IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS FOUNDATION,

Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant,

BLONDER-TONGUE LABORATORIES, INC.,

U.

V -

Defendant and Counterclaimant,

Civil Action

No. 66 C 567

JFD ELECTRONICS CORPORATION,

Counterclaim Defendant.

BRIEF IN ADVANCE OF TRIAL OF DEFENDANT AND COUNTERCLAIMANT, BLONDER-TONGUE LABORATORIES, INC.

INTRODUCTION - THE PARTIES AND ISSUES

Plaintiff, The University of Illinois Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation"), as the owner of U. S. Letters Patent No. 3,210,767 issued October 5, 1965, to Dwight E. Isbell and Reisaue Patent No. 25,740 issued March 9, 1951, to Paul E. Mayes and Robert L. Carrel, has October 3, brought suit against defendant; a New Jersey corporation, Blonder-Tongue Laboratories, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as "BT"), for alleged infringement by the acts of manufacture and sale of television home-receiving antennas. This suit was commenced pursuant to an agreement between the Foundation and JFD Electronics Corporation (hereinafter referred to as "JFD"), under which JFD was granted the exclusive license rights under the Isbell and Mayes et al patents to manufacture and sell such antennas. *Low letters*

Defendant, BT, although not having a place of business or its residence within the jurisdiction of this Court, voluntarily consented to jurisdiction; and counterclaimed against the Foundation for a declaratory judgment that said p patents are invalid, void, uninfringed and unenforceable.

In its counterclaim, BT joined JFD as a second counterclaim defendant and included counts for unfair competition and antitrust violations in which the Foundation was joined, and for infringement of BT's own antenna patent 3,259,-904 issued to Isaac S. Blonder and Abraham Schenfeld. Muy 5,1966

It is the above issues that are before this Court for trial.

The Isbell and Mayes et al Patents

- 2.-

As defenses to the Foundation's suit for patent infringement (and in support of BT's countaring declaratory judgement count) relating to the same), BT shall endeavor to demonstrate, among other reasons for invalidity, non-infringement and unenforceability, the following: The subject matter of the claims of the Isbell patent No. 3,210,767 was described in a printed publication* published more than one year prior to the May 3, 1960, date of **pub** application for said patent in contravention of Sec. 102 of Title 35, United States Code [35 U.S.C. 102(b)].

이 이 아파 영화

1.

2.

3.

The antennas of BT do not employ the substantially coplanar or collinear structure of antenna elements specifically provided for in the claims of each of the Isbell and Mayes et al patents but, rather, employ the spaced vertical plane arrangement for which the U. S. Patent Office granted the Blonder et al patent 3,259,904 to BT, wherefor no infringement of the Isbell and Mayes et al patents exists.

The subject matter of the claims of the Isbell and Mayes et al patents was fully anticipated by prior art and, if any differences existed therein from such prior art, they were of the type that were clearly obvious to one skilled in the art and thus the patents were issued in contravention of 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103.

Antenna Laboratory Quarterly Engineering Report No. 2, "Research Studies On Problems Related to ECM Antennas," Electrical Engineering Research ;Laboratory; University of Illyinois, Urbana, Illinois, dated 31 March 1959. With regard further to the Mayes et al patent, the alleged inventors did not themselves invent the subject matter of the claims of this patent, but derived the same from another*, such that the patent was granted further in contravention of 35 U.S.C. 102(f) and 103.

그 같은 사람은 가슴을 가지?

网络全国新闻 医白癜

4.

5.

6.

The Mayes et al patent is further invalid for double-patenting and for having been reissued contrary to the grounds provided for by statute for reissue patents, 35 U.S.C. 251.

Both the Isbell and Mayes et al patents are unenforceable in view of the unclean hands of the Foundation and its exclusive licensee, JFD, not only in connection with the acts of unfair competition and antitrust violation hereinafter summarized, but further because the Mayes et al reissue patent (and the original patent therefor) was procured by the Foundation presenting to the Patent Office deceptive and misleadning evidence

* At least from one Edwin M. Turner of Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio.

- 4 -

to the effect that the earlier work of Dwight E. Isbell was not a part of the prior art; whereas it was in fact a part of the prior art and had been described in printed publications* more than one year before the Mayes et al filing date. As a result, the Patent Office dropped the earlier work of Isbell from consideration as prior art against Mayes et al. which it otherwise would not have done, and was thereby influenced to grant said original and reissue patents. Because the Foundation and the alleged inventors knew the pertinent facts, or should have known them, they have come into court with unclean hands and are not entitled to enforce such patent, and the patent is invalid. Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co., 322 U.S. 238 (1944); Precision Instrument Mnf. Co. v. Automotive Maintenance Machinery Co., 324 U.S. 806 (1945); Walker Equip Process Equipment, Inc. v. Food Machinery and Chemical Corp., 322 U.S. 172 (1965).

알람이 만들었던 방법을 모양 성방을 보는

* Including report of footnote, a page 1, and Antenna Laboratory Technical Report No. 39, "Log Periodic Dipole Arrays," Electrical Engineering Research Laboratory, Urbana, Illinois. The defendant BT is thus entitled to judgment (1) that the Isbell and Mayes et al patents are invalid and void; (2) that even had they been otherwise valid, they are not enforceable against BT as a result of the unclean hands of the Foundation and JFD; and (3) that in any event, said patents have not been infringed by BT.

BT'S COUNTERCLAIMS

(A. Unfair Competition (B. Antitrust (C. BT Patent Infringement)

At the trial of the issues of the counterclaims, BT will endeavor to provide prove acts of unfair competition of the Foundation and JFD (that also bear upon the unclean hands matter, supra), including acts that further constitute a violation of

the antitrust laws, and acts of infringement of the BT antenna patnet 3,259,904, as well.

A. Unfair Competition

Via

With regard to unfair competition, the conspiracy and actions in pursuance thereof by the Foundation and JFD will be shown, unlawfully to dissuade BT's customers and potential customers from purchasing BT antennas, by individual and joint acts including circulating false and/or misleading news releases, advertising, announcements to the trade, threats and statements with regard to litigation, the right of BT to market so-called

Juillbe Alamon Rat

"log-periodic" antennas, the scope of the patents in suit - all to the irreparable injury of BT.

ma

Further to prevent competition from BT, it will be shown that JFD deliberately hired away from BT the head af and key sales manager of the BT antenna program and at a time // (after the filing of this suit against BT) when said program head was investigating, on behalf of BT, the unfair competition and antitrust activities of JFD that were impeding the sale of BT antennas in the market place.

B. Antitrust

Though the last-named act has hampered BT in its proofs, it is expected what this case will be well documented and otherwise proven.

The above mentioned acts in restraint of competition, particularly in the **kgi** light of the fact that JFD is among the largest manufacturers of said antennas in the country, coupled with mis use of the Foundation⁵ Isbell and Mayes et al patents for purposes of securing tie-in sales not covered by those patents, farxparpage constitute clear violations of the antitrust laws (150 U.S.C. 1, 14, 15).

C. BT Patent Infringement

And with regard to the BT patent 3,259,904 itself, it will be shown that this patent covers a highly unobvious

- 7 -

improvement, <u>contrary</u> to the complanar antenna element teachings of the still shell and Mayes et al patents and the then-known art relating to "log-periodic" antennas - an improvement that thus constitutes highly patentable invention, and that JFD chose widely to copy and incorporate into its antenna line following the appearance of the BT antennas on the market.

WHEREFORE, it is believed that counterclaimant BT is entitled to an injunction restraining the acts of unfair competition, antitrust violation and patent infringement complained of in the counterclaim; and, in view of the wanton character of the illegal conduct of the Foundation and JFD, triple damages gand attorneys' fees, as provided for by **xxx** statute, together with such other and further relief as may seem proper to this Court.

HOFGREN, WEGNER, ALLEN, STELLMAN & MCCORD

Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant

OF COUNSEL:

Rines and Rines Robert H. Rines David Rines No. Ten Post Office Square Boston, Massachusetts 02109

- 8 -

By

Manis, Ha, Jun allen Jun allen Con Juic Mullius) Sem- april Le: BT- Brief In Advanced Dried Dear John -Finished this on the angelance an armanling it byour, Feel free D modety-Will he reachable (lig mesage Thui Mr. Hauston Branch [813-0×5-310] will Tues ene ~~ & then I'll be arining Tuesen & Well he there Wed) Curdials Billines @ Hamings todge - Everylades Watt Park, Fla,

In The United Stales Nexture Courd For the Northern Vertury of Pelenoes Eastern Junion The Uncurity of Illenaes Houndation Plaintiffand Coenterclaim Defendant, CurlActur NO. 660 567 Blorder-Tonque Caboratories, Inc. Defendant and Courtes clausant, JED Electronics Carporation, Counterclaim Depordant) Brief In advance of Trial of Dependant and Coenterclainens, Blorder-Tonque Caluratories, Inc. Introduction- the Porties and Issues Plaintiff, The University of Delinoies Foundation (hereinofter No. 3 210, 767 to Duephr E. Tabell and Reissue Patent No. 25, 740 To Taul E. Mares and Robert L. Canel, has braught sur against a new Jensey conferation, Defendant Blender-Tongue Caboratories, The for alleged infrigment

(2)ley the ware factor and rale of television home necessing antennas. This next was commenced pursuant to an agreement between the Freundation and JFD Electronic Conferation (bereinathe referred bas" JFD"), under which JFD was graviled the exclusive leverise reputs under the I shell and Mayeser al patents to manufacture and sell such astennas. Referdant, BT, although not having a place of luciners or its residence wettern the foundection of thes Coeris, volumanily consented & jundection and counterclaimed acpoint the Jourdation for a declaratory programme That said patents are invalid, void, uninfringehand unenforcedle. In the counterclaim, BT joined JED as a second counterclaim dependant and included counts for impair competition and anti-trust inolations in which the toundation was yound, and for infungement of BT's own artenna patent 3, 259, 904 usued to Isaac . Alender and aleraham Schemifeld. It is the above issues that are defore this Court fortice. The Isbell and Mayes eral Patents as defenses to the foundation's suit for patent informent and in nepport of BT's countering declaratory judgment county relating to the same, BT shall

endlavor & demonstrate, among other reasons for invalidity, nen-infungineur and unenfaceabulety, the feelowing: . The subject matter of the claims of the Tabell patent No. 3, 210, 767 was described in a printed publication published marthan me year prior & the May 3, 1960 date of application for said vacent in contramention of Sec. 102 of Title 35, United States Code [354.5c. 102(b)] 2. The antennas of BT do not employ the rulinatual coplanar or co-linear structure of antenna elements specifically provided for in the claims of the and mayes order Isbell patents, livet, rather, employ the spaced vertical-plane anangement for whech the U.S. Valent appeile granted Blonder et al potent 3,259,904 to BT, whilefor no infingement d the Isbell and Mayes et al patents exists. 3. The subject matter of the claims of the Tabell patents was fully annupated by prior and, if any defferences exected therein not from such priorand, they were of the type that would revealed obvious to one sralled in the art and three incontravention of 354. S.C. 102 and 103 the patents were usued Antenna Laboratory Druarterly Engineering Repair IV0. 2," Research Studies On Pullens Related TO ECM antennas, "Electrical Engineering Researce Cabaratory.

G

Ø 4. With rejard fertilien to the Mayes et al patent, alleged innertors ded not themselves inverse the rulyist matter of the claims of this patent, leut derived the same from another suchthar the patent was granted further in contranention of 35415. C. (07 (f) and 103 5. The mayser al yetter is further moded for double-pattenting one earlier and for baring been reissied contrary to the grounds provided for by roaterte forrecanne 6. Both the Tokelland Wayes et al patents are unerforceable for the sea in men of the unclean hands of the foundation and its exclusive lecisce, JFD, Nor only in conviction with the acts of unfair competition and antitrust violation bereinagter summarized, best further because tooth the Mayes and reissice patent (and the original patent therefor) was procured by the Foundation presenting to the Vateno Ceffice deceptine and misleading

Our lears from one Eduin M. Turner of Wright Patterion an Force Base, Dayton, ohio.

(5)endevie to the effect that the earlies work of Dingur E. Ishell was not a part of the prior ant; whereas it was in fair a part of the prior and had been described in printed publications more than one year before the Mayeset al filing date, Asganesult, the Patent Office dropped the earlier work of Tabell from consideration as prior and against Mayes et al , where it othermise would not Vane done, and was therely influenced to grant said original and reissue potents, Because the Joendation and the celleged investors men the pertinent facts, or should have known them, they bare come with course with unclean bands (for thespeaning) and are not entitled & enforce such ysterit, and the patent is invalid. Hazel-atlas glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co., 322U.S. 238 (1944); Precision Instrument Mart. Co. V. automotive Maintenance Madrinery Co., 324 4.5. 806 (1945); Walter Process Equipment, Inc. V. Food machinery and Chemical Corp- 3224.5. 172 (1965) (2) Triclerding report of footnote 1 and Centenna Caborator Technical Plepart Ho. 39, "Log Ponodie Depole anays" Electrical Ergeneering Kescarch aboratory Urbana, Illinois.

6 VAL Rependent BT is thus entitled & judgmint (1) that the Isbell and Mays et al patents are invalid and void, (2) that even had they been atterinese valid, They are not enforceable against BT as a result of the unclean totog hands of the taundation and JED; and (3) that in any evens, said patents bare not been infringed ley BT. A. Alarfair Competition B. arte-Trust C. BT-Palent Infigurent BT's counter claims at the trial of the issues of the counterdains; BT well endeavor to prove acts of impair competition of the Idendation and JFD (that also bear upon the unclean hands matter supra) including acts that purther acts of an includion of the anti-trien laws, acts of infungiment of the BI antenna patent 3, 259,904, as well. A. unjan Complitum, H. unjan Complitum, and the regard to emparic complitution, the conspinant by the Foundation and JED, imlanfully to dissuade BT suntomers and potential centomers from perchasing BT antennas ling circulating false and / an misleading newspileases advertising and statements with regard to litegation and the right of BT to market "ling-periodice" antennas the support of BT, with be support the patents in the trade

 $(\overline{7})$ to the isropasable injury of BT. Further to prevent competition from BT, it will be shown that JFD deliberately hired away from BT the head of the BT artenna propan at a time (after the filing of the suit agama BT) when raid head was innestigating the impair competition and anti- trust admitics of JFD on behalf of BT that were impeding the pale of BT antennas in the warket place Thoughthe last - named act bas bampined BT in its profs, it is expected that this case will be well documented and attenuise pronen The above - mentionned acts in restains of competition, particularly in the leght of the face that JFD is among the largers of raid antennas in the country coupled with mis-use of the Formdation sales not covered by those patents, constitute clean here of the sections that we delineated both JPD - Rep C. BT-Patent (1505C1, 14, 15) Rand mitch regard to the BT patent 3, 259, 904 itself infurement, centrary to the teaching of the Jaheel and Mays et al patents and the then-known art relating to "log-periodic" artennas -- an improvement that

Thus constitutes shipply patenoable invention, and that JFD chose to copy and incorporate into its artennes line fallowing the appearance of the BT anternas on # the marter. Whenfor it is helieved that Conviendament BT is entitled to an injunction rectraming the acts of emplain completition and trust molation and palerer infinition complemed of and, in income of the wanton character of the illegal conduct of the foundation and JED, triple damages and altomas fees, as promided for ley statute, Toyether with withouther and further relieve as may seen proper & this Count. Herperifield undernatted, Holgen, Wenner, allen, Station & Milad alloning for Defendant and Counter claimont OF Councel Renes + Rines Robert Kines Dand Rines No. 10 Port Office Spring Borton G. Massaduretto 02109