

# Case Studies

## Patent Practitioners

# Case Study 1- Patent Practitioners

## FTE Model Engagement



### The Client:

A Law Firm based in the US

### The Case:

Client has engaged three professionals from Sagacious in the Full-Time engagement model. It provides patent drafting and patentability search projects on a regular basis, and also provides one or two invalidation/FTO search projects a month.

The client wants quick turn-around of projects in a preferred pre-defined style.

### The Methodology:

- ❑ FTE Selection: Resume of professionals were sent to the client, as per client's requirements. The client selected three FTEs out of these professionals.
- ❑ Preferences Training: Client sent some samples of their work and their preference/style sheet. The FTEs developed an understanding of preferences and confirmed them over a conference call with the client.
- ❑ Standardization of processes: During the first week, all the processes, deliverable formats, delivery timelines, conference call schedules and weekly report format were finalized.
- ❑ Ongoing Relationship for the last one year: The client has been providing us continuous work for the last one year, completely utilizing the three FTEs. It now plans to increase the number of FTEs to five.

### Advantages:

Each FTE can usually complete nearly two patent drafting assignments and one search assignment per month.

This amounts for a saving of **nearly 60%** w.r.t getting the same tasks done in house, and **nearly 15%** savings w.r.t the on-demand model.

Additionally, the client can now also operate in some domains for which it does not have a big in-house team.

# Case Study 2 - Patent Practitioners

## Patent Opposition/ invalidity



### The Client:

A Law Firm based in France

### The Case:

It was a quick-turnaround, on-demand project. Client was approached by a company, which manufactures cosmetic products for women, to undertake an opposition that had its deadline due in two weeks. Our client, in turn, gave us the project to identify relevant patent/ non-patent prior art a week before the opposition deadline.

### The Project Methodology:

Sagacious analyzed nearly 3,000 patents and non-patent articles/ publications in just 3 days to compile a report detailing:

- ❑ Relevant Patents: Patents disclosing identical or similar technology as claimed in the patent to be opposed
- ❑ Relevant Non-patent Literature: Non-patent articles/ publications disclosing identical or similar technology as claimed in the patent to be opposed
- ❑ Mapping: For quicker analysis at client's end, Sagacious also provided visual mapping between identified prior art and the claimed features of the patent to be opposed

### Advantages:

Sagacious completed the study for Euro 2,500.

The client could successfully complete a quick turn-around project, for which it did not even have the sufficient bandwidth in-house, thereby delighting the end client.

Additionally, this meant nearly **50% cost-savings** to the client w.r.t. conducting the entire study in-house.

# Case Study 3 - Patent Practitioners

## Pre-licensing support



### The Client:

A technology/patent acquisition and licensing firm based in the US

### The Case:

Client was in talks to acquire a patent portfolio in the domain of medical devices. It wanted to see the potential licensees for the patented technology prior to investment.

### The Project:

The project involved identifying potential licensees of the patented technology. Sagacious prepared a report detailing:

- ❑ List of potential licensees: List of ~150 manufacturers of the possibly infringing products, as they might need to license the patents in order to continue manufacturing/ selling the products.
- ❑ Infringing products: A list of ~600 products in the market/ pipeline that could possibly infringe on the patented technology.
- ❑ Financial data for the potential licensees: Revenue, market-share, %age revenue due to the possibly infringing products and other publicly available information.

### Financial Gain:

Sagacious completed the study in USD 3,500.

This meant at least **50% of savings** to the client w.r.t. getting the same study done in the US.