo} in light of \textit{Kirtsaeng} and ensure that the patent exhaustion doctrine is consistent with the common-law doctrine of first sale and the copyright exhaustion doctrine.

\textbf{B. Overrule Mallinckrodt}

In \textit{Mallinckrodt}, the Federal Circuit held that a post-sale restriction on a single-use device sold to hospitals did not exhaust the patent owner’s rights.\footnote{139 Mallinckrodt, 976 F. 2d at 700.} The flaw with this holding is that it creates a system where a patent owner can control how the patented product is distributed downstream.\footnote{140 Id.} This kind of control is against the patent system of United States. Moreover, when this kind of control is combined with geographic limitations, it could create far reaching implications beyond the scope of the patent right. In a hypothetical scenario, if the patentee licensed to A, A sells to B without authorization, B sells to C without authorization, and then C sells to D presumably also without authorization, \textit{Lexmark} makes it possible for A to benefit from sales to B, C and D.

Now, looking at the scenario in \textit{Mallinckrodt}, in conjunction with \textit{Jazz Photo}, the patent owner is able to not only sell his patented product outside United States without exhausting his patent rights, he is also able to impose post-sale restrictions on that patented product. By doing so, the patent owner is making money not only from the license holders but also from the purchasers of the product. Moreover, since
Mallinckrodt makes it acceptable to have post-sale restrictions, it would now be okay for the patent owner to keep collecting a portion of sales for a very long time. Therefore, Mallinckrodt should be overruled and foreign sales with authorization must exhaust patent rights.

C. International Patent Exhaustion

International patent exhaustion could promote innovation. It allows for patented products to be sold lawfully anywhere in the world. This would give the manufacturers access to the best quality materials for best possible price. It would also give them a chance to come up with new and improved ideas to make patented products better and thereby promote innovation. The recent Lexmark decision, combines both Jazz Photo and Mallinckrodt to hinder such innovation. Lexmark is aimed at deterring domestic patent owners from benefitting multiple times from licensees and customers. However, it overlooks the economic disadvantages that it poses to business owners.

Therefore, this comment proposes to overrule Jazz Photo to the extent it ruled that a sale of a patented item outside the United States never gives rise to United States patent exhaustion. It also proposes to overrule Mallinckrodt, in light of Quanta Computer Inc., to the extent that it ruled that a sale of a patented article, when the sale is made under a restriction that is otherwise lawful and within the scope of the patent grant does not give rise to patent exhaustion.

V. Conclusion

Internationally, patent exhaustion is a complex doctrine. Patent exhaustion is based on a common-law doctrine, called first sale doctrine. International patent exhaustion is when the patent rights exhaust after an international sale.

This comment discussed the evolution of patent exhaustion doctrine and how it is at odds with the copyright exhaustion doctrine, which also evolved from the common law first-sale doctrine. One of the important cases discussed in this article is Jazz Photo, which the Court found that U.S. Patent rights are not exhausted by products of foreign provenance.\textsuperscript{141} This holding is contrary to the Court’s holding in Kirtsaeng.\textsuperscript{142} This comment also discussed the Federal Circuit’s decision in Mallinckrodt – in which the court held that a patentee could place post-sale restrictions on the patented product.\textsuperscript{143} This holding is at odds with the Court’s decision in Quanta Computers, where the Supreme Court held that the initial authorized sale of a patented item terminates all patent rights to that item.\textsuperscript{144} The Lexmark decision, at issue, combined both Jazz Photo and Mallinckrodt, expanded the scope of patent rights beyond what the United States Patent system intended.\textsuperscript{145}

\textsuperscript{141} Jazz Photo, 264 F.3d at 1094.
\textsuperscript{142} Kirtsaeng, 133 S.Ct. at 1351
\textsuperscript{143} Mallinckrodt, 976 F. 2d at 700.
\textsuperscript{144} Quanta Computer, 553 U.S. at 617
\textsuperscript{145} Lexmark, 816 F.3d at 735.
To address this dichotomy, this comment analyzed the drawbacks in the *Lexmark* decision and concluded that the Court should take up the *Lexmark* decision, and examine its impact on business owners. Moreover, this article recommends that the Court should remove the dichotomy and overrule *Jazz Photo* and *Mallinekrodt*. 