



**LegalMetric District Report
South Carolina District Court
in Patent Cases**

January 1991-August 2015

This report contains confidential and proprietary information of LegalMetric, Inc. Use of this information by anyone other than the purchaser or, if the purchaser is a law firm, the purchaser's client, or disclosure of this information to persons other than the purchaser or, if the purchaser is a law firm, the purchaser's client, without the consent of LegalMetric, Inc. is prohibited.

The information contained in this report is obtained from the official docket records of the federal courts. No attempt has been made to correct that data. For example, cases may be misclassified in the official docket records. In addition, cases are classified only by the primary cause of action. Cases having multiple causes of action are analyzed only under the primary cause of action identified on the official court docket.

LegalMetric, Inc. is not a law firm, does not provide legal advice, and is not engaged in the practice of law. No attorney-client relationship exists between LegalMetric, Inc. and any user of its products. LegalMetric provides statistical and analytical information to anyone who desires to purchase that information. Any purchaser of LegalMetric products who wants legal advice should hire an attorney.

Overview


This report covers the patent cases of the active judges in the South Carolina District Court as of August 2015 (the date of the most recent LegalMetric docket download for this court). Cases of inactive judges are not included.

The number of cases, judgments, contested judgments, and trials for this court are shown below.

	Number
Total Cases	249
Open Cases	10
Closed Cases	239
Judgments	49
Contested Judgmnts	26
Trials	10
Bench	5
Jury	5

The overall win rate, contested win rate, and trial win rate for the patentee are shown below. Note that contested win rate does not include consent and default judgments.


	Pat. Win Rate
Overall	59.2
Contested	26.9
Trial	40.0
Bench	20.0
Jury	60.0



The average times to termination for all cases, for all cases terminated by judgment, for all contested judgments, and for all cases terminated by trials are shown below.

	Months
All Cases	12.8
Judgments	19.3
Contested	24.3
Trial	27.1
Bench	30.6
Jury	23.6

Average Time to Termination by Judgment



Larger Version in Body of Report

The average and median award amounts for this district are:

Average: \$607,916
Median: \$42,260


Appeals:

	Number of Appeals	Complete Affirmance Rate
Total	18	58.3

Motions and Claim Construction:

The win rates on various motions for the district (if any), along with the number of decisions and the number of claim construction decisions are shown below.


Win Rates on Contested Motions



	Win Rate
Preliminary Injunction	9.1
Stay Pending Reexam	72.7
Summary Judgment	37.7
Transfer	44.0
TRO	33.3

	Number of Decisions
Claim Construction	19
Preliminary Injunction	11
Stay Pending Reexam	11
Summary Judgment	77
Transfer	25
TRO	3

Number of Decisions



Home Field Advantage?


The plaintiff and defendant contested win rates in South Carolina District Court are shown below, broken out by party location:

(Away - Plaintiff and Defendant (neither side located in the forum), Defendant Local - Plaintiff Away (only defendant located in the forum), Local - Plaintiff and Defendant (both sides located in the forum) and Plaintiff Local - Defendant Away (plaintiff local - defendant not).


Not all courts fit the expected pattern of favoring local plaintiffs. Many courts in fact show a distinct preference for non-local plaintiffs.

The win rate charts are followed by a chart illustrating the fractions of contested judgment cases (cases in which a judgment is entered in favor of a party, but excluding consent and default judgments) for each category (all local plaintiffs, etc.). Many well-known patent venues tend to have a large segment of cases in the "Away - Plaintiff and Defendant" category.


Plaintiff Win Rate, by Party Location



Defendant Win Rate, by Party Location




Fraction of Contested Judgments, by Party Location



Breakdown by Division

The breakdown of patent cases by division is illustrated in the following chart:


Total Patent Cases, by Division



Breakdown by Case Outcome

The breakdown of patent cases by case outcome is illustrated in the following chart:


Case Outcomes by Type



Breakdown by Judge

The chart and table below illustrates the total number of patent cases for each of the active judges in the district. In addition, the table shows the number of patent cases for the past three years assigned to each judge.


Number of Cases, by Judge




	All Cases	Last Three Years
District	249	32
Anderson	42	0
Austin	1	0
Blatt	5	2
Cain	5	1
Childs	10	7
Currie	26	1
Duffy	6	2
Floyd	15	0
Gergel	12	5
Harwell	18	4
Hendricks	2	2
Herlong	35	0
Houck	8	0
Lewis	5	3
Norton	7	1
Seymour	21	3
Wooten	31	1

Divisional Comparisons


The overall patentee case win rate (includes consent and default judgments), contested win rate (does NOT include consent and default judgments), trial win rate, complete affirmance rate (appeals affirmed with no other action, divided by the total number of appeals except for dismissed and pending appeals), and average time to termination by judgment (includes consent and default judgments) are shown below for each division.



	Complete Aff. Rate/ Number of Appeals	
District	58.3	12
Charleston	100.0	1
Columbia	40.0	5
Greenville	60.0	5
Spartanburg	100.0	1




	Time to Term./ Number of Judgmts.	
District	19.3	49
Anderson/Green	9.7	2
Charleston	14.6	7
Columbia	31.1	13
Florence	18.0	8
Greenville	15.8	12
Orangeburg	7.4	1
Spartanburg	13.6	6



What are the Odds: Termination by Judgment

The percentage of closed patent cases terminated by judgment are shown in the chart to the right. Terminations by judgments include terminations resulting from trials, from dispositive summary judgment motions, from involuntary dismissals, from consent judgments, and from default judgments.




The number of judgments by each outcome, the overall patentee win rate, the contested patentee win rate, and the trial win rate for each outcome are shown below. Note that the overall win rate includes consent and default judgments, whereas the contested win rate does not include consent and default judgments. The figures given are for "patentees", rather than "plaintiffs". These figures take into account those declaratory judgment cases where the plaintiff is not the patentee.


	Number of Judgments	Overall Win Rate	Contested Win Rate	Trial Win Rate
Bench Trial	5	20.0	20.0	20.0
Consent Judgment	19	94.7		
Default Judgment	4	100.0		
Involuntary Dismissal	3	0.0	0.0	
Jury Verdict	5	60.0	60.0	60.0
Summary Judgment	13	23.1	23.1	

Win Rates by Year

The following chart shows the patentee overall win rate and contested win rate for the active judges in the South Carolina District Court by year. The overall win rate should be compared with the historical nationwide overall win rate of 59%, and the contested win rate should be compared with the historical nationwide patentee contested win rate of 25.1%. A chart with a considerable amount of "jitter" reflects relatively few data points. Note that the contested win rates are usually much lower than the overall win rates since they exclude consent and default judgments.



The total number of terminations by judgment per year by the currently active judges during the same period in the South Carolina District Court is shown in the following chart:




The actual number of judgments, number of patentee "wins", and the corresponding win rates are shown below. In this report, a judgment entered in favor of both the plaintiff and the defendant on their respective patent infringement claims is counted as "1/2" a win for each party. This could happen, for example, where the plaintiff files a patent infringement action, the defendant files a patent infringement counterclaim on its own patents, and both prevail on their respective claims.

	Patentee Wins	Total Decisions	Patentee Win Rate
1994	1	1	100.0
1995	2	2	100.0
1996	1	1	100.0
1997	1	2	50.0
1998	4	4	100.0
1999	1	2	50.0
2000	0	1	0.0
2001	2	2	100.0
2002	4	4	100.0
2004	2	4	50.0
2005	3	4	75.0
2006	1	5	20.0
2007	2	6	33.3
2008	0	1	0.0
2009	3	4	75.0
2011	2	2	100.0
2012	0	2	0.0
2013	0	1	0.0
2014	0	1	0.0

Patentee Overall and Contested Win Rates: By Judge


The overall patentee win rate varies significantly from judge to judge over the period covered by this report. The chart below illustrates these win rates for these judges. The win rate for judges with no terminations by judgment is left blank.

Patentee Overall Win Rate: By Judge



The patentee contested win rate for these judges is shown below. Note that contested win rates do not include consent and default judgments. The win rate for judges with no contested judgments is left blank.

Patentee Contested Win Rate: By Judge




The table below includes the patentee overall and contested win rates for each active judge, along with the number of terminations by judgment and by contested judgment by that judge in patent cases during the period covered by this report.


	Overall Win Rate	Number of Judgments	Contested Win Rate	Contested Judgments
Total	59.2	49	26.9	26
Anderson	100.0	7	100.0	3
Austin		0		0
Blatt		0		0
Cain		0		0
Childs		0		0
Currie	33.3	12	0.0	8
Duffy	0.0	2	0.0	1
Floyd	100.0	1	100.0	1
Gergel	100.0	2		0
Harwell	66.7	3	50.0	2
Hendricks		0		0
Herlong	55.6	9	20.0	5
Houck	100.0	1		0
Lewis		0		0
Norton	33.3	3	0.0	2
Seymour	33.3	3	33.3	3
Wooten	83.3	6	0.0	1

How Long? Time to Termination

The average time from case filing to termination for all closed cases, for all cases terminated by judgment, for all cases terminated by contested judgment, and for all cases terminated by trial covered by this report are shown below.




The average time from case filing to termination for all closed cases by year, for all cases terminated by judgment, for all cases terminated by contested judgment, and for all cases terminated by trial covered by this report are shown below.



Time to Contested Judgment: By Judge

The average time from case filing to contested judgment for the active judges in this district is shown in the chart below.


Average Time to Contested Judgment: By Judge




Average Time to Termination by Case Outcomes

The number of cases terminated by each outcome for the active judges in this district is shown in the chart below, and the average time to termination for each outcome is shown in the second chart below.

Case Outcomes




Average Time to Termination by Outcome



Termination by Month of Litigation

An overview of when terminations typically occur is found in the following chart, which shows the number of patent cases in the South Carolina District Court that were terminated each month of litigation. The first month of litigation is labeled "1", etc. Months with no case terminations are omitted from the chart.


Closed Cases Each Month



Average Pendency for All Cases: By Judge

The variation in pendency for all closed cases is shown below.


Average Time to Termination for All Cases



Average Pendency for Cases Terminated by Judgment: By Judge

The variation in pendency for all cases terminated by judgment is shown below.


Average Time to Termination by Judgment



Average Pendency for Cases Terminated by Contested Judgment: By Judge

The variation in pendency for all cases terminated by contested judgment is shown below.

Average Time to Termination by Contested Judgment



Case and Judgment Outcomes


The number of outcomes by judgment, the patentee win rate for those outcomes, and the average time to termination for those outcomes for this court are shown below, broken out by type of outcome.

	Number of Judgments	Pat. Win Rate	Average Time to Termination
Total	49	59.2	19.3
Bench Trial	5	20.0	30.6
Consent Judgment	19	94.7	13.9
Default Judgment	4	100.0	12.9
Involuntary Dismissal	3	0.0	5.1
Jury Verdict	5	60.0	23.6
Summary Judgment	13	23.1	26.5

Detailed information about these cases, broken out by type of outcome, is shown in the following sections.

Bench Trial

The number of Bench Trial outcomes and the average time to termination by that outcome are shown below for the district and for each judge who has at least one such outcome.




Bench Trial

	Average Time to Termination	Number of Cases
District	30.6	5
Anderson	15.3	1
Currie	38.0	2
Duffy	25.6	1
Wooten	36.1	1


Bench Trial

The distribution of these outcomes by month of litigation is shown below. Months with no outcomes are omitted from the chart.



Bench Trial

The patentee and accused infringer win rates for cases with this outcome are shown below for the judges and the district as a whole.




Bench Trial

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Judge</u>	<u>Prevailing Party</u>	<u>Pendency</u>	<u>Case Name</u>
7:00cv00800	Anderson	Patentee	15.3	Welding Services Inc v. Thermal Engineering
2:96cv03830	Duffy	Accused Infringer	25.6	Hill-Rom Company Inc v. Kinetic Concepts Inc, et al
4:02cv02951	Wooten	Accused Infringer	36.1	Brown Mfg Corp v. Alpha Lawn & Garden, et al
3:03cv00442	Currie	Accused Infringer	36.7	Chem-Nuclear Systems, et al v. Avantech Inc
3:03cv00441	Currie	Accused Infringer	39.2	Chem-Nuclear Systems, et al v. Braun, et al

Consent Judgment

The number of Consent Judgment outcomes and the average time to termination by that outcome are shown below for the district and for each judge who has at least one such outcome.




Consent Judgment

	Average Time to Termination	Number of Cases
District	13.9	19
Anderson	14.9	1
Currie	18.4	4
Duffy	12.0	1
Gergel	13.0	2
Herlong	14.7	4
Houck	5.1	1
Norton	16.9	1
Wooten	11.5	5


Consent Judgment

The distribution of these outcomes by month of litigation is shown below. Months with no outcomes are omitted from the chart.




Consent Judgment

The patentee and accused infringer win rates for cases with this outcome are shown below for the judges and the district as a whole.



Default Judgment

The number of Default Judgment outcomes and the average time to termination by that outcome are shown below for the district and for each judge who has at least one such outcome.




Default Judgment

	Average Time to Termination	Number of Cases
District	12.9	4
Anderson	12.8	3
Harwell	13.1	1


Default Judgment

The distribution of these outcomes by month of litigation is shown below. Months with no outcomes are omitted from the chart.




Default Judgment

The patentee and accused infringer win rates for cases with this outcome are shown below for the judges and the district as a whole.



Involuntary Dismissal

The number of Involuntary Dismissal outcomes and the average time to termination by that outcome are shown below for the district and for each judge who has at least one such outcome.




Involuntary Dismissal

	Average Time to Termination	Number of Cases
District	5.1	3
Harwell	3.9	1
Herlong	6.0	1
Norton	5.5	1


Involuntary Dismissal

The distribution of these outcomes by month of litigation is shown below. Months with no outcomes are omitted from the chart.



Involuntary Dismissal

The patentee and accused infringer win rates for cases with this outcome are shown below for the judges and the district as a whole.




Involuntary Dismissal

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Judge</u>	<u>Prevailing Party</u>	<u>Pendency</u>	<u>Case Name</u>
4:12cv02516	Harwell	Accused Infringer	3.9	Gerard v. Lee et al
2:03cv03725	Norton	Accused Infringer	5.5	Monolith Software, et al v. B-50 Data Solutions, et al
7:07cv00511	Herlong	Accused Infringer	6.0	DAF Inc v. Bandit Industries

Jury Verdict

The number of Jury Verdict outcomes and the average time to termination by that outcome are shown below for the district and for each judge who has at least one such outcome.




Jury Verdict

	Average Time to Termination	Number of Cases
District	23.6	5
Anderson	16.2	2
Currie	26.6	1
Floyd	36.4	1
Herlong	22.7	1


Jury Verdict

The distribution of these outcomes by month of litigation is shown below. Months with no outcomes are omitted from the chart.



Jury Verdict

The patentee and accused infringer win rates for cases with this outcome are shown below for the judges and the district as a whole.




Jury Verdict

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Judge</u>	<u>Prevailing Party</u>	<u>Pendency</u>	<u>Case Name</u>
6:00cv02764	Anderson	Patentee	14.5	BBA Nowovens, et al v. Superior Nonwovens, et al
6:98cv01135	Anderson	Patentee	17.9	Shockley v. Arcan Inc, et al
7:02cv03631	Herlong	Accused Infringer	22.7	Milliken & Company v. Mohawk Industries, et al
3:03cv03915	Currie	Accused Infringer	26.6	Chem-Nuclear Systems, et al v. Abernethy, et al
6:02cv02946	Floyd	Patentee	36.4	Dystar Textilfarben v. CH Patrick Co Inc, et al

Lack of Jurisdiction

The number of Lack of Jurisdiction outcomes and the average time to termination by that outcome are shown below for the district and for each judge who has at least one such outcome.




Lack of Jurisdiction

	Average Time to Termination	Number of Cases
District	10.3	6
Currie	5.7	2
Floyd	10.3	1
Harwell	13.7	1
Herlong	4.5	1
Lewis	21.5	1


Lack of Jurisdiction

The distribution of these outcomes by month of litigation is shown below. Months with no outcomes are omitted from the chart.



Other Termination

The number of Other Termination outcomes and the average time to termination by that outcome are shown below for the district and for each judge who has at least one such outcome.




Other Termination

	Average Time to Termination	Number of Cases
District	6.1	15
Anderson	2.4	2
Floyd	0.4	1
Herlong	7.2	3
Norton	9.1	2
Seymour	4.1	5
Wooten	12.8	2


Other Termination

The distribution of these outcomes by month of litigation is shown below. Months with no outcomes are omitted from the chart.



Summary Judgment

The number of Summary Judgment outcomes and the average time to termination by that outcome are shown below for the district and for each judge who has at least one such outcome.




Summary Judgment

	Average Time to Termination	Number of Cases
District	26.5	13
Currie	37.6	5
Harwell	39.4	1
Herlong	11.8	3
Norton	16.1	1
Seymour	22.0	3


Summary Judgment

The distribution of these outcomes by month of litigation is shown below. Months with no outcomes are omitted from the chart.



Summary Judgment

The patentee and accused infringer win rates for cases with this outcome are shown below for the judges and the district as a whole.




Summary Judgment

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Judge</u>	<u>Prevailing Party</u>	<u>Pendency</u>	<u>Case Name</u>
5:09cv00312	Seymour	Patentee	7.4	Hubbell Incorporated et al v. Dynamic Lighting Inc et al
6:96cv02752	Herlong	Accused Infringer	9.4	Springfield Company v. Staubli Corporation, et al
6:94cv02054	Herlong	Patentee	11.8	Michelin Americas v. Hoffmeister
6:99cv01824	Seymour	Accused Infringer	12.7	Day International v. Reeves Brothers Inc
7:08cv02880	Herlong	Accused Infringer	14.4	Channelbind International Corporation v. Esselte Corporation et al
2:12cv02568	Norton	Accused Infringer	16.1	Carolina Waterworks Inc v. Taylor Made Group LLC et al
3:06cv02566	Currie	Accused Infringer	27.5	Garcia v. SCANA Corporation
3:10cv02140	Currie	Accused Infringer	35.9	Pure Fishing Inc v. Normark Corporation
3:04cv01200	Currie	Accused Infringer	36.3	Household Intl Inc v. Decisioning.com Inc
4:05cv03062	Harwell	Patentee	39.4	Monsanto Company v. Strickland
3:03cv02837	Currie	Accused Infringer	42.8	Decisioning.com Inc v. Ameritrade Holding, et al
3:03cv01924	Currie	Accused Infringer	45.6	Decisioning.com Inc v. Federated Dept Store, et al
3:02cv03440	Seymour	Accused Infringer	45.8	Green v. Snavelly Forest Prod

Transfer

The number of Transfer outcomes and the average time to termination by that outcome are shown below for the district and for each judge who has at least one such outcome.




Transfer

	Average Time to Termination	Number of Cases
District	5.9	15
Anderson	4.3	5
Blatt	3.7	1
Childs	7.1	2
Duffy	6.0	1
Herlong	5.6	2
Houck	5.5	1
Lewis	7.6	1
Wooten	9.9	2

Transfer

The distribution of these outcomes by month of litigation is shown below. Months with no outcomes are omitted from the chart.



Awards and Settlement Amounts

The case names and judges for each award or settlement amount found (if any) are shown in the following tables. Caution: Awards and settlement amounts not shown in the dockets are not included.


	Average	Median
Total	607916	42260
Consent Judgment	116205	48862
Default Judgment	21303	21168
Jury Verdict	2628550	3855238
Summary Judgment	25050	30000

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Case Name</u>	<u>Date of Award or Settlement</u>	<u>Judge</u>	<u>Case Outcomes</u>	<u>Award Amounts</u>
4:02cv00032	Monsanto Company v. Meekins, et al	7/8/2002	Wooten	Consent Judgment	41,795.60
4:02cv00033	Monsanto Company v. Meekins	7/8/2002	Wooten	Consent Judgment	42,724.80
5:09cv00312	Hubbell Incorporated et al v. Dynamic Lighting Inc et al	9/18/2009	Seymour	Summary Judgment	30,000.00
8:97cv01972	Jacobs Chuck, et al v. Innovative, et al	2/24/1998	Anderson	Default Judgment	41,616.00
6:93cv02051	Best Machinery Co v. Cox, et al	6/7/1994	Herlong	Consent Judgment	55,000.00
8:97cv00243	Jacobs Chuck, et al v. Shan Dong Jining, et al	1/15/1998	Anderson	Default Judgment	39,816.00
6:94cv02054	Michelin Americas v. Hoffmeister	7/21/1995	Herlong	Summary Judgment	930.00
6:05cv00112	O'Donnell v. Zhenyi Wang and Pets	2/15/2006	Harwell	Default Judgment	1,260.00
6:00cv02764	BBA Nowovens, et al v. Superior Nonwovens, et al	11/21/2001	Anderson	Jury Verdict	3,940,412.00
6:98cv01135	Shockley v. Arcan Inc, et al	10/18/1999	Anderson	Jury Verdict	3,855,238.00
6:96cv03808	Jacobs Chuck, et al v. Wendeng Hongfa Mach, et al	7/22/1998	Anderson	Default Judgment	2,519.00
4:02cv00358	Monsanto Company v. Rogers, et al	5/6/2004	Wooten	Consent Judgment	325,298.00
6:02cv02946	Dystar Textilfarben v. CH Patrick Co Inc, et al	9/16/2005	Floyd	Jury Verdict	90,000.00
4:05cv03062	Monsanto Company v. Strickland	2/9/2009	Harwell	Summary Judgment	44,220.00

Appeals

The number of rulings on appeal in these cases and the rulings themselves are found in the table below. The Complete Affirmance Rate (the number of appeals which were affirmed with no other ruling, divided by the total number of appeals decision-not counting dismissed and pending appeals), the percentage of appeal rulings which affirmed the lower court at least in part, the percentage which reversed this court at least in part, the percentage which remanded this court at least in part, and the percentage which vacated this court at least in part are shown in the chart immediately below.

Appeal Outcomes




	Total
Affirmed	7
Affirmed,Reversed,Vacated,Remanded	1
Affirmed,Vacated,Remanded	3
Dismissed	6
Reversed	1

<u>Case Name</u>	<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Judge</u>	<u>Result of Appeal</u>
BBA Nowovens, et al v. Superior Nonwovens, et al	6:00cv02764	Anderson	Affirmed
Welding Services Inc v. Thermal Engineering	7:00cv00800	Anderson	Affirmed
Pure Fishing Inc v. Normark Corporation	3:10cv02140	Currie	Affirmed
Hill-Rom Company Inc v. Kinetic Concepts Inc, et al	2:96cv03830	Duffy	Affirmed
Springfield Company v. Staubli Corporation, et al	6:96cv02752	Herlong	Affirmed
Green v. Snively Forest Prod	3:02cv03440	Seymour	Affirmed
Day International v. Reeves Brothers Inc	6:99cv01824	Seymour	Affirmed
Shockley v. Arcan Inc, et al	6:98cv01135	Anderson	Affirmed,Reversed,Vacated,Remanded
Decisioning.com Inc v. Federated Dept Store, et al	3:03cv01924	Currie	Affirmed,Vacated,Remanded
Decisioning.com Inc v. Ameritrade Holding, et al	3:03cv02837	Currie	Affirmed,Vacated,Remanded
Household Intl Inc v. Decisioning.com Inc	3:04cv01200	Currie	Affirmed,Vacated,Remanded
Chem-Nuclear Systems, et al v. Braun, et al	3:03cv00441	Currie	Dismissed
Chem-Nuclear Systems, et al v. Avantech Inc	3:03cv00442	Currie	Dismissed
Chem-Nuclear Systems, et al v. Abernethy, et al	3:03cv03915	Currie	Dismissed
Milliken & Company v. Mohawk Industries, et al	7:02cv03631	Herlong	Dismissed
Carolina Waterworks Inc v. Taylor Made Group LLC et al	2:12cv02568	Norton	Dismissed
Sawgrass Technologies Inc v. Texas Original Graphics Inc et al	2:05cv01696	Wooten	Dismissed
Dystar Textilfarben v. CH Patrick Co Inc, et al	6:02cv02946	Floyd	Reversed

Jury Demands

The number of jury demands by party type is shown below.




Experience

The active judges in the South Carolina District Court vary considerably in their exposure to patent cases in general and to significant motions in those cases.

Total Number of Patent Cases: By Judge

The total number of patent cases per judge is shown below, followed by a table listing the judge, total number of patent cases, total number of closed patent cases and total number of open patent cases.

Total Patent Cases: By Judge




	Total Number of Cases	Number of Closed Cases	Number of Open Cases
Total	249	239	10
Anderson	42	42	0
Austin	1	1	0
Blatt	5	2	3
Cain	5	4	1
Childs	10	7	3
Currie	26	26	0
Duffy	6	6	0
Floyd	15	15	0
Gergel	12	11	1
Harwell	18	18	0
Hendricks	2	1	1
Herlong	35	35	0
Houck	8	8	0
Lewis	5	4	1
Norton	7	7	0
Seymour	21	21	0
Wooten	31	31	0

Total Number of Claim Construction Rulings: By Judge


The number of claim construction rulings for each active judge is shown below. These figures do not include summary judgment decisions that may involve claim construction issues.

	Number of Decisions
Total	19
Currie	5
Duffy	1
Floyd	3
Gergel	2
Hendricks	1
Herlong	4
Houck	1
Norton	1
Seymour	1



The average time (in months) from case filing to claim construction rulings for each active judge is shown below.

	Number of Decisions
Total	20.4
Currie	19.8
Duffy	24.0
Floyd	23.4
Gergel	15.8
Hendricks	18.2
Herlong	14.5
Houck	43.9
Norton	16.1
Seymour	26.5



Motion Outcomes


The win rates and times to decision on contested preliminary injunction, stay pending reexam, summary judgment, and transfer motions are shown below. A motion that is granted in part and denied in part is treated as "1/2" granted, and "1/2" denied.

Preliminary Injunction

The number of Preliminary Injunction motions by outcome are shown below.


Motion Outcomes

For Preliminary Injunction



	Total
Total	13
Denied	6
Denied as Moot	2
Denied w/o Prej	4
Granted	1


The win rates, by judge, on contested Preliminary Injunction motions are shown below. The win rate for judges with no contested decisions (if any) is left blank.



The average times from motion filing to decision, by judge, on contested Preliminary Injunction motions are shown below. The time for judges with no contested decisions (if any) is left blank.

Average Time to Decision, by Judge

For Preliminary Injunction



The supporting data for Preliminary Injunction motions is found in the following table:


	Total Motions	Contested Decisions	Win Rate	Time to Decision
District	13	11	9.1	3.0
Anderson	2	2	50.0	2.9
Austin	1	1	0.0	9.2
Currie	6	6	0.0	1.7
Duffy	1	1	0.0	6.0
Floyd	1	0		
Gergel	1	1	0.0	1.5
Norton	1	0		

Stay Pending IPR

The number of Stay Pending IPR motions by outcome are shown below.


Motion Outcomes

For Stay Pending IPR



	Total
Total	2
Granted	2


The win rates, by judge, on contested Stay Pending IPR motions are shown below. The win rate for judges with no contested decisions (if any) is left blank.



The average times from motion filing to decision, by judge, on contested Stay Pending IPR motions are shown below. The time for judges with no contested decisions (if any) is left blank.

Average Time to Decision, by Judge

For Stay Pending IPR




The supporting data for Stay Pending IPR motions is found in the following table:

	Total Motions	Contested Decisions	Win Rate	Time to Decision
District	2	0		
Childs	2	0		

Stay Pending Reexam


The number of Stay Pending Reexam motions by outcome are shown below.

Motion Outcomes
For Stay Pending Reexam



	Total
Total	16
Denied	1
Denied as Moot	1
Denied w/o Prej	2
Dismissed	1
Granted	11


The win rates, by judge, on contested Stay Pending Reexam motions are shown below. The win rate for judges with no contested decisions (if any) is left blank.



The average times from motion filing to decision, by judge, on contested Stay Pending Reexam motions are shown below. The time for judges with no contested decisions (if any) is left blank.

Average Time to Decision, by Judge

For Stay Pending Reexam




The supporting data for Stay Pending Reexam motions is found in the following table:

	Total Motions	Contested Decisions	Win Rate	Time to Decision
District	16	11	72.7	2.6
Anderson	1	1	100.0	3.6
Austin	2	2	50.0	0.4
Cain	3	3	66.7	1.6
Currie	3	0		
Floyd	1	1	100.0	3.4
Harwell	2	2	50.0	4.2
Herlong	1	0		
Wooten	3	2	100.0	3.9

Summary Judgment


The number of Summary Judgment motions by outcome are shown below.

Motion Outcomes
For Summary Judgment



	Total
Total	88
Denied	39
Denied as Moot	7
Dismissed	3
Granted	20
Grntd. in Part	18
Withdrawn	1


The win rates, by judge, on contested Summary Judgment motions are shown below. The win rate for judges with no contested decisions (if any) is left blank.



The average times from motion filing to decision, by judge, on contested Summary Judgment motions are shown below. The time for judges with no contested decisions (if any) is left blank.

Average Time to Decision, by Judge

For Summary Judgment




The supporting data for Summary Judgment motions is found in the following table:

	Total Motions	Contested Decisions	Win Rate	Time to Decision
District	88	77	37.7	4.0
Anderson	8	8	0.0	1.5
Austin	1	1	100.0	8.3
Blatt	2	1	0.0	20.6
Cain	1	0		
Childs	2	1	0.0	10.2
Currie	34	29	46.6	2.8
Duffy	2	2	25.0	2.5
Floyd	7	7	0.0	6.5
Harwell	2	2	75.0	6.0
Herlong	13	12	58.3	1.5
Houck	5	5	0.0	8.8
McDonald	1	1	100.0	6.4
Norton	3	3	33.3	2.5
Seymour	4	3	83.3	7.4
Wooten	3	2	50.0	7.2

Transfer


The number of Transfer motions by outcome are shown below.

Motion Outcomes
For Transfer



	Total
Total	33
Denied	12
Denied as Moot	6
Denied w/o Prej	2
Dismissed	2
Granted	11


The win rates, by judge, on contested Transfer motions are shown below. The win rate for judges with no contested decisions (if any) is left blank.



The average times from motion filing to decision, by judge, on contested Transfer motions are shown below. The time for judges with no contested decisions (if any) is left blank.

Average Time to Decision, by Judge

For Transfer




The supporting data for Transfer motions is found in the following table:

	Total Motions	Contested Decisions	Win Rate	Time to Decision
District	33	25	44.0	3.8
Anderson	6	6	66.7	1.5
Blatt	1	1	0.0	0.7
Cain	1	1	0.0	4.6
Childs	2	2	100.0	5.3
Currie	5	2	0.0	7.8
Duffy	2	2	50.0	6.1
Gergel	2	1	0.0	1.4
Harwell	1	1	0.0	8.9
Herlong	4	4	25.0	1.2
Houck	1	1	100.0	3.4
Lewis	1	0		
Norton	1	1	100.0	2.1
Rogers	2	2	50.0	8.7
Seymour	1	1	0.0	4.2
Wooten	3	0		

TRO


The number of TRO motions by outcome are shown below.

Motion Outcomes
For TRO



	Total
Total	7
Denied	2
Denied as Moot	1
Granted	1
Withdrawn	3


The win rates, by judge, on contested TRO motions are shown below. The win rate for judges with no contested decisions (if any) is left blank.



The average times from motion filing to decision, by judge, on contested TRO motions are shown below. The time for judges with no contested decisions (if any) is left blank.

Average Time to Decision, by Judge

For TRO



The supporting data for TRO motions is found in the following table:

	Total Motions	Contested Decisions	Win Rate	Time to Decision
District	7	3	33.3	0.7
Anderson	1	1	100.0	0.0
Austin	2	2	0.0	1.1
Currie	3	0		
Floyd	1	0		