

J. CHRISTOPHER CARRAWAY

PARTNER

503.473.0818 | chris.carraway@klarquist.com



OVERVIEW

Since 1995, Chris has focused his practice exclusively on intellectual property litigation, representing such clients as Microsoft, SAP, eBay, LinkedIn, and NBC in patent litigation in federal courts nationwide.

Chris has particular experience litigating patents involving computer software, computer hardware, video game technology, and e-commerce. He has argued at numerous claim construction and summary judgment hearings and Federal Circuit appeals. Prior to entering private practice, Chris served as a law clerk to the Hon. William C. Bryson of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Some of the federal courts where Chris has recently litigated include California (Northern and Central Districts), Colorado, Delaware, Massachusetts, New York (Southern District), Oregon, Texas (Eastern and Western Districts), Virginia (Eastern District), and Washington (Western District).

Chris joined Klarquist in 1999 as a lateral associate and became partner in 2003.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- ▶ Michael Best & Friedrich | Associate, 1996 – 1999 | Milwaukee, WI
- ▶ U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit | Law clerk to Hon. William C. Bryson, 1995 – 1996 | Washington, D.C.

PRESENTATIONS & PUBLICATIONS

- ▶ “2020 Patent Law Review,” Oregon State Bar, Feb. 19, 2021
- ▶ “TC Heartland Decision: Impact on Patent Litigation Landscape Explored,” The Knowledge Group Webcast, January 31, 2018
- ▶ Claiming Strategies In View of Evolving Damages Law, AIPLA 2016 Electronic & Computer Patent Law Summit, Portland, OR, June 14, 2016
- ▶ IP Overview Told Through Football Stories, Western MT Bar Ass’n, Missoula, January 21, 2016
- ▶ Patent Reform Issues for Universities, AUTM Western Region Meeting, Seattle, October 2, 2014

EDUCATION

J.D. with High Honors, Order of the Coif, Duke University School of Law, 1995

B.S., *magna cum laude* in Economics, Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, 1992

ADMISSIONS

Oregon, 1996

Washington, 2006

Montana, 2011

U.S. Supreme Court

U.S. Court of Appeals
Federal Circuit
Seventh Circuit

U.S. District Court
District of Colorado
District of Oregon
Eastern District of Texas
Western District of Washington
Eastern District of Wisconsin
Western District of Wisconsin

Klarquist

J. CHRISTOPHER CARRAWAY

PARTNER

503.473.0818 | chris.carraway@klarquist.com

“Discovery Issues in Patent Litigation,” Practicing Law Institute (PLI), Patent Litigation 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010

- ▶ “Important Patent Cases of 2008,” Oregon State Bar’s 2009 Intellectual Property Year in Review Seminar, March 12, 2009
- ▶ “Reexamination of U.S. Patents: An Alternative (or Supplement) to Litigation,” Chartered Institute of Patent Attorneys (CIPA), London, UK, February 13, 2008
- ▶ “Markman Strategies for the Defense Perspective,” Law Seminars Int’l, San Francisco, January 9, 2008
- ▶ “Why Web Site Operators Must Comply with the Patent Marking Statute and How They Can Do So,” IPL Newsletter (ABA), Winter 2006
- ▶ “In the Wake of Knorr-Bremse: Opinions of Counsel are as Important as Ever,” Practicing Law Institute (PLI), Patent Litigation 2005
- ▶ “Practice Before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit,” Oregon Intell. Prop’y Law Ass’n, April 2004
- ▶ “A Preview of Willfulness Law After the Federal Circuit’s Knorr-Bremse Opinion,” Oregon State Bar, Intell. Prop’y Section, May 2004
- ▶ “The Uncertain Future of Enforcing Patents Broadened through Reissue,” 8 Federal Circuit Bar Journal 63 (1998)
- ▶ “Offer to Sell Amendment Expands Forum Options for Patent Infringement Actions,” National Law Journal, Jan. 26, 1998 at C8
- ▶ “Color as a Trademark Under the Lanham Act,” 57 Law & Contemp. Probs. 243 (Autumn 1994).

REPRESENTATIVE CASES

- ▶ *Big Baboon Inc. v. SAP* (N.D. Cal., Fed. Cir.): Successfully led defense team for SAP in case involving enterprise resource planning software. Won motion to dismiss requiring plaintiff to name accused product, then won summary judgment of invalidity that the SAP product plaintiff accused was prior art to the asserted patent, then won an award of \$188,000 in attorney fees for SAP. Decisions were affirmed on appeal.
- ▶ *Kewazinga v. Microsoft* (S.D.N.Y.): Defending Microsoft in case relating to Streetside map imaging.
- ▶ *Nautilus v. ICON* (D. Utah): Represented patent owner Nautilus in case asserting four exercise equipment patents. After patents survived inter partes review petitions and two rounds of ex parte reexamination, the case was resolved.
- ▶ *Uniloc v. Microsoft* (C.D. Cal.): Defending Microsoft in case involving feature of Teams videoconferencing. Case was stayed pending inter partes review petition, in which all claims have been found unpatentable.

PRACTICE AREAS

Litigation
Post-Grant USPTO Proceedings

TECHNOLOGY AREAS

Software & Internet Technology
Mobile Devices & Applications

LANGUAGES

French

Klarquist