

HR 628

To establish a pilot program in certain United States district courts to encourage enhancement of expertise in patent cases among district judges.

Congress: 111 (2009–2011, Ended)

Chamber: House

Policy Area: Law

Introduced: Jan 22, 2009

Current Status: Became Public Law No: 111-349.

Latest Action: Became Public Law No: 111-349. (Jan 4, 2011)

Law: 111-349 (Enacted Jan 4, 2011)

Official Text: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/111th-congress/house-bill/628>

Sponsor

Name: Rep. Issa, Darrell E. [R-CA-49]

Party: Republican • **State:** CA • **Chamber:** House

Cosponsors (3 total)

Cosponsor	Party / State	Role	Date Joined
Rep. Schiff, Adam B. [D-CA-29]	D · CA		Jan 22, 2009
Rep. Coble, Howard [R-NC-6]	R · NC		Feb 10, 2009
Rep. Johnson, Henry C. "Hank," Jr. [D-GA-4]	D · GA		Feb 10, 2009

Committee Activity

Committee	Chamber	Activity	Date
Judiciary Committee	House	Referred To	Jan 22, 2009
Judiciary Committee	Senate	Discharged From	Dec 13, 2010

Subjects & Policy Tags

Policy Area:

Law

Related Bills

Bill	Relationship	Last Action
111 S 299	Identical bill	Jan 22, 2009: Read twice and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(This measure has not been amended since it was passed by the Senate on December 13, 2010. The summary of that version is repeated here.)

Establishes a pilot program in certain U.S. district courts under which: (1) those district judges who request to hear cases involving patent or plant variety protection issues are designated by the chief judge to hear them; (2) such cases are randomly assigned to the district court judges, regardless of whether they are designated; (3) a judge not designated to whom such a case is assigned may decline to accept the case; and (4) a case so declined is randomly reassigned to one of those judges so designated.

Actions Timeline

- **Jan 4, 2011:** Signed by President.
- **Jan 4, 2011:** Became Public Law No: 111-349.
- **Dec 28, 2010:** Presented to President.
- **Dec 17, 2010:** Considered as unfinished business. (consideration: CR H8762-8763)
- **Dec 17, 2010:** Resolving differences -- House actions: On motion that the House suspend the rules and agree to the Senate amendment Agreed to by recorded vote (2/3 required): 371 - 1 (Roll no. 651).(text as House agreed to Senate amendment: CR 12/16/2010 H8536-8537)
- **Dec 17, 2010:** On motion that the House suspend the rules and agree to the Senate amendment Agreed to by recorded vote (2/3 required): 371 - 1 (Roll no. 651). (text as House agreed to Senate amendment: CR 12/16/2010 H8536-8537)
- **Dec 17, 2010:** Motion to reconsider laid on the table Agreed to without objection.
- **Dec 17, 2010:** Cleared for White House.
- **Dec 16, 2010:** Ms. Chu moved that the House suspend the rules and agree to the Senate amendment. (consideration: CR H8536-8539)
- **Dec 16, 2010:** DEBATE - The House proceeded with forty minutes of debate on the Senate amendment to H.R. 628.
- **Dec 16, 2010:** At the conclusion of debate, the chair put the question on the motion to suspend the rules. Ms. Chu objected to the vote on the grounds that a quorum was not present. Further proceedings on the motion were postponed. The point of no quorum was withdrawn.
- **Dec 14, 2010:** Message on Senate action sent to the House.
- **Dec 13, 2010:** Senate Committee on the Judiciary discharged by Unanimous Consent.
- **Dec 13, 2010:** Measure laid before Senate by unanimous consent. (consideration: CR S8946-8947)
- **Dec 13, 2010:** Passed/agreed to in Senate: Passed Senate with an amendment by Unanimous Consent.
- **Dec 13, 2010:** Passed Senate with an amendment by Unanimous Consent.
- **Mar 18, 2009:** Received in the Senate and Read twice and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.
- **Mar 17, 2009:** Mr. Johnson (GA) moved to suspend the rules and pass the bill.
- **Mar 17, 2009:** Considered under suspension of the rules. (consideration: CR H3456-3459)
- **Mar 17, 2009:** DEBATE - The House proceeded with forty minutes of debate on H.R. 628.
- **Mar 17, 2009:** At the conclusion of debate, the chair put the question on the motion to suspend the rules. Mr. Issa objected to the vote on the grounds that a quorum was not present. Further proceedings on the motion were postponed. The point of no quorum was withdrawn.
- **Mar 17, 2009:** Considered as unfinished business. (consideration: CR H3471)
- **Mar 17, 2009:** Passed/agreed to in House: On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill Agreed to by recorded vote (2/3 required): 409 - 7 (Roll no. 130).(text: CR H3456-3457)
- **Mar 17, 2009:** On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill Agreed to by recorded vote (2/3 required): 409 - 7 (Roll no. 130). (text: CR H3456-3457)
- **Mar 17, 2009:** Motion to reconsider laid on the table Agreed to without objection.
- **Jan 22, 2009:** Introduced in House
- **Jan 22, 2009:** Referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary.