

## 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	<b>Jan 22, 2009:</b> 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.