
DEVLIN LAW FIRM LLC
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

DEVLIN LAW FIRM LLC
1526 Gilpin Ave., Wilmington, DE 19806
(302) 449-9010 · devlinlawfirm.com



Henrik Parker

COUNSEL

PHONE (302) 449-9010

PRACTICE AREAS

- Intellectual Property Litigation

AREAS OF EXPERTISE

- Led a team in obtaining summary judgment for a client invalidating all asserted claims of five separate patents directed to generating sales leads for automobile dealers.
- Led a team from multiple law firms representing a small semiconductor chip manufacturing equipment company in asserting patents against a large Japanese company. After several years of discovery, 16 different claim construction proceedings, multiple summary judgment motions and other pretrial jousting by the defendant who tried to win the litigation through a war of attrition, there was a monthlong jury trial leading to a full patent infringement liability verdict that resulted in a settlement garnering well over $70 million for the client.
- Led a team defending a manufacturer of air scrubbers against a patent infringement charge. After obtaining favorable claim construction rulings through a Markman Hearing, secured favorable settlement.

Biography

Rik Parker has focused his career on intellectual property litigation in all of its manifestations and has a strong record of success. He has 35 years of experience and was previously a long-time Partner at Woodcock Washburn LLP in Philadelphia, continuing as a Partner when that firm merged into Baker Hostetler. His chemical engineering background and ability to analyze complex issues to identify and exploit critical tipping points while coherently organizing persuasive legal arguments have enabled him to lead many successful litigation teams in district courts, the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals and the International Trade Commission (ITC).

Rik's experience spans technology areas ranging from hard-core chemical engineering to lasers/laser drivers, medical devices, nanotechnology and the use of the internet and/or software for mapping, computer telephony integration, and internet connection services. Representing patentees, in one instance, his team won a jury verdict garnering more than $70 million. Representing defendants, his teams routinely protect clients from liability for substantial damages.

Beyond representing clients, Rik is a frequent lecturer and author on the topic of attorney-client privilege in business transactions. Recognized in the IAM Patent 1000 each year since 2012, he has been described as "a well-rounded lawyer," as having "great business sense. He thinks of the goal and then focuses his arguments on it, rather than litigating superfluously," as "present[ing] well and do[ing] a good job stating his position in negotiations and settlement talks. He can crunch the numbers and do the engineering, but also knows how to communicate in a way that lay people understand," and as "a seasoned litigator … [who] has a gift for analyzing extremely complex technical fact patterns, combined with a persuasive narrative style when presenting in court."

Honors and Distinctions

- Pennsylvania Super Lawyer every year since 2004

- Led a team in obtaining summary judgment for a client invalidating all asserted claims of five separate patents directed to generating sales leads for automobile dealers.
- Led a team defending a water purification company against patent infringement charges. After working to obtain discovery of certain critical facts not previously public, secured quick settlement on favorable terms.
- Defended a large business software company against a patent infringement suit related to computer/telephony integration systems. After discovery and claim construction proceedings, was the principal drafter of a request for reexamination of the asserted patent at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) that was based on user manuals and public uses of similar systems. That reexamination led to all claims being finally rejected by the USPTO.
- Took over the case for a semiconductor manufacturing equipment company after its asserted patent had been found unenforceable by a district court as having been procured by inequitable conduct. Successfully obtained reversal of that decision in the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, which led to a favorable settlement.

EDUCATION

- J.D., University of Southern California Gould School of Law, 1984; American Jurisprudence Awards in Civil Procedure and Antitrust
- B.S.E., Chemical Engineering, Princeton University, 1980

BAR & COURT ADMISSIONS

- U.S. Supreme Court
- U.S. Court of Appeals, Federal Circuit
- U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit

- Selected one of the Best Lawyers In America every year since 2006
- Recognized for patent litigation every year since 2012 in IAM Patent 1000 – The World's Leading Patent Practitioners

Professional Memberships

- American Intellectual Property Law Association
- Professional Programs Committee
- Litigation Committee
- Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee
- Philadelphia Intellectual Property Law Association
- Amicus Committee: Chair
- Federal Circuit Bar Association
- American Bar Association
- Intellectual Property Law Section
- Litigation Section

Selected Articles, Presentations, and Publications

- "Attorney-Client Privilege In Intellectual Property Business Transactions," Webinar hosted by American Intellectual Property Law Association (June, 2016)
- "Shall We Dance? Litigation Options Surrounding the FDA's Biosimilar Approval Process," Intellectual Property Litigation Newsletter, American Bar Association (March 2016)
- "Ethical Issues in Patent Litigation: Abuse of Process," 2015 CASRIP High Technology Protection Summit, University of Washington School of Law (July, 2015)
- "Intellectual Property Roundtable: Issues Facing Practitioners Today," Philadelphia Legal Intelligencer, Philadelphia, PA (January, 2014)
- "PIPLA 27th Annual Review – Selected Appellate Decisions," Philadelphia Intellectual Property Law Association (May, 2012)
- "Attorney-Client Privilege In Intellectual Property Business Transactions – Don't Look Now?," Pennsylvania Bar Institute's 5th Annual Intellectual Property Institute (March, 2011)
- "PIPLA 25th Annual Review – Selected Federal Circuit Decisions," Philadelphia Intellectual Property Law Association (May, 2010)
- "Attorney-Client Privilege In Intellectual Property Business Transactions," The Legal Intelligencer's General Counsel CLE Seminar (March, 2010)
- Panelist, "Perspectives On USPTO Reform Legislation," Philadelphia Intellectual Property Law Association (January, 2009)
- "eBay v. MercExchange And Subsequent Developments In Post-Verdict Damages," American Institute of Certified Public Accountants Trends In Patent Damages Seminar (October, 2008)

- U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania
- U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Texas
- U.S. District Court, Central District of California
- U.S. District Court, Northern District of California
- U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Registration No. 31,863
- Pennsylvania
- California [Inactive]

**Attorney is not barred in Delaware.*

LANGUAGES

English

- Panelist, Conference on "Calculating And Proving Patent Damages," Law Seminars International (October, 2006)
- "Waiver Of Privilege In Business Transactions – Don't Look Before You Leap," IP Law 360 (April, 2006)
- "'Waiving' Goodbye To Privilege In Business Transactions: What You Should Know Before You Deal," 2002 Intellectual Property Law Update
- "Privilege, Privilege, Who's Got the Privilege? Or, How To Waive Goodbye To Your Protected Documents," Annual Meeting of the American Intellectual Property Law Association (October, 1995)
- "It's Academic: De Jure Infringement, De Facto Exemption," Eleventh Annual Joint Seminar of Philadelphia Intellectual Property Law Association, New York Patent Law Association, New Jersey Patent Law Association, and Connecticut Patent Law Association, Philadelphia, PA (April, 1995)
- "Doctrine Of Equivalents Analysis After Wilson Sporting Goods: The Hypothetical Claim Hydra," 18 American Intellectual Property Law Association Quarterly Journal (1990)
- Note, "Reform For Rights Of Employed Inventors," 57(4) Southern California Law Review 603 (1984)