



## CONTACT

### Call

312-551-9500

### Email

[rgreenspoon@dbllawyers.com](mailto:rgreenspoon@dbllawyers.com)

## PRACTICE AREAS

Corporate Transactions & Finance  
Intellectual Property  
Litigation & Disputes

## INDUSTRIES

Aerospace & Defense  
Automotive  
Aviation  
Firearms  
Manufacturing  
Media & Entertainment  
Retail and Consumer Products  
Software  
Technology

## OFFICE

Chicago, IL

# ROBERT GREENSPOON

## PARTNER

Robert Greenspoon is a Partner at the Chicago office of Dunlap Bennett & Ludwig. Rare among lawyers, he is a registered patent attorney whose practice spans every aspect of the patent field. Robert helps inventors and companies in all types of Patent Office proceedings (including PTAB challenges), tries patent cases in the courts, argues for appellants and appellees in patent appeals at the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, and brings and defends patent proceedings at the United States Supreme Court.

Robert also manages the patent prosecution team at DBL. He drafts and prosecutes patents, oversees global patenting strategy, and develops monetization strategies. His clients include the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 3-D printing startup Impossible Objects, seasonal decorations company Holiday Bright Lights, healthcare technology company Peerbridge Health, and many others.

In addition to his patent practice, Robert assists clients with other types of intellectual property and complex commercial matters, including trademark and trade secret disputes.

## EDUCATION

- J.D., University of Michigan
- A.B., Physics and the History and Philosophy of Science, University of Chicago

## ADMISSIONS

- Illinois
- Supreme Court of the United States
- US Court of Appeals Fourth Circuit
- US Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit
- US Court of Appeals Seventh Circuit
- US Court of Appeals Eighth Circuit
- US Court of Appeals Ninth Circuit
- US Court of Appeals Tenth Circuit
- US Court of Appeals Federal Circuit
- E.D. Michigan
- D. Connecticut
- E.D. Wisconsin
- W.D. Wisconsin
- N.D. Illinois
- D. Arizona



## EXPERIENCE

- *Petro Mex, LLC v. United States* (Federal Circuit, Appeal No. 2023-1848): In an appeal of oil and gas company's trial loss against the government for breaching a mineral lease, argued for client and convinced the court to reverse statute of limitations bar, and vacate refusal to apply earlier client win in Bureau of Land Management proceeding against the government.
- *Adasa Inc. v. Avery Dennison Corp.*, 55 F.4th 900 (Fed. Cir. 2022): In a patent infringement case involving an encoded memory structure ensuring unique RFID serial numbers, helped client preserve a high-eight figure jury verdict and recover attorney fees, successfully defending those judgments as arguing counsel.
- *Tumey v. Mycroft AI, Inc.*, 27 F.4th 657 (8th Cir. 2022): In an appeal of a RICO action involving alleged cyberattacks and harassment involving First Amendment free speech issues, argued for client and convinced court to overturn preliminary injunction and get case reassigned to a different judge.
- *3M Company v. Evergreen Adhesives, Inc.* (Federal Circuit, Appeal No. 20-1738, 2021): In an appeal of an IPR decision favorable to patent owner, protected patent claims covering an aerosol adhesive system, argued for client and convinced the court to affirm the IPR decision on the grounds that the PTAB did not abuse its discretion in excluding evidence offered only through incorporation by reference.
- *Opticurrent, LLC v. Power Integrations, Inc.* (Federal Circuit, Appeal No. 19-2141, 2020): In an appeal of a patent infringement case involving a noninverting transistor that limits current leakage, argued for client convincing the court to affirm jury verdict and award of ongoing royalties and pre- and post-judgment interest.
- *D'Agostino v. MasterCard Int'l Inc.*, 844 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2016): In an appeal of IPR decisions invalidating patent claims covering methods of effecting secure credit-card purchases by minimizing merchant access to credit card numbers, argued for client to obtain vacatur of the IPR decisions and remand of the case.
- *Medtronic v. LifePort Sciences* (Federal Circuit, Appeal No. 15-1862, 2016): In an appeal of an IPR decision upholding the patentability of claims covering a hook for attaching an endoluminal prosthesis within an artery, vein, or other type of corporeal lumen, argued for client and convinced the court to affirm the IPR decision based on a revised claim construction position provided in the PTAB board's institution decision.
- *Computer Software Protection v. Adobe Systems, Inc.* (Federal Circuit, Appeal No. 15-1608, 2016): In an appeal of an order denying attorney fees in a patent infringement case, argued for client and convinced the court to affirm the district court decision.
- *Zayed v. Associated Bank*, 779 F.3d 727 (8th Cir. 2015): In an appeal of a district court's decision granting a bank's motion to dismiss a claim for aiding and abetting in a fraudulent Ponzi scheme case, argued for client Receivership and convinced the court to reverse the district court's decision and remand the case by showing the complaint stated aiding and abetting liability.
- *1st Media, LLC v. Electronic Arts, Inc., et. al.*, 694 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2012): In an appeal of a district court decision finding inequitable conduct by a patent owner, argued for client and convinced the court to reverse the judgment by showing that the record contained no evidence of a deliberate decision to withhold prior art references from the patent office.
- *1st Technology v. Bodog* (Federal Circuit, Appeal No. 08-1132, 2008): In an appeal of a default judgment in a patent infringement case involving the separation, processing, and recombination of multiple streams of multimedia data, argued for client and convinced the court to affirm the district court's default judgment because service of process in Costa Rica adequately complied with the U.S. Constitution.
- *HyperPhrase v. Google* (Federal Circuit, Appeal No. 07-1125, 2007): In an appeal of an order granting summary judgment and non-infringement in a patent case involving systems and methods for contextually linking computerized records, argued for client and convinced the court to vacate the decision in part and remand for further proceedings by showing that the district court improperly construed a key claim limitation.
- *IMS Technology, Inc. v. Haas Automation, Inc.*, 206 F.3d 1422 (Fed. Cir. 2000): In an appeal of a district court's decision granting summary judgment of non-infringement in a patent case involving a numerical control for a machine tool, argued for client and convinced the court to vacate and remand district court's decision by showing that the district court relied on an incorrect claim construction.



## PUBLICATIONS

---

- Co-author, "Are Patent Trolls Really Undermining the Patent System?" in the September/October 2006 issue of IP Litigator
- Co-author, "Obviousness after KSR v. Teleflex: A Private Practice Perspective," in the August/September 2007 issue of Intellectual Asset Management Magazine, reprinted in the July/August 2007 issue of IP Litigator
- Author, "Is the United States Finally Ready for a Patent Small Claims Court?" in the Winter 2009 volume of the Minnesota Journal of Law, Science and Technology
- Co-author, "Don't Assume a Can Opener: Confronting Patent Economic Theory with Licensing and Enforcement Reality" in June 2011 volume of The Columbia Science and Technology Law Review
- Author, numerous public policy guest articles on the IPWatchdog Blog

## HONORS & AWARDS

---

- National Law Journal Trailblazer, Intellectual Property (2017)
- IAM Strategy 300 (2016-2018)
- Illinois Super Lawyer -- Intellectual Property Litigation (2013-2023)
- Martindale-Hubbell rated AV-Preeminent

