

## John Schnurer

### Partner

[john.schnurer@foley.com](mailto:john.schnurer@foley.com)

San Diego  
858.847.6745



John Schnurer is an experienced trial lawyer and litigator who represents clients in federal and state courts nationwide, as well as before the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC). He has successfully led numerous jury and bench trials, including patent cases, and has litigated over 40 Section 337 investigations before the ITC.

As a skilled intellectual property strategist, John leverages his background in electrical engineering to advise clients on patent infringement, validity, post-grant proceedings, and large portfolio due diligence for acquisitions, licensing, and pre-suit analysis. As a registered patent attorney, he also helps clients patent their technologies. He has extensive experience with patent post-grant proceedings, particularly *inter partes* reviews (IPR), before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

John regularly represents clients from the U.S., Taiwan, Korea, and China, offering deep experience in cross-border IP and business dispute matters. His diverse legal background includes serving as an attorney with the Department of Justice and the U.S. Air Force, where he supervised criminal trial attorneys and led numerous felony jury and bench trials. Additionally, he has handled civil and commercial lawsuits involving environmental, medical malpractice, breach of contract, antitrust, unfair competition and tort claims.

## Representative Experience

### Litigation

- Lead counsel for Delta Electronics, Inc. in two cases involving three patents related to power ICs. *Delta Electronics, Inc. v. Vicor Corp.*, U.S. District Court for Delaware, Case No. 1:23-cv-1246 and U.S. District Court for W.D. of Texas, Case No. 6:23-cv-726.\*
- Lead counsel for Monolithic Power Systems in multiple cases involving two patents related to step-down converters for point-of-load applications. *Monolithic Power Systems, Inc. v. Reed Semiconductor Corp et al*, U.S. District Court for Delaware, Case Nos. 1:23-cv-1155, 1:24-cv-0165, and 1:24-cv-0166.\*

- Lead counsel for U.D. Electronic Corp. in a three-patent case relating to RJ-45 Integrated Connector Modules. *Pulse Electronics, Inc. v. U.D. Electronic Corp.*, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California, Case No. 3:18-cv-00373.\*
- Lead counsel for plaintiffs in a business litigation jury trial before Judge Robert Conrad involving claims of fraud, conversion, breach of contract, and other business claims that resulted in a complete jury verdict victory in favor of plaintiffs and a finding of millions in actual and punitive damages. *Vanguard Pai Lung, LLC v. William Moody et al.*, State of California, County of Mecklenburg, Business Court.\*
- Lead counsel for plaintiff Lucent Trans in business litigation before Judge Fernando Olguin involving claims of fraud, breach of contract, and unjust enrichment. *Lucent Trans Electronic Co., Inc. v. Foreign Trade Corporation D/B/A Technocel et al.*, U.S. District Court for the Central District of California.\*
- Lead counsel for TCL defendants in patent litigation before Judge Ed Kinkeade concerning wireless technologies, particularly channel sounding for a spread spectrum signal, used in mobile devices. *Aperture Net, LLC v. TCT Mobile (US) Inc. et al.*, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Case No. 3:21-cv-00524.\*
- Lead counsel for TCL defendants in patent litigation concerning software restriction in accused mobile devices before Judge George Wu (California). *Ancora Technologies, Inc. v. TCT Mobile (US) Inc. et al.*, U.S. District Court for the Central District of California and Eastern District of Texas.\*
- Lead counsel for TCL in a three-patent case concerning 4G LTE standards in mobile handsets before Judge James Selna. *Wi-Lan Inc. et al. v. TCT Mobile (US) Inc. et al.*, U.S. District Court for the Central District of California.\*
- Lead counsel for defendant Coolpad Technologies in a multiple-patent case before Judge Cathy Ann Bencivengo related to mobile devices implicating Android, 802.11, and LTE. *Bell Northern Research, LLC v. Coolpad Technologies, Inc.*, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California.\*
- Lead counsel for T-Max in a three-patent and one-copyright case before Judge Cormac J. Carney and Magistrate Judge Jean P. Rosenbluth concerning retractable vehicle step automotive accessories. *Lund Motion Products, Inc. v. T-Max (Hangzhou) Technology Co., Ltd. et al.*, U.S. District Court for the Central District of California.\*
- Lead counsel for Monolithic Power Systems in litigation including claims for trade secret misappropriation, tortious interference, disparagement, defamation, and unfair competition. *Monolithic Power Systems, Inc. v. Intersil Corporation*, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware.\*
- Lead counsel for Auto-Vox in litigation including claims for tortious interference and declaratory judgment of noninfringement of a design patent and declaratory judgment of invalidity, unenforceability, cancellation, and noninfringement of a trademark. Complaint dismissed. *Shenzhen Auto-Vox Technology Co., Ltd. v. The Noco Company*, U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington.\*
- Lead counsel for Genoray in a three-patent case before Judge Roy B. Dalton, Jr. and Magistrate Judge David A. Baker concerning power supply and image processing for dental x-ray imaging equipment. Settled favorably. *Oy Ajat Ltd. v. Genoray Co. Ltd. and Genoray America, Inc.*, U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida.\*

- Lead counsel for Cellco Partnership (d/b/a Verizon Wireless), TeleCommunication Systems, Inc., and Networks in Motion, Inc. in a one-patent case before Judge Leonard Stark concerning vehicle ETA systems. Achieved stipulated judgment of noninfringement after favorable claim construction order before trial. Successfully argued the appeal, securing affirmance of Judge Stark's rulings. Case dismissed with prejudice. *Vehicle IP LLC v. AT&T Mobility LLC*, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware.\*
- Lead counsel for Largan Precision in a six-patent case before Judge Sabraw and Judge Bencivengo concerning optical lens in smartphones, tablets, and other products. Obtained a very favorable settlement a week before a three-week jury trial was to begin. *Largan Precision, Company Ltd. v. Samsung Electronics, et al.* U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California, Case No.13-CV-2740.\*
- Lead counsel for HTC in a six-patent case concerning haptics functionality in smartphones. Obtained a very favorable settlement for HTC a day before trial was to begin. *Immersion Corporation v. HTC Corporation and HTC America Inc., et al.*, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware.\*

### ITC Section 337 Actions

- Counsel for Respondent Shenzhen Carku and its customers in three investigations brought by NOCO involving multiple patents asserted against lithiumion jump starters, resulting in a finding of no violation in each of the three investigations. U.S. International Trade Commission Investigations, Case No. 337-TA-1256, 1359 and 1360.\*
- Lead counsel for TCL involving four patents brought by Philips, which resulted in a finding of no violation based on noninfringement and no technical domestic industry. *In the Matter of Certain Digital Video-Capable Devices and Components Thereof*, U.S. International Trade Commission Investigations, Case No. 337-TA-1224.\*
- Lead counsel for respondent TTE Technology Inc. in multi-patent case brought by Universal Electronics related to remote control technologies. *In the Matter of Certain Electronic Devices, Including Streaming Players, Televisions, Set Top Boxes, Remote Controllers, and Components Thereof*, U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation, Case No. 337-TA-1200.\*
- Lead counsel for TCL in a multi-patent case brought by Innovative Foundries related to semiconductor process technologies used in Qualcomm chips incorporated in TCL mobile products. The case settled after TCL's suppliers reached a settlement with the complainant. *In the Matter of Certain Semiconductor Devices, Integrated Circuits, and Consumer Products Containing the Same*, U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation, Case No. 337-TA-1149.\*
- Lead counsel for Shenzhen Huiding Technology Co., Ltd. (d.b.a. Goodix) and Goodix Technology Inc. in a four-patent investigation before ALJ Essex (later transferred to ALJ McNamara) concerning touchscreen controllers in smartphones. The case settled favorably after the hearing, with OUII recommending no violation. Filed nine *inter partes* review petitions, five of which were instituted. *In the Matter of Certain Touchscreen Controllers and Products Containing Same*, U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation, Case No. 337-TA-957.\*

- Lead counsel for Fortress Investment Group LLC and AND34 Funding LLC in a five-patent investigation before ALJ Pender concerning audio signal processing in tablets, desktops, and laptops. The case was selected for the 100-Day Pilot Program, and after the ALJ affirmed the complainant's standing, the matter settled before the hearing. *In the Matter of Audio Processing Hardware and Software and Products Containing the Same*, U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation, Case No. 337-TA-949.\*
- Lead counsel for AmTRAN Technology Co., Ltd. and AmTRAN Logistics, Inc. in a three-patent case before ALJ Shaw concerning smart TVs and devices in point-to-point communication networks. The investigation was terminated after the complainant moved to withdraw, and the district court case was settled favorably. *In the Matter of Point-to-Point Network Communication Devices and Products Containing Same*, U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation, Case No. 337-TA-892.\*
- Lead counsel for HTC Corporation and HTC America Inc. in a four-patent case before ALJ Essex concerning camera functionality and image processing in smartphones. One patent was dismissed before trial, and a favorable determination of noninfringement was reached for the remaining patents. *In the Matter of Certain Electronic Imaging Devices*, U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation, Case No. 337-TA-850.\*
- Lead counsel for ASUS in a five-patent case before ALJ Gildea concerning teleconferencing technologies in ASUS tablets. The case settled favorably. *In the Matter of Certain Consumer Electronics, Including Mobile Phones and Tablets*, U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation, Case No. 337-TA-839.\*
- Lead counsel for HTC Corporation and HTC America Inc. in a four-patent case before ALJ Essex concerning CPU architecture and display technologies. The case settled favorably. *In the Matter of Certain Consumer Electronics and Display Devices and Products Containing Same*, U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation, Case No. 337-TA-836.\*
- Lead counsel for HTC Corporation and HTC America Inc. in a five-patent case before ALJ Gildea concerning haptic functionality in smartphones. The case was terminated after the complainant moved to withdraw. *In the Matter of Certain Mobile Electronic Devices Incorporating Haptics*, U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation, Case No. 337-TA-834.\*
- Counsel for HTC Corporation and HTC America Inc. in a patent case before ALJ Gildea concerning smartphones. *Certain Portable Electronic Devices and Related Software*, U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation, Case No. 337-TA-797.\*
- Counsel for Broadcom in a six-patent case before ALJ Essex concerning DDRx memory controller products. The case settled. *In the Matter of Certain Semiconductor Chips and Products Containing Same*, U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation, Case No. 337-TA-753.\*
- Lead trial counsel for HTC in a three-patent case brought by Flashpoint and presided over by Chief ALJ Luckern concerning camera functionality in smartphones. The trial resulted in a win with a finding of noninfringement and invalidity, and HTC was found to have an implied license for Windows-based products. Other respondents settled before and after trial, and the Federal Circuit affirmed the commission's final determination. *In the Matter of Certain Electronic Imaging Devices*, U.S.

International Trade Commission Investigation, Case No. 337-TA-726.\*

- Lead counsel for AmTRAN Technology Co., Ltd. and AmTRAN Logistics, Inc. in a three-patent case before ALJ Shaw concerning Smart TVs and devices in point-to-point communication networks. The investigation was terminated after the complainant moved to withdraw, and the district court case was settled favorably. *In the Matter of Point-to-Point Network Communication Devices and Products Containing Same*, U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation, Case No. 337-TA-892.\*
- Lead trial counsel for HTC in a three-patent case before CALJ Luckern concerning camera functionality in smart phones; win at trial and initial ID finding noninfringement, invalidity based on-sale bar, and none of the domestic industry licensees practiced the asserted patents; Commission reviewed the ID, affirmed the findings on petition and also found HTC had an implied license to practice the asserted patents for its Windows-based products; Other respondents Nokia and RIM settled shortly before trial and LG settled after trial and before the initial determination; Fed. Cir. affirmed Commission's FD less than a week after oral arguments. *In the Matter of Certain Electronic Imaging Devices, U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation*, Case No. No. 337-TA-726.\*
- Lead counsel for Respondent ASUS in a three patent case before ALJ Essex concerning products implementing power supplies, variable speed fans, and Network Address Port Translation; win at trial and initial ID, Commission decided not to review initial ID which became the final ID, and case, along with two other federal court cases between the parties, subsequently settled favorably. *In the Matter of Certain Computer Products, Computer Components and Products Containing Same*, U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation, Case No. 337-TA-628.\*

\*Matters handled prior to joining Foley.

## Awards and Recognition

- *Daily Journal*, Top 100 Intellectual Property Lawyers in California (2021)
- *Chambers USA: America's Leading Lawyers for Business*, Recognized Practitioner: Patent – California
- *Best Lawyers*, Best Lawyers in America, Commercial Litigation; Litigation – Intellectual Property; Litigation – Patent (2018-2025)
- *Super Lawyers*, Top 50 Lawyers in San Diego, Corporate Counsel Edition (2017)
- *Super Lawyers*, California Super Lawyer, Intellectual Property Litigation, Corporate Counsel Edition (2009-2025)
- *Benchmark Litigation*, Guide to America's Leading Litigation Firms and Attorneys (2021)
- *Managing IP*, IP Star (2013-2014, 2016, 2020-2024)
- *Intellectual Asset Management (IAM) Patent 1000*, Litigation Bronze Band (2012-2022), Patent 1000 (2023-2024)
- *Daily Journal*, Top 75 Intellectual Property Litigators in California (2011)
- *San Diego Daily Transcript*, Top Intellectual Property Attorney (2007, 2008, 2010, and 2012)

## Practice Areas

- [IP Litigation](#)

- [Intellectual Property](#)

## Education

- University of California, Berkeley School of Law (J.D., 1996)
  - Articles editor, *Berkeley Technology Law Journal*
- Harvey Mudd College (B.S., 1993)
  - Electrical engineering

## Admissions

- California
- Texas
- Supreme Court of California
- U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit
- U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California
- U.S. District Court for the Central District of California
- U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California
- U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California
- U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware
- U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida
- U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida
- U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York
- U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas
- U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas
- U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas
- U.S. District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin
- U.S. Patent and Trademark Office