Case	Court	Year	Relevant output	Type
In re Wands	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT	1988	Not relevant - Biology related issues	NA
Cable/Home Communication Corp. v. Network Productions, Inc.	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT	1990	Defendants admitted helping to create, promote, distribute and import for financial gain various pirated computer software chips and devices, which enabled display of plaintiffs' programming intended for their paying subscribers by disrupting the functioning of their copyrighted computer program designed to scramble satellite transmissions. The Court prove violations of the copyright and communications laws, sentencing the defendants	A
Lotus Dev. Corp. v. Paperback Software Int'l	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS	1990	The court held that if the expression of an idea had elements that went beyond all functional elements of the idea itself, and beyond the obvious, and if there were numerous other ways of expressing the non-copyrightable idea, then those elements of expression, if original and substantial, were copyrightable. Accordingly, the court found that some nonliteral elements of plaintiff's program, such as the user interface, and in particular the menu command structure, were copyrightable	C
United States v. Davis	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT	1992	The defendant was convicted of violating various federal statutes and copyright infringement regarding cable television, satellite-signal system. Once completed, the defendant's modifications made it possible for the modules to descramble and decrypt satellite programming without the knowledge of the cable companies. The modifications also made it all but impossible to use the device in any legitimate fashion. The defendant's convictions were affirmed.	A
United States v. Shriver	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT	1992	The provisions of a wiretap statute that prohibited the interception of electronic communications applied to defendants' descrambling device. The provisions of a wiretap statute that prohibited the manufacture or sale of a device could not apply to defendants unless the device's primary use was for surreptitious interception.	A
United States v. Bailey,	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT	1994	Defendant modified cellular phones so as to fool the local network into permitting calls placed by those phones to be completed in roaming mode, even though the call could never be billed. The district court granted defendant's Fed. R. Crim. P. 29 motion for acquittal on the ground that the computer chips in question were not counterfeit access devices within the meaning of the statute. The Appeal court reversed, finding that the placement of a cellular phone call by the practice of "tumbling" the electronic serial number accessed an account in order fraudulently to obtain services.	A
FASA Corp. v. Playmates Toys	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION	1994	The court indicated that a comparison of the game materials revealed that there were marked similarities between the two, but the court could not conclude that no reasonable trier of fact could find substantial similarity.	C
United States v. Manzer	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT	1995	The jury reasonably determined that computer programs sold by defendant were derivative of copyrighted material, and that the software contained sufficient notice of its protected status	C
United States v. Yates	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY, LEXINGTON DIVISION	1995	The court held that cloning involved programming a cellular telephone so that its electronic serial number and mobile identification number combination was identical to a legitimate customer's account. The court ruled that defendant violated § 1029(a) because cloning involved the use of an altered telecommunications instrument to obtain access to telecommunications services for the purpose of defrauding the carrier.	A
FASA Corp. v. Playmates Toys	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION	1996	Plaintiff corporations claimed that defendant company violated copyright and trademark rights to a series of toys. The court entered judgment in favour of the defendant finding that, although the plaintiff had established certain protectable copyright and trademark rights, plaintiff had failed to prove any facts that established defendant's liability, rendering adjudication of damages unnecessary.	C
Lumex, Inc. v. Highsmith	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	1996	Not relevant - Labour Law related issues	NA
People v. Butler	COURT OF APPEAL OF CALIFORNIA, SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT, DIVISION FOUR	1996	Not relevant - Jurisprudential issues	NA
People v. Pena	SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK, BRONX COUNTY	1996	Defendant primarily claimed that cloned, or altered, cellular phones did not constitute written instruments and forged instruments as those terms were defined in the penal law. The court disagreed and held that the penal law's definitions of forged instrument and written instrument were sufficiently broad to have included a cloned cellular telephone.	A
People v. Lawrence	SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK, KINGS COUNTY	1996	The court found that a cell phone contained computer chips that were programmed by software, and that the cloning involved the alteration or forgery of these programs	A
United States v. Clayton	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT	1997	Defendant was convicted of various violations for cloning cellular phones. The court of appeals affirmed defendant's convictions and sentence.	A
International Paper Co. v. Suwyn	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	1997	Not relevant - Labour Law related issues	NA
United States v. Sepulveda,	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT	1997	Appellants possessed 14 cloned cellular telephones programmed to charge unauthorized calls to subscribers' accounts and four unprogrammed numerical combinations corresponding to additional accounts. The court affirmed appellants' convictions and held that the unprogrammed combinations were access devices	A
United States v. Pervaz	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT	1997	For defendants' roles in a telephone cloning operation, they were indicted for seven counts of fraud and related activities involving access devices to telephone calls transmitted by cellular phones. The court thought that the district court correctly denied their motion to suppress because the cellular company's search that revealed the origin of the calls in the cloning operation did not involve government action.	A
Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. Eli Lilly & Co.	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT	1997	Not relevant - Biology related issues	NA
Young v. Nationwide Life Ins. Co.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, GALVESTON DIVISION	1998	Not relevant - Labour Law related issues	NA
United States v. Alvelo-Ramos	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT	1998	The Defendant sought review of the decision of the the District Court, which convicted him of possession of cloned cellular telephones and cloning hardware and software. The court stated that there was sufficient evidence that the phones were manufactured outside of Puerto Rico and had the capacity to make long-distance phone calls.	A

Young v. Nationwide Life Ins. Co.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, GALVESTON DIVISION	1998	Not relevant - Class action for breach of contract	NA
United States v. Cabrera	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT	1999	Appellant was suspected of using equipment to clone cellular telephones. On appeal, the court vacated the sentence and remanded for resentencing because the district court erred in ruling that the government presented specific and reliable evidence to connect appellant with the amount of loss. The district court failed to specifically find that appellant caused the loss.	A
EarthWeb, Inc. v. Schlack	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	1999	Not relevant - Labour Law related issues	NA
United States v. Microsoft Corp.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	1999	Plaintiff government claimed that defendant software manufacturer violated antitrust provisions of the Sherman Act. The court defined the relevant market as the licensing of Intel-compatible personal computer operating systems (OS). The court concluded that defendant had monopoly power in the relevant market because defendant could substantially raise its prices without losing business to a commercially viable alternative, defendant's market share was large and stable, and the relevant market was protected by a high barrier of entry. The court further found that defendant purposefully leveraged its monopoly power in the relevant market to thwart competition in other software markets. Specifically, through restrictive OS licensing agreements with computer manufacturers, defendant achieved higher market share in the web browser market. Defendant protected its monopoly and stifled innovation by imposing barriers to entry against various cross-platform software, "middleware," and network applications.	B
Tradescape.com v. Shivaram	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	1999	Plaintiff sued defendants for copyright infringement and theft of trade secrets concerning online day trading computer software. Defendants, including software consultant that used to work for plaintiff, developed computer software program that allowed for online day trading. Plaintiff established a likelihood of success on the merits on its copyright infringement and theft of trade secrets claims because it provided sufficient direct and circumstantial evidence of copying of protectable material.	C
Sun Microsystems, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	2000	Plaintiff major computer and software designer had received a preliminary injunction against defendant major computer and software designer in its suit against defendant for allegedly unfair competition. The court granted the preliminary injunction, finding that plaintiff had a reasonable chance of success on the merits, the hardship to plaintiff of defendant's continuing its potentially unfair competition outweighed the burden on defendant, and defendant was likely to continue harming plaintiff if the injunction were not granted.	B
Commonwealth v. Cruz	APPEALS COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS	2001	Not relevant - Jurisprudential issues	NA
Advanced Cell Tech. v. Infigen, Inc.	SUPERIOR COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS, AT WORCESTER	2002	Not relevant - Jurisprudential issues	NA
Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe Inc.	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT	2002	Not relevant - Biology related issues	NA
Directv, Inc. v. Trone	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	2002	Not relevant - Labour Law related issues	NA
New York v. Microsoft Corp.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	2002	The appellate court found Microsoft liable for violating the Sherman Act by maintaining, or attempting to maintain, a monopoly by engaging in exclusionary conduct. The court determined that only one of the new technologies proposed by the non-settling States, server/network computing, was relevant to the issue of a remedy. The court adopted Microsoft's treatment of middleware for use in the order of remedy, instead of the non-settling States' flawed treatment of the term.	B
New York v. Microsoft Corp.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	2002	Duplication	NA
Dresser-Rand Co. v. Virtual Automation, Inc.	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT	2004	Not relevant - Labour Law related issues	NA
Larimer v. IBM Corp.	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT	2004	Not relevant - Labour Law related issues	NA
Massachusetts v. Microsoft Corp.	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT	2004	After the United States District Court approval of a consent decree pursuant to the Tunney Act, in settlement of antitrust action against defendant software developer and manufacturer, one plaintiff, a State, appealed entry of the decree. The court held that requiring the manufacturer to provide for uninstallation of its web browser with the Add/Remove utility was equivalent to removing the program from the operating system. This remedy, directed at the effect of commingling, rather than prohibiting commingling, was within the lower court's discretion and avoided the drawbacks requiring software redesign. The remedial order of the district court was affirmed. The order denying intervention was reversed and the order approving the consent decree in the public interest was affirmed.	B
Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.,	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT	2004	Not relevant - Biology related issues	NA
Optivus Tech., Inc. v. Ion Beam Applications S.A.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	2004	Not relevant - Biology related issues	NA
Etzion v. Etzion	SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK, NASSAU COUNTY	2005	Not relevant - Family Law related issues	NA
Capon v. Eshhar	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT	2005	Not relevant - Biology related issues	NA
Allflex USA, Inc. v. Avid Identification Sys.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	2007	Where the appellant has identified no relationship between the valuation placed on the appeal and the issues the appellant wishes to challenge, the parties have simply placed a "side bet" on the outcome of the appeal, which is not enough to avoid a ruling of mootness.	C
UniRAM Tech., Inc. v. Taiwan Semiconductor Mfg. Co.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	2007	Verdict for the Plaintiff : the jury found that TSMC was liable for unfair enrichment because it breached its contract with UniRAM and misappropriated its trade secret. The jury awarded UniRAM	C
Agrizap, Inc. v. Woodstream Corp.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA	2007	Plaintiff patent holder sued defendant competitor for patent infringement. The holder also alleged related fraudulent misrepresentation. At best, software implementation of certain mechanical implementations could only be infringed under the doctrine of equivalents. Accordingly, in the present case, the microprocessor-based implementation of the functions of an electronic rat trap could not literally infringe specific, physical electronic components, such as a resistive switch, trigger circuit, and timing module, that implemented those same functions.	C

Matter of Maura	SURROGATE'S COURT OF NEW YORK, NASSAU COUNTY	2007	Not relevant - Family Law related issues	NA
Paterson v. Little, Brown & Co.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	2007	Not relevant - Torts	NA
ESTATE OF JOHN B. MAURA	SURROGATE'S COURT OF NEW YORK, NASSAU COUNTY	2007	Not relevant - Family Law related issues	NA
Tauck v. Tauck	SUPERIOR COURT OF CONNECTICUT	2007	Not relevant - Family Law related issues	NA
Veritas Operating Corp. v. Microsoft Corp.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	2008	Microsoft Corp. lied to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to get patents for data storage technology after stealing trade secrets, according to a patent infringement lawsuit filed by security software company Symantec Corp., acquired Veritas Operating Corp. The Court denied in part the motion as to Veritas' claims of trade secret misappropriation, breach of the duty of good faith and fair dealing, and copyright infringement; and granted in part the motion insofar as Veritas' claims of unfair competition	B
Veritas Operating Corp. v. Microsoft Corp.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	2008	Duplication	NA
United States v. Brown	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA	2008	Not relevant - Criminal Law - Fraud	NA
New Jersey Natural Gas Co. v. Director, Div. of Taxation	TAX COURT OF NEW JERSEY	2008	Not relevant - Tax Law	NA
Ford Motor Co. v. Dir. of Revenue	SUPERIOR COURT OF DELAWARE	2007	Not relevant - Tax Law	NA
Barnett v. Simmons	SUPREME COURT OF OKLAHOMA	2008	Not relevant - Jurisprudential issues	NA
RightThing, LLC v. Brown	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO	2009	Not relevant - Labour Law related issues	NA
Killian v. Green Tree Servicing, LLC (In re Killian)	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA	2009	Not relevant - Private Law related issues	NA
Abstrax, Inc. v. Dell, Inc.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS	2009	Dell filed a motion for partial summary judgment of no infringement of U.S. Patent '328 Patent. Dell sought partial summary judgment that some of its products do not infringe certain claims and under the doctrine of equivalents. The magistrate judge found that a jury would be able to draw a reasonable inference that Dell was on notice of the '328 patent prior to the initiation of the present suit because there was evidence that a former Motorola executive who knew of the '328 patent and had spoken with the patent's inventor joined Dell before the pending litigation began. Dell's Objection to the Magistrate Judge's for Partial Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement was overruled, and the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation Regarding Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement was adopted.	C
Garey v. United States	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA	2010	Not relevant - Criminal Law - Threaten to use a weapon of mass destruction	NA
Ass'n for Molecular Pathology v. United States PTO	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	2010	Not relevant - Biology related issues	NA
Ass'n for Molecular Pathology v. United States PTO	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	2010	Not relevant - Biology related issues	NA
United States v. Burgess,	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA	2010	Not relevant - Criminal Law issue - child pornography	NA
Schreiber v Schreiber	SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK, KINGS COUNTY	2010	Not relevant - Family Law related issues	NA
Dassault Systemes, S.A. v. Childress	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN	2010	Duplication	NA
Life Techs. Corp. v. Illumina, Inc.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE	2010	Not relevant - Biology related issues	NA
PSN Ill., LLC v. Abbott Labs. & Abbott Bioresearch Ctr., Inc.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS	2011	Not relevant - Biology related issues	NA
Novesky v. Computer Cable Connection, Inc.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN	2011	Not relevant - Labour Law related issues	NA
Berster Techs., LLC v. Christmas	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	2012	An owner of copyrights in computer codes for electronic games was entitled to preliminary injunctive relief prohibiting infringing acts by competitors since the owner was likely to be successful in showing that codes in the competitors' products matched the owner's codes and the harm to the owner from the loss of goodwill and business opportunities outweighed speculative harm to the competitors. The motion was granted.	B
Matter of Benincaso	SURROGATE'S COURT OF NEW YORK, NASSAU COUNTY	2012	Not relevant - Uncorrected opinion, not published in official reports	NA
Oracle Am., Inc. v. Google Inc.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	2012	Oracle wrote 37 packages of computer source code, "application programming interfaces" (API), in the Java language, and licenses them to others for writing "apps" for computers, tablets, smartphones, and other devices. Oracle alleged that Google's Android mobile operating system infringed Oracle's patents and copyrights. The jury found no patent infringement, but that Google infringed copyrights in the 37 Java packages and a specific routine, "rangeCheck". Whether copyright protection extends to all elements of an original work of computer software, including a system or method of operation, that an author could have written in more than one way.	C
SEC v. Pentagon Capital Mgmt. PLC	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	2012	Not relevant - Securities Law related issues	NA

Tetris Holding, LLC v. Xio Interactive, Inc.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY	2012	Defendant competitor said it did not infringe plaintiff holder's video game copyright, because it only copied game rules and functionality, not expressive elements. The holder was entitled to summary judgment because (1) elements copied were not unprotected operation methods but protected expression related to the elements, and (2) the doctrines of scenes a faire and merger did not apply, as the game's presentation was wholly fanciful and the competitor could have expressed game rules in many novel ways, but did not, protected the elements. The motion granted.	C
United States v. Harris	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS	2012	The Defendant was convicted of seven counts of wire fraud based on his participation in a scheme to sell hardware and software that enabled users to obtain free and higher speed internet access by misrepresenting themselves as paying subscribers to cable internet service providers. He has filed a motion to dismiss and for judgment of acquittal on the ground that the wire fraud statute is unconstitutionally vague as applied to the facts of this case. For the reasons, the defendant's motion is not meritorious.	A
Ass'n for Molecular Pathology v. United States PTO	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT	2012	Not relevant - Biology related issues	NA
Defreitas v. Tillinghast	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	2013	Not relevant - Criminal Law issue - sexual harassment	NA
In re Uehling	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	2013	Not relevant - Jurisprudential issues	NA
Split Pivot, Inc. v. Trek Bicycle Corp.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN	2013	Not relevant - Patent claim regarding bycicle components	NA
Ex parte Castellanos	COURT OF APPEALS OF TEXAS, FOURTEENTH DISTRICT, HOUSTON	2014	Not relevant - Criminal law - credit card cloning	NA
Ex parte Castillo-Lorente	COURT OF APPEALS OF TEXAS, FOURTEENTH DISTRICT, HOUSTON	2014	Not relevant - Criminal law - money laundry	NA
Oracle USA, Inc. v. Rimini St., Inc.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA	2014	A software company that held copyrights on several software programs established a prima facie case of copyright infringement by showing that a competitor that was hired by a city, a school district, and two businesses that used the company's programs copied the programs when it built development environments so it could provide software support service. The competitor did not show that licensing agreements the software company entered with the city and the school district gave the competitor the right to copy the company's programs. A licensing agreement the software company entered with one of the businesses allowed the competitor to copy the company's programs on its system and there were issues of fact concerning the competitor's claim that a licensing agreement the company entered with the other business allowed the competitor to copy the company's programs. The court granted the software company's motion for summary judgment on its claims alleging copyright infringement in part and denied it in part.	C
Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	2014	Plaintiff Apple Inc. alleged that Defendants Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd copied Apple's technology, user interface, and innovative style in its phone, media player, and table computer products. The jury found that nine accused Samsung products infringed Apple's '647 patent and three Samsung devices infringed Apple's '721 patent, while three cleared that patent.	C
Univ. of Utah Research Found. v. Ambry Genetics Corp.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION	2014	Not relevant - Biology related issues	NA
GPNE Corp. v. Apple, Inc.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	2014	Not relevant - Labour Law related issues	NA
In re The Search of Premises Known as: A Nextel Cellular Tel. with Belonging to & Seized from	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS	2014	Not relevant - Jurisprudential issues	NA
Everyscape, Inc. v. Adobe Sys.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS	2014	Patent infringement analysis involves two steps: (1) the threshold construction of the meaning and scope of the asserted claim, followed by (2) a determination of whether the accused product infringes the properly construed claim. If no reasonable jury could possibly find that an accused product satisfies every claim limitation of the asserted claims, either literally, or under the doctrine of equivalents, then summary judgment of noninfringement must be granted.	C
Long v. Ala. Dep't of Human Res.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA	2014	Not relevant - Labour Law related issues	NA
Dassault Systemes, S.A. v. Childress	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN	2014	Plaintiff owns the copyrights for CATIA software products and has registered the CATIA trademark with the USPTO. Plaintiff sought damages for copyright and trademark infringement, unfair competition arising from allegedly unauthorized use of its name and software licenses to operate a for-profit training course. The district court ruled in favour of plaintiff.	B

Legend:

A: Software and Hardware cloning issues related to physical devices
B: Software cloning issues related to competition and antitrust issues
C: Software cloning issues related to misappropriation of trade secrets and copyright infringements
NA: Not Applicable. This is not a case related to software cloning