



“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 – 2022
- 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

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, in the Court of Federal Claims, and at the USPTO’s Patent Trial and Appeal Board. Addy has handled 90 federal district court cases and more than 90 appeals to the Federal Circuit.

Experienced in protecting and monetizing corporate intellectual asset portfolios, 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 pro-business. 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.

Meredith Addy is unique as a lawyer. She understands the ramifications of the matters at hand. She is strategic, informed, and willing to take good risks. At oral argument, she is persuasive, polished and professional. And Mimi is very easy to work with.

Jeff Salmon, Attorney
Jeffrey W. Salmon Law Firm, LLC
WiFi Smart Networks Pvt. Ltd.

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 Council for ten years and was a co-founder and the first president of the Richard Linn American Inn of Court, directed

Award & Honors (cont.)

Best Lawyers in America

- Patent Litigation and Patent Law, 2007 – 2022

Illinois Super Lawyers

- Top 10 Super Lawyers in Illinois 2008, 2015, 2016
- Top 50 Female Super Lawyers in Illinois, 2005–2020
- Top 100 Super Lawyers in Illinois 2005, 2008, 2010, 2014–2019

Intellectual Asset Management (IAM)

- IAM Strategy Global 300 – 2023–2024
- 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

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).

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

Addy created and writes the blog [Business De Novo](#), to generate conversations around the business of innovation and the importance of protecting it. She was a perennial editor of Claim Construction in the Federal Circuit, a publication of West LegalWorks, and is a frequent speaker at legal and industry events. She frequently teaches CLE-credit courses on patent litigation, and has written numerous articles and publications. Addy earned her B.A. in electrical engineering at Rice University, her J.D. at the University of Georgia Law School, and her M.B.A. from the University of Chicago's Booth School.

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

- *Swarm Technology LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.* (Fed. Cir.). Represent appellant patentee on appeal of adverse decision of the PTAB on a patent pertaining to system architecture.
- *Mozido, Inc. v. Apple* (Fed. Cir.). Represent appellant patentee on multiple appeals from PTAB decisions relating to patents on digital wallet technology.
- *PerDiemCo LLC v. NexTraQ LLC* (Fed. Cir.) Represent appellant patentee on appeal from Rule 12 dismissal holding the eight asserted patents, relating to geofencing and electronic logging technology, failed to satisfy 35 U.S.C § 101.
- *Fintiv, Inc. v. Apple Inc.* (Fed. Cir.). Represent appellant patentee on appeal from a PTAB decision relating a patent on digital wallet technology.
- *Fintiv, Inc. v. PayPal Holdings, Inc.* (Fed. Cir.). Represent appellant patentee on appeal of an adverse decision from the W.D. Texas on patent relating to digital wallet technology.
- *Google LLC v. Sonos, Inc.* (Fed. Cir.). Represent U.S. Inventors for Jobs as *amicus curiae* on appeal of a district court decision implementing patent laches.
- *Juniper Networks, Inc. v. Swarm Technology LLC* (Fed. Cir.). Represent appellee patentee on two appeals of two successful decisions of the PTAB on patents pertaining to system architecture.
- *Amazon.com, Inc. v. Swarm Technology LLC* (Fed. Cir.). Represent appellee patentee on appeal of a successful decision of the PTAB on a patent pertaining to system architecture.

Award & Honors (cont.)

- Life Science Star – Hatch-Waxman Litigation, 2012
- Life Science Star – Patent Strategy & Management, 2012

Faculty & CLE Instruction

- Featured faculty member in Patent Masters series sponsored by *IP Watchdog*, 2019-2021.
- Featured faculty member in ongoing series at the Practising Law Institute on patent litigation, 2014–2018.

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

Education

- JD *cum laude*, Univ. of Georgia School of Law

- *Fintiv, Inc. v. Apple Inc.* (Fed. Cir.). Represent appellant patentee on appeal of a decision of the W.D. of Texas finding non-infringement on summary judgment, where the accused device is the Apple Wallet.
- *Jump Rope Systems LLC v. Coulter Ventures LLC d/b/a Rogue Fitness* (S. Ct. 2022). Represented Fair Inventing Fund—a nonprofit inventor advocacy organization—as amicus curiae in support of Jump Rope’s petition for certiorari, asking the US Supreme Court do away with the Federal Circuit’s application of collateral estoppel to prevent a patent infringement suit brought on a patent previously held unpatentable at the PTAB and affirmed on appeal, because the “clear and convincing” standard required to invalidate a patent in the district court is materially higher than the “preponderance of evidence” standard applied in the PTAB.
- *Cooperative Entertainment, Inc. v. Kollektive Technology, Inc.* (Fed. Cir. 2022). Represented appellant on decision from N.D. Cal. dismissing our client’s patent relating to peer-to-peer content distribution as not satisfying 35 U.S.C. §101. In a precedential opinion, the Federal Circuit vacated and remanded, holding that the pleadings satisfied FRCP 12(b).
- *Wildcat Licensing WI LLC v. Atlas Copco and Assembly Systems, LLC, General Motors, LLC, Faurecia Automotive Seating, LLC and Magna Int’l Inc.* (Fed. Cir. 2022). Represented appellant on appeal of a decision where the PTAB invalidated two Reissue patents related to automotive component manufacturing.
- *Sisvel International S.A. v. Cradlepoint Inc., Dell Inc., Sierra Wireless, Inc. Thales DIS AIS Deutschland GmbH, ZTE Corp., & ZTE (USA) Inc.* (Fed. Cir. 2022). Represent appellee Thales DIS AIS in five appeals from successful *inter partes* reviews where the PTAB struck down the challenged claims relating to wireless solutions in cellular 3G systems.
- *Mexichem Amanco Holding S.A. v. Honeywell Int’l. Inc.* (Fed. Cir. 2020). Represented appellant on appeal of a decision of the PTAB upholding a patent related to hydrofluorocarbons (HFO) refrigerants in automobile air-conditioning systems. Settled.
- *Honeywell Int’l. Inc. v. Mexichem Amanco Holding S.A.* (Fed. Cir. 2020). Represented appellee on two appeals of PTAB decisions invalidating patents related to HFO refrigerants used in air-conditioning systems. Settled.
- *RideApp, Inc. v. Lyft, Inc., 20-1284* (Fed. Cir. 2020). Represented appellant on appeal of a summary judgment decision relating to section 112 indefiniteness regarding mobile applications for location tracking and ride hailing systems.
- *In re Fatigue Fracture Tech.* (Fed. Cir. 2020). Represented 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). Represented 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.

Education (cont.)

- 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

- *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 appellant 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 A. Mercado Ph.D. and Inventor Groups as amici curiae on petition for writ of certiorari in case about the proper application of 35 U.S.C. § 101.
- *Evolutionary Intelligence v. Sprint Nextel et al.* (Fed. Cir. 2017). Represented patentee on petition for writ of certiorari 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 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 PTAB 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 Federal 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 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 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 airline as appellee from judgment of noninfringement involving method for manufacturing e-passports. Case decided favorably for client.
 - *Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz* (Fed. Cir. 2009) (partially en banc). Successfully represented Sandoz on appeal resolving a long-standing Federal Circuit split on infringement of product-by-process claims. The Court ruled in favor of our client that the asserted product-by-process claims were not infringed, and resolved en banc the longstanding conflict, holding that product-by-process claims cannot be infringed by “products made by processes other than the one claimed.”

Representative Cases in the Trial Courts

- *DataCloud Techs, LLC v. Imperva, Inc.* (E.D. Tex.). Represent defendant in infringement action relating to patents for technologies including cloud-based hosting, web application firewall, products for web-based account roles and permissions, and email-based verification via SSL.
- *KP Innovations 2, LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd* (W.D. Tex.). Represent plaintiff patentee in infringement litigation on patent for smart phones.
- *DH International Ltd. v. Apple Inc.* (W.D. Tex.). Represent plaintiff patentee in infringement litigation on digital wallet technology.
- *Per Diem Co. LLC v. NexTraq LLC* (N.D. Ga.). Represent plaintiff patentee in infringement litigation on multiple patents relating to electronic logging technology.
- *Soteropoulos and Tadipatri v. Round Finance and FanCraze* (D.C. Del.). Represent plaintiffs alleging breach of fiduciary duties, intentional interference with a prospective economic advantage, conversion, fraud and unjust enrichment.
- *Gentex Corporation, et al. v. Meta Platforms Technologies, LLC 22-cv-08392* (N.D. Cal. 2022). Represent plaintiff Thales Visionix, Inc. in litigation against Meta for infringing five patents related to interactive gaming.
- *PerDiemCo. v. NexTraq, Inc.* (N.D. Ga.). Represent patentee on two multi-patent litigations having to do with geofencing and electronic logging devices (ELD) used in the trucking industry.
- Represented indemnitor in multiple patent litigations covering more than 20 patents relating to telecommunications equipment and asserted to be standard essential.
- *Centre de Recherche Medico Dentaire v. Digital Smile Design et al.* (S.D. Fla.). Represent patentee asserting a patent covering smile design systems.

-
- *PerDiemCo. v. RM Acquisition d/b/a Rand McNally* (N.D. Ill.). Represented patentee asserting geofencing and electronic logging devices (ELD).
 - *Thales Visionix, Inc. v. United States and Elbit Systems of America*. Represented defense contractor-plaintiff patentee before the Court of Federal Claims in litigation about technology supporting the inertial navigation system in pilot helmets in the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter.
 - *Triple T Enterprises v. KFC, Inc., Grubhub Inc., and Postmates Inc.* (D. Idaho). Represented 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.). Represented pharmaceutical company as creditor in adversarial action proceeding in bankruptcy court.
 - *PerDiemCo, LLC v. GPS Insight, LLC* (N.D. Ill.). Represented patentee on assertion that defendant infringed eight patents related to geofencing and electronic logging devices (ELD) used in the trucking industry.
 - *In re Aceto Corporation, et al.* (D. N.J. Bank.). Represented pharmaceutical company as creditor in bankruptcy proceeding.
 - *Gebo Cermex USA, Inc., et al v. ACMI USA, Inc.* (N.D. Ga.). 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). Represented pharmaceutical company in breach of contract action on several products.
 - *Gebo Cermex USA, Inc., et al. v. Alliance Industrial Corp.* (W.D. Va.). Represented 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 competitors who filed declaratory judgments.
 - *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). Represented publishing company as defendant in patent litigation on web page linking technology.
 - *Eli Lilly v. Sun Pharmaceuticals* (D. Ind. 2013). Represented a 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®.
 - *Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz* (N.D. Ill. 2007). Successfully represented defendant Sandoz on defense of Abbott's temporary restraining order to prevent the sale of cefdinir, the generic of the antibiotic Omnicef®. The district court ruled in favor of our client that the asserted product-by-process claims were not infringed.

Representative PTAB Litigation

- *FourSquare Labs, Inc. v. BoardActive Corp.* (PTAB). Represent patentee in defense of two patents relating to advanced content delivery based on geofencing.
- *Meta Platforms Inc. v. Thales Visionix, Inc.* Represent patentee Thales Visionix, Inc. in defense of eight *inter partes* reviews filed by Meta Platforms Technologies on Thales' portfolio of patents related to interactive gaming.
- *FourSquare Labs, Inc. v. BoardActive Corp.* (PTAB). Represent patentee in geofencing and advertising space on two IPRs filed against it.
- *Cradlepoint Inc., Dell Inc., Sierra Wireless, Inc. Thales DIS AIS Deutschland GmbH, ZTE Corp., & ZTE (USA) Inc. v. Sisvel International S.A.* (PTAB). Represent global technology provider Thales DIS AIS in fifteen *inter partes* reviews of various claims relating to wireless solutions in patents of patent assertion entity Sisvel and its affiliate 3G Licensing S.A.
- *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 pending). Represented respondent in *inter partes* review proceeding on patent for automotive part manufacturing process.
- *LinkedIn v. DiStefano Patent Trust III* (PTAB). Represented respondent in *inter partes* review proceeding on web page linking. The PTAB declined to institute IPR.
- *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). Represented patent owner in *inter partes* review on a patent for inertial navigation system.

Court Appts., Expert or Special Master; Arbitrations

- *Shimon Maimon v. Lockheed Martin Corporation*. Represent inventor Shimon Maimon of NetzVision in JAMS arbitration against Lockheed Martin Corporation for breach of IP licensing agreement and patent infringement relating to infrared sensor technology. Pending.
- *Nuance Communications, Inc. v. ABBYY Software House, Lexmark and eCopy, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. 2014). Appointed special master to develop reports and recommendations on the Court's orders re: claims and terms to be adjudicated in litigation involving multiple patents related to optical character recognition technology, 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

- Event Co-Chair. Discussion of Current State of Patent Litigation. Hosted conversation with Judge Ryan T. Holte, U.S. Court of Federal Claims. IPWatchdog Patent Masters Litigation 2022. 23–24 May 2022.
- Panelist. "Winning Alice and Mayo at the District Courts and on Appeal." IPWatchdog Patent Masters Litigation 2022. 23–24 May 2022.

-
- Presenter. “The PTAB Tomorrow: Top 5 Most Important Issues Facing the PTAB & New Director in 2022.” PTAB Masters 2022. IPWatchdog virtual conference. 24–27 Jan 2022.
 - Panelist. “*Alice v. Mayo*: Dissecting CAFC and District Court Handling of § 101 Absent Congressional Intervention.” IPWatchdog Patent Masters Litigation 2021. 7–10 Jun 2021.
 - Presenter. “Litigating in Parallel: Fighting on Multiple Fronts.” PTAB Masters 2021. IPWatchdog virtual conference. 22 Apr 2021.
 - Panelist. “Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit Practice.” IP Master Class: Strategies for the Federal Circuit, District Courts, ITC, and PTAB. Virtual Seminar at the University of Illinois Chicago Law School (formerly The John Marshall Law School). 16 Apr 2021.
 - Panelist. “Cross-border disputes and multinational litigation: Issues pertaining to strategic use of international post-grant proceedings, harmonization, discovery disputes, and global settlement/licensing.” Leahy Institute of Advanced Patent Studies at The Naples Roundtable (Virtual). 15–17 Feb 2021.
 - Panelist. “CAFC Past, Present and Future.” IPWatchdog CON2020 (Virtual). 7 Sep 2020.
 - “Alice at Age Four: Time to Grow Up.” *IP Watchdog* 18 Sep 2018.
 - Panelist with Bob Steinberg and John A. Dragseth. “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.
 - “Is There a Light at the End of the Alice Tunnel?” *IP Watchdog* 18 Feb 2018.
 - “A Surreal Endeavor: Asserting Patent Rights in the U.S.” *IP Watchdog* 15 Feb 2018.
 - “For a Trial Court Peering through the Looking Glass, Everything Appears Abstract.” *IP Watchdog* 26 Oct 2017.
 - “Confessions of a Frustrated Patent Attorney: The Telephone Call.” *IP Watchdog* 1 Oct 2017.
 - “Request for Amicus Support at Federal Circuit in *Evolutionary Intelligence v. Sprint Nextel Corp.*,” *IP Watchdog* 31 March 2017.

Media Mentions

- Shetty, Nisha. “Inventors, patent counsel alarmed about Sonos-Google prosecution laches appeal.” *Intellectual Asset Management*. 16 Apr 2024. Addresses negative impact on smaller patentees of reversal by a judge (N.D. Cal.) of a jury verdict favoring Sonos in a patent infringement dispute with Google, ruling that prosecution laches limits Sonos’s claims.
- “Standard Computer Equipment Can Support Inventive Concept under Alice Step 2.” *National Law Review* 6 Oct 2022. Addresses precedential ruling in AddyHart’s client’s favor in a case under § 101, *Cooperative Entertainment, Inc. v. Kollektive Technology, Inc.*, relating to peer-to-peer file-sharing for video and videogames.
- Karpan, Andrew. “Fed. Circ. Says Licensing Co.’s Software IP May Be Inventive.” *Law360* 28 Sep 2022. Addresses ruling in *Cooperative v. Kollektive*.

-
- Handler, Samantha. “Video Sharing Patent Infringement Case Revived by Appeals Court.” *Bloomberg Law* 28 Sep 2022. Addresses *Cooperative v. Collective*.
 - Crouch, Dennis. “Eligibility: Patent’s Claims of Inventive Concept Overcome Eligibility Dismissal.” *PatentlyO* 28 Sep 2022. Addresses *Cooperative v. Collective*.
 - Handler, Samantha. “Justices Reject Divisive Patent Eligibility Driveshaft Case.” *Bloomberg Law* 30 Jun 2022. Features Addy’s remarks after SCOTUS’s denial of petition for certiorari in *American Axle v. Neapco*.
 - Kass, Dani. “Women Arguing Far Fewer Patent Appeals for Companies Than Men.” *Law360* 23 Jun 2021. Features Addy as one of the top five private-sector attorneys arguing majority of patent appeals in nation’s highest courts.
 - 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

10 Glenlake Parkway
Suite 130
Atlanta, GA 30328

Austin

2025 Guadalupe Street
Suite 260
Austin, TX 78705

Chicago

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

Irvine

5151 California St.
Suite 100
Irvine, CA 92618