



JSIP 2026 WORLDWIDE MOCK TRIAL : PHASE 1

The Smartphone Stand Case

Patent Infringement Proceedings Under Japanese Law (Explanatory Session)

PRESENT INVENTION (PONY CO.)

Element [D'] Biasing Member:
"Metal Compression Coil Spring"

- Operates via axial linear compression stress
- Overcomes wear & rubber aging issues

ACCUSED PRODUCT (DONKEY CO.)

Element [D'] Biasing Member:
"Metal Leaf Spring"

- Operates via plate bending stress
- Main Legal Issue: Infringement under DoE?



Phase 1: Proceedings Under Japanese Law (Explanatory Session)

The Explanatory Session Format

- **Core Function in Japan:** A standard proceeding in Japanese patent litigation where parties present key technical features and legal issues.
- **Participants:** Involves Judges, Court Research Officials, and Technical Advisors (in this session: Judges and Research Official).
- **Key Objective:** To clarify complex technical principles and narrow down fundamental legal disputes prior to judicial deliberation.

Procedural Flow of Phase 1

1. Plaintiff Presentation (15 min)

Pony Co. presents the Invention, technical background, and grounds for Doctrine of Equivalents (DoE).

2. Defendant Presentation (15 min)

Donkey Co. presents non-infringement arguments based on essential differences & prosecution history estoppel.

3. Questions from the Court (10 min)

Judges & Research Official question both counsels regarding physical mechanics & amendment history.



Plaintiff (Pony): Invention Overview & Technical Advantages

Prior Art Problems

1. Friction Hinge:
Degrades due to mechanical wear of sliding parts over repeated rotation.
2. Rubber Stopper:
Loses elasticity due to natural aging of rubber, failing to maintain desired angle.

Technical Solution

- Metal Spring Mechanism:**
Uses restoring force of a metal compression coil spring to bias a protrusion into hinge recesses.
- Engagement Structure:**
Mechanical mating between protrusion and recesses holds the stand at fixed angles.

Functions & Effects

- ✓ Crisp Click Feeling:
Instantly snaps into place with a clear tactile click at predetermined positions.
- ✓ Long-term Durability:
Metal elasticity prevents degradation from wear or aging, maintaining strong holding force indefinitely.



Plaintiff (Pony): Claim Construction & Amendment Context

CLAIM 1 STRUCTURE & AMENDMENT

[A]-[C], [E]: Mounting portion, base portion, hinge shaft, recesses, and mating protrusion (Undisputed)

Element [D] (As Filed): "an elastic member that biases said protrusion" (Broad term encompassing rubber & springs)

Element [D'] (As Amended): "a metal compression coil spring that biases said protrusion" (Narrowed during examination)

Purpose of Amendment & Applicant's Remarks

- Exclusion Target: The examiner cited Cited Document 1 (rubber stopper). The amendment to "metal compression coil spring" was made solely to exclude the prior art's rubber stopper.
- Applicant's Argument in Remarks: Emphasized that unlike rubber stoppers which degrade and lack click feel, the Invention uses the mechanical linear compression/restoring mechanism of a metal spring.



Plaintiff (Pony): Comparison with the Accused Product

Feature Category	Present Invention (Pony)	Accused Product (Donkey)
Basic Configuration	Mounting portion, base portion, hinge shaft, recesses, mating protrusion	IDENTICAL to Invention (Elements A, B, C, E satisfied)
Biasing Member (Element D')	Metal Compression Coil Spring	Metal Leaf Spring (Sole technical difference)
Functions & Effects	✓ Crisp click feeling upon engagement ✓ Long-term durability without aging/wear	✓ IDENTICAL crisp click feeling ✓ IDENTICAL metal elasticity & durability



Plaintiff (Pony): Application of Ball Spline 5-Requirement Test

Req. 1: Non-Essential Part

Difference is not an essential part of the Invention.

DISPUTED (Satisfied)

Req. 2: Replaceability

Achieves same purpose and same function & effect.

UNDISPUTED (Satisfied)

Req. 3: Ease of Replacement

Obvious to a skilled person at time of infringement.

UNDISPUTED (Satisfied)

Req. 4: Non-Obviousness

Accused product is not obvious from prior art at filing.

UNDISPUTED (Satisfied)

Req. 5: No Intentional Exclusion

No special circumstances such as intentional exclusion.

DISPUTED (Satisfied)



Plaintiff (Pony): Requirement 1 — Non-Essential Part

Legal Standard (Maxacalcitol Grand Panel, 2016)

"Essential part" refers to the characteristic portion of the claim that constitutes a unique technical idea not found in the prior art, identified by comparing the invention with prior art.

Technical Idea & Contribution Analysis

- **Prior Art Problem ([0004]-[0006]):** Friction hinges wear out; rubber stoppers lose elasticity from aging, losing holding force.
- **Invention's Solution ([0008]):** Uses mechanical metal spring resilience to bias a protrusion into recesses, achieving durable holding force & click feel.
- **Core Technical Idea:** "Biasing the protrusion using a mechanical mechanism of metal spring resilience."
- **Conclusion on Req. 1:** Both compression coil spring and leaf spring embody this identical technical idea. The specific spring shape (coil vs. leaf) is merely a minor variation within the disclosed technical idea. Requirement 1 is satisfied.



Plaintiff (Pony): Requirement 5 — No Intentional Exclusion

Legal Standard (Maxacalcitol Supreme Court, 2017)

Special circumstances (intentional exclusion) exist only when it can be said that the applicant objectively/externally indicated an intention to disclaim the substitute structure while recognizing it as an alternative.

Application to Prosecution History

- **Purpose of Amendment:** Narrowed from "elastic member" solely to distinguish Cited Document 1's rubber stopper. There was no intent or indication to disclaim metal leaf springs.
- **Remarks Analysis:** Remarks contrasted rubber stoppers with mechanical metal spring resilience obeying Hooke's law. Leaf springs also operate via mechanical metal spring resilience.
- **Unrecognized Substitute:** Leaf springs were NOT obvious to a skilled person at filing. The applicant could not objectively/externally disclaim a substitute structure that was unrecognized at filing.
- **Conclusion on Req. 5:** No special circumstances of intentional exclusion exist. Requirement 5 is satisfied.



Plaintiff (Pony): Summary & Relief Sought

Summary of Plaintiff's Case

- ✓ Literal Infringement: Accused Product literally satisfies Claim Elements A, B, C, and E.
- ✓ DoE Infringement: Element D' ("metal leaf spring") satisfies all 5 requirements of the Ball Spline Supreme Court standard.
- ✓ Non-Essential Part (Req. 1): Both springs share the core technical idea of mechanical metal spring resilience.
- ✓ No Intentional Exclusion (Req. 5): Amendment was made solely to exclude prior art rubber stoppers, not metal leaf springs.
- ✓ **Relief Sought: Plaintiff respectfully requests an injunction against manufacture/sale and full compensation for damages.**



Defendant (Donkey): Comparison of Biasing Mechanisms

Prior Art (Cited Doc 1)

Biasing Member:
Rubber Stopper

Mechanism:
Rubber material elasticity.

Drawback:
Degrades over time, losing elasticity & holding force.

Present Invention

Biasing Member:
Metal Compression Coil Spring

Mechanism:
Linear compression stress along hinge axis.

Claimed Scope:
Strictly limited to compression coil springs.

Accused Product

Biasing Member:
Metal Leaf Spring

Mechanism:
Bending stress of plate metal.

Non-Infringement:
X No literal infringement
X Fails DoE Req. 1 & Req. 5



Defendant (Donkey): Requirement 1 — Difference is Essential

Rationale of DoE (Ball Spline Supreme Court Standard)

DoE protects the substantive value of an invention without harming third-party predictability. If a difference pertains to an essential part, it represents a fundamentally different technical idea and cannot be equivalent.

Essential Technical Difference

- **Minimal Technical Contribution:** Invention's contribution over prior art is minimal—merely specifying a "metal compression coil spring" as the biasing member.
- **Fundamental Mechanical Disconnect:** Coil springs operate via axial linear compression stress. Leaf springs operate via plate bending stress. The physical mechanisms are fundamentally different.
- **Chilling Effect on Competitors:** Allowing a patentee who made a minor contribution to claim non-disclosed mechanisms stifles legitimate competitor innovation and harms predictability.
- **Conclusion on Req. 1:** The difference lies in the very essential part of the claimed invention. Requirement 1 is NOT satisfied.



Defendant (Donkey): Requirement 5 — Prosecution History Estoppel

Legal Standard (Maxacalcitol Supreme Court, 2017)

Intends to balance interests under first-to-file system between applicants (prompt filing) and third parties (relying on public records to design products without fear of unexpected litigation).

Prosecution History & Estoppel Analysis

- **Voluntary Narrowing Amendment:** As filed: "elastic member" (rejected over Cited Doc 1). Applicant narrowed specifically to "metal compression coil spring" rather than "metal spring".
- **Express Disclaimers in Remarks:** Applicant argued that Invention is distinguished by "the mechanical mechanism of linear compression and repulsion". Non-coil structures were disclaimed.
- **Third-Party Reliance & Estoppel:** Third parties reasonably rely on this public record. Recapturing non-coil springs under DoE violates estoppel and harms public predictability.
- **Conclusion on Req. 5:** Special circumstances of intentional exclusion exist. Requirement 5 is NOT satisfied.



Defendant (Donkey): Detailed Analysis of Prosecution Record

Objective Signs in Public Record

- **1. Specification Disclosure ([0023]):** Specification broadly discloses "elastic member" without property limitations, noting housing shape/depth can be designed as appropriate (encompassing rubber, metal, coil, leaf, dome springs).
- **2. Examination Rejection & Choice:** When rejected over Cited Doc 1, applicant had full opportunity to amend to intermediate concepts like "metal spring". Instead, applicant chose pinpoint wording: "metal compression coil spring".
- **3. Remarks on Linear Behavior:** Applicant asserted in Remarks that the Invention is distinguished by "linear compression/repulsion". Dome leaf springs exhibit non-linear behavior; leaf springs are not inherently linear.
- **4. Estoppel & Public Protection:** Having obtained patent allowance by restricting claims to linear compression coil springs, asserting DoE against leaf springs constitutes impermissible "post-hoc expansion" (bait-and-switch).



Defendant (Donkey): Summary & Relief Sought

Summary of Defendant's Case

- X No Literal Infringement: Accused Product lacks Element D' ("metal compression coil spring").
- X Fails DoE Requirement 1: The difference in physical mechanics (axial linear compression vs. bending stress) constitutes an essential part.
- X Fails DoE Requirement 5: Narrowing amendment and Remarks disclaiming non-coil structures constitute intentional exclusion / estoppel.
- X Public Predictability: Patent scope must be predictably defined by public prosecution records.
- X **Relief Sought: Defendant respectfully requests that all Plaintiff's claims for injunction and damages be dismissed in their entirety.**



Question from Research Official (Mr. Tsukuba)

QUESTION (MR. TSUKUBA, RESEARCH OFFICIAL):

"The compression coil spring in the Invention is compressed axially (compression stress), whereas the leaf spring in the Accused Product bows/bends (bending stress). Doesn't this difference in physical force generation constitute a fundamental difference in physical mechanics?"

PLAINTIFF'S ANSWER (COUNSEL MATSUYAMA):

- Both utilize the fundamental physical principle of metal elastic deformation (Hooke's law).
- Whether force is generated via axial compression or bending is merely a minor mechanical detail within the overall technical idea.
- The core technical idea is "biasing the protrusion using mechanical metal spring resilience". Both springs accomplish this identically without degradation.



Question 1 from the Bench (Mr. Rai, High Court Judge)

QUESTION (MR. RAI, HIGH COURT JUDGE):

"The specification states the problem solved is preventing degradation of holding force due to friction wear or rubber aging. Isn't the substantive value of the Invention in providing a stable angle-holding mechanism using a metal spring, rather than limiting it to a specific spring shape?"

DEFENDANT'S ANSWER (COUNSEL ARAI):

- The specification discloses ONLY "compression coil springs" as an embodiment, with zero disclosure of general metal spring concepts or leaf springs.
- If rights were extended to leaf springs, third parties could not predict whether dome springs, resin springs, or FRP composites infringe.
- Allowing DoE here severely harms third-party predictability based on public specification disclosures.



Question 2 from the Bench (Ms. Maseki, High Court Judge)

QUESTION (MS. MASEKI, HIGH COURT JUDGE):

"During prosecution, the applicant voluntarily narrowed 'elastic member' to 'metal compression coil spring' to avoid rejection. Objectively, doesn't this indicate that other structures (including leaf springs) were excluded from the scope of rights?"

PLAINTIFF'S ANSWER (COUNSEL MATSUYAMA):

- Maxacalcitol requires 'disclaiming while recognizing as a substitute'. The narrowing was solely to exclude rubber stoppers.
- Simply using the embodiment term 'compression coil spring' does not constitute an intentional disclaimer of all non-coil springs.
- Leaf springs were NOT obvious at filing, so the applicant could not intentionally disclaim what was unrecognized.



JSIP 2026 WORLDWIDE MOCK TRIAL : PHASE 1

Conclusion of Phase 1 Proceedings

- Phase 1 (Opening proceedings under Japanese law) is now concluded.
- The court will adjourn briefly before proceeding to Phase 2.
- Phase 2: Oral Argument Before the International Panel (Chaired by Chief Judge Masuda).
- Proceedings will resume at 14:20.