



*“When you ask Addy a difficult question, as we often do in oral arguments, she fires right back with a very crisp, clear answer that is totally responsive to the question. It’s factual and accurate and fair. The contrast with other attorneys is stark. Most other attorneys duck the questions. Addy answers them head-on.”*

The Hon. Paul R. Michel, Chief Judge (Ret.)  
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

**Practice Areas**

- Patent Litigation
- Appellate Representation
- *Inter partes* reviews (PTAB)
- Intellectual Asset Portfolio Management
- Pharmaceutical Litigation
- Technology Licensing

**Awards & Honors**

**Chambers USA**

- Chambers USA Band I, 2006 – 2020
- 2011 Intellectual Property Woman of the Year – Shortlisted

**Law360**

- The 10 Most Influential Women in IP Law, 2014
- Female Powerbrokers, 2014

**Law Bulletin Publishing Co.**

- 40 Attorneys Under 40 Hall of Fame, 2014
- 40 Illinois Attorneys Under Forty to Watch, 2004

**Best Lawyers in America**

- Patent Litigation and Patent Law, 2007 – 2020

Meredith Addy, co-founder of AddyHart P.C., is a deeply experienced intellectual property litigator who specializes in cases before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, in the federal district courts, and at the USPTO’s Patent Trial and Appeal Board. Addy has led 40 federal district court cases and more than 60 appeals to the Federal Circuit. Experienced in protecting and monetizing corporate intellectual asset portfolios, Addy in 2015 earned her M.B.A. from the University of Chicago’s Booth School.

Addy has spent her career counseling high-profile companies in the software, technology, biotechnology, and pharmaceutical industries. She focuses on developing and executing strategies to achieve the most efficient approach to realizing her clients’ IP goals. Her clients describe her as “an exceptionally skilled lawyer” and a “key figure, who knows the courts inside and out,” adding that she is “extremely probusiness. She really understands business and how it’s run.” (Chambers USA) Practicing in today’s highly complex technical environment, Addy has an innate ability to explain complex legal and technical issues to jurists and laypeople alike—an ability that in part depends on her training as an electrical engineer.

Addy has held high management positions at AmLaw100 firms and IP boutiques, including serving as office managing partner of the Chicago office of an AmLaw100 firm; serving as chair of the national patent litigation practice at another AmLaw100 firm; and serving as chair of the national appellate practice at one of the nation’s largest IP law firms. She has also served on firms’ Executive Committees and Boards of Directors.

Addy served on the Federal Circuit’s advisory counsel for ten years and was a cofounder and the first president of the Richard Linn American Inn of Court, directed to intellectual property. She also served on the Board of Directors for the Federal Circuit Bar Association and as chair and co-chair of the Amicus Committees for the American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA) and the Intellectual Property Law Association of Chicago (IPLAC).



meredith@addyhart.com | +1 312 320 4200

**Award & Honors (cont.)**

**Illinois Super Lawyers**

- Top 10 Super Lawyers in Illinois 2008, 2015, 2016
- Top 50 Female Super Lawyers in Illinois, 2005–2019
- Top 100 Super Lawyers in Illinois 2005, 2008, 2010, 2014–2019

**Intellectual Asset Management (IAM)**

- Patent Litigation 1000 (2014–2018)
- Patent Litigation 250 (2011, 2013)
- Top 20 Federal Circuit Practitioner
- Top 15 Illinois Patent Litigator, 2011
- Leading Patent Litigator, 2011

**Leading Lawyers Network**

- Top 10 Leading Women Intellectual Property Lawyers, 2015
- Top 10 Intellectual Property Lawyers, 2014
- Top 100 Women Lawyers, 2015
- Top 100 Women Business Lawyers, 2014–2015
- Top 250 Leading Business Lawyers, 2014

**250 Top Women in IP by IPmetrics LLC**

**Legal 500, 2007–2008**

**Managing Intellectual Property (MIP)**

- Top 250 Women in IP, 2013–2014, 2020–2021
- IP Stars. 2013–2016, 2020–2021
- Life Science Star – Patent Litigation, 2012
- Life Science Star – Hatch-Waxman Litigation, 2012
- Life Science Star – Patent Strategy & Management, 2012

During her 25+-year career in IP law, Addy has assisted district courts, appointed both as a Special Master under F.R.C.P. § 706, and as a Court-Appointed Expert under F.R.C.P. § 53 in handling various aspects of complex patent cases about technologies ranging from encryption to guided vehicles to medical devices, advising courts on all aspects of the discovery process; claim construction and patent validity; summary judgment proceedings; pre-trial proceedings, and trial.

Addy created and writes the blog [Business De Novo](#), to generate conversations around the business of innovation. She has been a long-standing editor of *Claim Construction in the Federal Circuit*, a publication of West LegalWorks, is a frequent speaker at legal and industry events, has taught CLE-credit courses on patent litigation, and has written numerous articles and publications.

**Representative Cases: U.S. Supreme Ct. and Federal Circuit**

- *In re Fatigue Fracture Tech.* (Fed. Cir. 2020). Represent Patent Owner on appeal of an adverse decision at the PTAB on an *ex parte reexamination* filed on a patent related to automotive equipment.
- *Navistar Inc. v. Fatigue Fracture Tech.* (Fed. Cir. 2019). Represent Patent Owner on appeal of an adverse decision at the PTAB in an *inter partes* review filed on a patent related to automotive manufacturing process.
- *Shure Incorporated v. Clear One, Inc.* (Fed. Cir. 2019). Represented patent challenger on appeal of an adverse PTAB decision relating to beamforming in microphones.
- *Athena Diagnostics v. Mayo Collaborative* (S.Ct. 2019). Represented *amicus curiae* in certiorari petition regarding Federal Circuit's treatment of diagnostics under 35 U.S.C. § 101.
- *Sophos v. RPost* (Fed. Cir. 2019). Represented RPost on appeal of a fee decision.
- *DiStefano Patent Trust III v. LinkedIn Corporation* (Fed. Cir. 2019). Represented patentee on appeal of a district court dismissal under 35 U.S.C. § 101.
- *Athena Diagnostics v. Mayo Collaborative* (Fed. Cir. 2018). Represented *amicus curiae* in brief requesting the court revisit the 35 U.S.C. § 101 decision en banc.
- *Sophos v. RPost* (Fed. Cir. 2018). Argued for patentee on appeal of an adverse district court validity decision.
- *TC Heartland LLC v. Kraft Foods Group Brands LLC* (S. Ct. 2017). Represented American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA) as *amicus curiae* on writ of certiorari about proper interpretation of patent venue statute 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b).
- *RecogniCorp, LLC. v. Nintendo Co., Ltd.* (S. Ct. 2017). Represented Raymond Mercado Ph.D. and Inventor Groups as *amicus curiae* on petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court in a case about the proper application of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

**Award & Honors (cont.)**

**Faculty & CLE Instruction**

- Featured faculty member in ongoing series at the Practising Law Institute on patent litigation, 2014–2018.
- Featured faculty member in Patent Masters series sponsored by *IP Watchdog*, 2019.

**Bar Admissions**

- Illinois
- Georgia
- District of Columbia
- U.S. Patent & Trademark Office

**Admissions to Courts**

- U.S. Supreme Court
- U.S. Ct. of Appeals for the Federal Circuit
- U.S. Ct. of Appeals for the Second Circuit
- U.S. Ct. of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit
- U.S. Ct. of Appeals for the Dist. of Columbia
- U.S. International Trade Commission
- U.S. Court of Federal Claims
- U.S. Dist. Ct. N.D. Ill. (member Trial Bar)
- U.S. Dist. Ct. N.D. Ga.
- Supreme Court of Georgia
- Supreme Court of Illinois
- Patent Trial and Appeal Board

- *Evolutionary Intelligence v. Sprint Nextel, et al.* (Fed. Cir. 2017). Represented patentee on petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court in case about the scope of analysis when determining patent-eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.
- *Synopsys v. Mentor Graphics* (S. Ct. 2017). Represented Intellectual Property Law Association of Chicago as *amicus curiae* on petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court in case about the scope of analysis when determining patent-eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.
- *Elbit Sys. Am. v. Thales Visionix, Inc.* (Fed. Cir. 2017). Represented defense contractor-patentee Thales Visionix as appellee on appeal from a favorable decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board holding that specific claims of its patents were not invalid based on prior art.
- *In re Openings dba Total Door* (Fed. Cir. 2017). Represented appellant manufacturer of industrial doors on appeal of an adverse decision of the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board that its proposed mark is functional.
- *Thales Visionix, Inc. v. Elbit Systems, Inc.* (Fed. Cir. 2017). Represented appellant defense contractor on successful appeal reversing the decision from the Court of Federal Claims that its patent was not valid as covering patent-ineligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.
- *HTC v. IPCom* (Fed. Cir. 2016). Represented patentee on appeal of an adverse decision by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board that its mobile technology patent is not valid.
- *Zoltek Corp. v. U.S.* (Fed. Cir. 2016). Represented materials company on successful appeal of an adverse decision of the Court of Claims that its patent on carbon fiber was not valid.
- *Continental Automotive Systems U.S., Inc. v. Schrader-Bridgeport International, Inc.* (Fed. Cir. 2014). Represented international automotive company on appeal from adverse decision of the PTAB.
- *Industrial Technology Research v. ITC* (Fed. Cir. 2013). Represented international electronics company on appeal from final determination of the U.S. International Trade Commission that patents are not infringed. Case was affirmed.
- *Allergan, Inc. v. Apotex* (Fed. Cir. 2013). Represented an international pharmaceutical company in appealing a district court decision finding infringement and validity of patents covering Latisse® treatment for thinning eyelashes.
- *AstraZeneca v. Sandoz* (Fed. Cir. 2013). Represented international pharmaceutical company in appeal of trial court determination that patents on Pulmicort Respules®, generic budesonide, are either invalid or not infringed.
- *Randall Mfg. v. Rea* (Fed. Cir. 2013). Represented manufacturing company in successful reversal of adverse reexamination determination by USPTO.
- *Iris Corporation v. Japan Airlines Int'l Co., Ltd.* (Fed. Cir. 2014). Represented international airline as appellee from judgment of noninfringement involving method for manufacturing e-passports. Case decided favorably for client.

#### Education

- JD *cum laude*, Univ. of Georgia School of Law
- BSEE, Rice University
- LLM with honors, Intellectual Property, John Marshall Law School, Chicago
- MBA, University of Chicago Booth School of Business

#### Professional Memberships

- Federal Circuit Advisory Council, 2004-2014
- Richard Linn American Inn of Court for IP (Chicago) – Co-Founder and First President, 2007-2009
- Federal Circuit Bar Association – Board of Directors, 2011-2017
- American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA) – Chair of Amicus Committee, 2007-2008

#### Board Memberships

- Art Sandy Springs (ArtSS), (2019-present)

#### Representative Cases in the Trial Courts

- Currently representing indemnitor in sixteen patent litigations covering more than 35 patents relating to telecommunications equipment and asserted to be standard essential.
- *Thales Visionix, Inc. v. United States and Elbit Systems of America* (C.F.C. pending). Represent defense contractor-plaintiff patentee before the Court of Federal Claims in litigation about technology supporting the inertial navigation system in the pilot helmets in the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter.
- *Triple T Enterprises v. KFC, Inc., Grubhub Inc., and Postmates Inc.*, (D. Idaho) (pending). Represent holder of Smoky Mountain family of trademarks in assertion of trademark infringement against fast food company and associated delivery companies.
- *Kavod Pharma. & Kavack Pharma. v. Apex Pharmaceuticals, Inc.* (D. N.J. Bank.) (pending). Represent pharmaceutical company as creditor in adversarial action proceeding in bankruptcy court.
- *In re Aceto Corporation, et al.* (D. N.J. Bank.) (pending). Represent pharmaceutical company as creditor in bankruptcy proceeding.
- *Gebo Cermex USA, Inc., et al v. ACMI USA, Inc.* (N.D. Ga.) (pending). Represented plaintiff patentee in enforcement of patent on manufacturing conveyor systems.
- *Apex Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Pack Pharmaceuticals, LLC and Rising Pharmaceuticals, Inc.* (Cir. Ct. Cook Cty. 2017). Represent pharmaceutical company in breach of contract action on several products.
- *Gebo Cermex USA, Inc., et al. v. Alliance Industrial Corp.* (W.D. Va.). Represent plaintiff patentee in enforcement of patent on manufacturing conveyor systems. Resolved favorably.
- *Synopsys, Inc. v. RPost Holdings Inc.* (N.D. Cal.). Represented provider of proprietary messaging platforms in asserting patents against competitor who filed declaratory judgment action.
- *Trend Micro, Inc. v. RPost Holdings Inc.* (N.D. Cal.), and *RPost Holdings Inc. v. Trend Micro, Inc.* (N.D. Cal.). Represented provider of proprietary messaging platforms in asserting patents against competitors who filed declaratory judgment action.
- *Veraseal LLC v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., et al.* (E.D. Tex.). Represented intervenor-defendant indemnitor in patent litigation about bottle and closure systems.
- *Gebo Cermex USA, Inc. v. Descon Conveyor Systems & Consultants Inc.* (N.D. Ga. 2018). Represented plaintiff patentee in enforcement of patent on manufacturing conveyor systems.
- *Watlow v. Continental Automotive Systems, Inc.* (E.D. Mo. 2016). Represented automotive supplier as defendant in patent litigation related to temperature sensors.
- *Cascades v. CCH, a Wolters Kluwer Company* (N.D. Ill. 2015). Represent publishing company as defendant in patent litigation on web page linking technology.

- *Eli Lilly v. Sun Pharmaceuticals* (D. Ind. 2013). Represented pharmaceutical company in district court litigation on drug for treating certain types of cancer.
- *APP Pharma v. Navinta* (D.N.J. 2012). Represented pharmaceutical company in patent litigation through preliminary injunction hearing related to Naropin® and generic ropivacaine hydrochloride.
- *Allergan v. Apotex, et al.* (M.D.N.C. 2012). Represented international pharmaceutical company in patent litigation through trial under the Hatch-Waxman Act related to bimatoprost, sold by Allergan as Latisse® for hypotrichosis.
- *Pfizer v. Sandoz Inc.* (D.N.J. 2011). Represented international pharmaceutical company in patent litigation under the Hatch-Waxman Act related to pregabalin, sold by Pfizer as Lyrica®. Case settled during trial.
- *Allergan v. Sandoz Inc.* (D. Del. 2011). Represented international pharmaceutical company in patent litigation through trial under the Hatch-Waxman Act related to bimatoprost, sold by Allergan as Lumigan® for glaucoma.
- *Novo Nordisk Inc., et al. v. Sandoz Inc.* (D.N.J. 2011) and *Sandoz Inc. v. Novo Nordisk, Incorporated, et al.* (E.D. Mich. 2011). Represented international pharmaceutical company in two successive patent infringement cases over the generic drug repaglinide, used in the treatment of Type 2 diabetes and sold by Novo Nordisk under the brand name Prandin®.

#### **Representative PTAB Litigations**

- *Alliance Indus. & ACMI Inc. v. Gebo Corp. et al.* (PTAB dismissed). Represented patent owner in defense of IPR Petition. The PTAB declined to institute IPR.
- *Navistar Inc. v. Fatigue Fracture Tech., LLC* (PTAB). Represented respondent in *inter partes* review proceeding on patent for automotive part manufacturing process.
- *LinkedIn v. DiStefano Patent Trust III* (PTAB dismissed). Successfully represented respondent in *inter partes* review proceeding on web page linking.
- *In re Fatigue Fracture Tech., LLC* (PTAB). Represented patent owner on appeal of defense of ex parte reexamination relating to automotive part technology.
- *Elbit Sys. U.S. v. Thales Visionix, Inc.* (PTAB) Successfully defended respondent in *inter partes* review on a patent for inertial navigation system.

#### **Court Appointments as Expert or Special Master**

- *Nuance Communications, Inc. v. ABBYY Software House, Lexmark and eCopy, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. 2014). Court-appointed special master in connection with preparing reports and recommendations (R&Rs) on court orders relating to claims and terms to be adjudicated in litigation involving multiple patents related to optical character recognition (OCR) technology. Prepared R&Rs on scheduling orders and submission of late prior art.

- 
- *Protegrity v. Ingrian Networks, Inc.* (D. Conn. 2013). Court-appointed technical advisor in database security case to assist court in decisions relating to litigation, including but not limited to discovery; claim construction; dispositive motions; explaining technologies at issue and the scope and content of asserted patents; prior art; procedures before the USPTO; and, explaining the function and operation of accused products.
  - *Urologix, Inc. v. Prostalund AB.* (E.D. Wis. 2003). Court-appointed assistant to the district court to prepare recommendations with respect to patent claim construction and summary judgment in patent litigation concerning a medical device. Reconsideration of the decision was denied.
  - *Omega Mfg. Corp. v. Valley Tissue Pkg.* (E.D. Wis. 2002). Court-appointed special master in connection with patent claim construction hearing. Prepared claim construction decision and recommendations adopted by the district court on discovery motions in patent litigation relating to packaging of paper products.
  - *Microelectronic Modules v. Maxim Integrated Prods.* (E.D. Wis., filed 2001). Court appointed expert in connection with the preparation of patent claim construction recommendations and summary judgment recommendations to the district court in patent litigation concerning electrical circuitry.
  - *Allen-Bradley Co. v. DataLink Techs.* (E.D. Wis. filed 1997). Court-appointed assistant to the district court in connection with preparation of recommendations regarding patent claim construction and summary judgment in complex patent litigation involving patents relating to programmable controllers for integrating multiple computer systems.
  - *HK Systems, Inc. v. Mannesmann Dematic Rapistan Corp.* (E.D. Wis. Filed 2000). Court-appointed expert assistant on claim construction issues and summary judgment motions on patents for automatic guided vehicles. Prepared recommendations on claim construction and multiple summary judgment motions.

#### Articles & Presentations

- Addy, Meredith Martin. "Alice at Age Four: Time to Grow Up." *IP Watchdog* 18 Sep 2018.
- Addy, Meredith Martin, Bob Steinberg and John A. Dragseth, panelists. "PTAB Endgame: The Final Written Decision, Rehearing and Appeals to the CAFC." A program of the Practising Law Institute. USPTO Post-Grant Patent Trials 2018. 16 May 2018 and 28 Sep 2018.
- Addy, Meredith Martin. "Is There a Light at the End of the Alice Tunnel?" *IP Watchdog* 18 Feb 2018.
- Addy, Meredith Martin. "A Surreal Endeavor: Asserting Patent Rights in the U.S." *IP Watchdog* 15 Feb 2018.
- Addy, Meredith Martin. "For a Trial Court Peering through the Looking Glass, Everything Appears Abstract." *IP Watchdog* 26 Oct 2017.

- 
- Addy, Meredith Martin. “Confessions of a Frustrated Patent Attorney: The Telephone Call.” *IP Watchdog* 1 Oct 2017.
  - Addy, Meredith Martin. “Request for Amicus Support at Federal Circuit in *Evolutionary Intelligence v. Sprint Nextel Corp.*,” *IP Watchdog* 31 March 2017.

#### Media Mentions

- Hattenbach, Benjamin and Rosalyn Kautz. “A Recurring Problem In Patentability of Computer Software.” *Law360* 22 Feb 2018.
- Schaffer, Robert and Joseph Robinson. “CAFC says PTAB Entitled to Weigh the Credibility of Experts, Ignore Attorney Argument.” *IP Watchdog* 18 Feb 2018.
- Brachman, Steve. “Federal Circuit Upholds Thales Motion-Tracking Patent Asserted against U.S. Government for Second Time.” *IP Watchdog* 13 Feb 2018.
- Penton, Kevin. “Federal Circ. Upholds Validity of Motion Tracking IP.” *Law360* 6 Feb 2018.
- Marsh, Richard and Braden Katterheinrich. “New Fed. Circ. Guidance for Patenting Software Inventions.” *Law360* 26 Jan 2018.
- Ashery, Lawrence E. “The Hottest Patent Law Issues of 2017.” *Law360* 2 Jan 2018.
- Schecter, Manny. “Through the Looking Glass: Recent Federal Circuit Decisions Do Not Change the Need for Action on Alice.” *IP Watchdog* 11 May 2017.
- “Heads Up! That’s Patentable Subject Matter: *Thales Visionix Inc. v. U.S.*” *National Law Review* 1 May 2017.
- “Federal Circuit reverses fighter jet patent suit against US.” *World IP Review (WIPR)* 9 Mar 2017.
- McDermott, Will & Emery. (Analysis). “Federal Circuit Reverses Fighter Jet Patent Suit Against US.” *Defense-Aerospace.com* 9 Mar 2017.
- Davis, Ryan. “Fed. Circ. Reverses Alice Win for US in F-35 Helmet Case.” *Law360* 8 Mar 2017.
- Borella, Michael. “*Thales Visionix Inc. v. U.S. Fed. Circ. (2017)*: Federal Circuit Finds Motion Tracking System to be Patent-Eligible.” *PatentDocs* 9 Mar 2017.
- “Patent Litigator and Appellate Attorney Meredith Martin Addy Jumps to Litigation Boutique Tabet DiVito & Rothstein.” *EconoTimes* 4 May 2016.
- Hoover, Jimmy. “F-35 Helmet Tech Not Invalid Under Alice, Fed. Circ. Hears.” *Law360* 2 Nov 2016.
- Hoover, Jimmy. “DOD, Elbit Accused of Distorting Alice Test on Tracker System.” *Law360* 1 Jun 2016.
- Hoover, Jimmy. “DOD Urges Fed. Cir. to Uphold Toss of F-35 Patent Suit.” *Law360* 2 May 2016.
- DiMora, Alfred J. “The Case of *Evolutionary Intelligence, LLC vs. Apple, Facebook, Sprint, Yelp, Twitter, et al.*” *LinkedIn Pulse* 9 May 2017.
- “Improved Computer Functionality Argument Fails 101 Eligibility Test in *Evolutionary Intelligence*.” Patent 213.

- 
- Griffis, Kelcee. “Fed. Circ. Urged to Rehear Apple, Facebook IP Suit.” *Law360* 20 Apr 2017.
  - Daniels, Melissa. “Fed. Circ. Won’t Rehear Apple, Facebook IP Suit.” *Law360* 24 May 2017.
  - Mealey’s. “Trademark Applicant Tells Federal Circuit Design Is Not Functional.” *Lexis Legal News* 15 Sep 2017.



**Atlanta**

[inquiry@addyhart.com](mailto:inquiry@addyhart.com)

10 Glenlake Parkway  
Suite 130  
Atlanta, GA 30328

**Chicago**

[inquiry@addyhart.com](mailto:inquiry@addyhart.com)

101 N. Michigan Ave.  
Suite 1200-1  
Chicago, IL 60611

**Irvine**

[inquiry@addyhart.com](mailto:inquiry@addyhart.com)

15 Hubble  
Suite 200  
Irvine, CA 92618