

TOP PATENT FIRMS

2022 Rankings of the
Top Patent Firms at the USPTO
Based on Technology Center



02

TOP PATENT FIRMS AT THE USPTO

The top patent firms in each technology area – according to the data.

Some awards recognize firms based on staff size or volume of work. Others are based on client satisfaction. And let's face it, some are won after paying a hefty entry fee. But there aren't enough based on data.

Backed by our industry-leading patent database, Juristat's annual Top Patent Firms rankings are based solely on performance metrics.

Our database of more than 10 million pending, abandoned, and granted patent applications allows us to objectively analyze the performance of every law firm practicing within the USPTO – no call for participation or entry fees required.



03

HOW THE RANKINGS WORK

We know that each technology center presents its own unique set of challenges. And, perhaps more importantly, we know that firm expertise in a specific field is often more sought after than general aptitude.

And so, rather than ranking firm performance across the entire USPTO, we narrowed in on each tech center to find the best of the best within each particular area.

Juristat's rankings consider both volume and performance in that specific technology center. We based the rankings on how well a firm performed in three key metrics over a 12-month period. These metrics are:

- **Number of applications filed**
- **Allowance rate**
- **The average number of office actions before allowance**

This analysis was conducted between December 2022 - February 2023, and analyzed public applications disposed (or in the case of the first metric, applications filed) between January 1, 2020, and December 31, 2020. To qualify for inclusion, a firm must have filed a minimum of 100 applications in the tech center during that time period. This ensures the firm has extensive experience in that technology center and provides an appropriate-sized dataset to evaluate performance metrics. For our analysis, we attributed applications to the firm listed on the application at the time of disposition. We also excluded foreign priority applications and design applications from this analysis.

We narrowed the field in each technology center by first identifying the top ten firms in each of three categories – allowance rate, average office actions before allowance, and volume of applications filed. As you look at each tech center's rankings, you see the top ten in each of those three key metrics, as well as our overall ranking – the Juristat Rank.

04



This overall **Juristat Rank** was calculated by taking into account the firm's rank for the key metric, as well as rewarding firms who ranked for more than one category. This gives us a better picture of which firms have the most well-rounded performance in each tech center.

A caveat, of course. This method is but one way to measure a firm's performance and is not intended to be definitive. In fact, you should not rely solely on a firm's filing volume, allowance rate, or the number of office actions as a measure of success - as that doesn't necessarily account for patent quality. Beyond that, many clients value timeliness, communication, retention of top talent, or adoption of new technologies - more qualitative measures we can't yet analyze with data.

Additionally, these rankings represent a snapshot of performance at the time of analysis. This analysis of public applications was conducted from December 2022 - February 2023. Make sure you have the most up-to-date performance metrics by subscribing to Juristat.

Explore the rankings online at
resources.juristat.com/top-firms/2022

You can read more about our methodology at
resources.juristat.com/top-firms/2022/faq

05

TC 1600

Firm	Juristat Rank	Applications Filed Rank	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank
DENTONS	1	1	1	1
MASCHOFF BRENNAN	2		3	2
DECHERT	3		5	3
KLARQUIST	4		2	7
COOLEY	5	4		8
FISH & RICHARDSON	5	2		10
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI	7	3		10
HONIGMAN	8			3
LATHROP GPM	9		4	
GOODWIN	10			5
KILPATRICK TOWNSEND	10		5	
WOLF GREENFIELD	10	5		
FOLEY & LARDNER	13	6		
MINTZ	13	8	10	
MORGAN LEWIS	13		8	10
SHEPPARD MULLIN	13			6
BARNES & THORNBURG	17		7	
BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS	17	7		
CHOATE	19			8
K&L GATES	19		8	
MORRISON FOERSTER	21	9		
JONES DAY	22			10
KNOBBE MARTENS	22	10		
QUARLES	22		10	
WOMBLE BOND DICKINSON	22			10

06

TC 1700

Firm	Juristat Rank	Applications Filed Rank	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank
DINSMORE	1	5	3	1
FISH & RICHARDSON	2	3	4	4
MERCHANT & GOULD	3		1	2
FOLEY & LARDNER	4	2	6	8
BSKB	5		5	4
KNOBBE MARTENS	6	10	10	2
SERVILLA WHITNEY	7		7	4
SNELL & WILMER	7		2	9
HARNESS IP	9	1		
OBLON	10		10	4
KILPATRICK TOWNSEND	11	8	7	
DORITY & MANNING	12	4		
CANTOR COLBURN	13	6		
BARNES & THORNBURG	14		7	
PATTERSON + SHERIDAN	14	7		
BROOKS KUSHMAN	16			9
WOLF GREENFIELD	16	9		

07

TC 2100

Firm	Juristat Rank	Applications Filed Rank	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank
RYAN, MASON & LEWIS	1	10	2	2
CHAMBERLAIN HRDLICKA	2		4	1
NIXON VANDERHYE	2		3	2
KNOBBE MARTENS	4	4		2
BROOKS CAMERON & HUEBSCH	5		1	6
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER	6	5	5	
SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG & WOESSNER	7	1		
FLETCHER YODER	7		5	8
K&L GATES	7		5	8
FISH & RICHARDSON	10	2		
KILPATRICK TOWNSEND	11	3		
FOLEY & LARDNER	12	8		8
KOWERT, HOOD, MUNYON, RANKIN & GOETZEL	12	6	10	
FINNEGAN	14			5
HICKMAN BECKER BINGHAM LEDESMA	14		5	
VAN PELT, YI & JAMES	14		5	
MORGAN LEWIS	17			6
WOMBLE BOND DICKINSON (US)	18	7		
AMIN, TUROCY & WATSON	19			8
FENWICK & WEST	19			8
PATTERSON + SHERIDAN	19	10	10	
NICHOLSON DE VOS WEBSTER & ELLIOTT	22	9		
STERNE KESSLER	23		10	



Data by Juristat

08

TC 2400

Firm	Juristat Rank	Applications Filed Rank	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank
HARRITY & HARRITY	1	4	6	1
FLETCHER YODER	2		2	3
FISH & RICHARDSON	3	1		5
WENDEROTH	4		2	5
ADELI	5		1	
HONIGMAN	5			1
BANNER WITCOFF	5	7	6	
CONLEY ROSE	8		2	
HOLLAND & HART	8	2		
FINNEGAN	10			3
SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG & WOESSNER	10	3		
DENTONS	12			5
GUNTIN & GUST	12		5	
LADAS & PARRY	12			5
LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & WAIMEY	12			5
PERKINS COIE	12	5		
SCIENBIZIP	12			5
AMIN, TUROCY & WATSON	18		6	
KILPATRICK TOWNSEND	18	6		
KOWERT HOOD MUNYON RANKIN & GOETZEL	18		6	
VAN PELT, YI & JAMES	18		6	
SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT	22	8		
LEE & HAYES	23	9		
PATTERSON + SHERIDAN	24	10		
POLSINELLI	24	10		

09

TC 2600

Firm	Juristat Rank	Applications Filed Rank	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank
HARRITY & HARRITY	1		3	1
HONIGMAN	2		3	5
SUGHRUE	2		3	5
YOUNG BASILE	2		3	5
HARNESS IP	5		8	1
FISH & RICHARDSON	6	1		9
GUNTIN & GUST	6		1	9
FENWICK & WEST	8	6		5
FLETCHER YODER	9		3	9
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH	10			1
PIERCE ATWOOD	10		1	
KNOBBE MARTENS	10	4		9
KILPATRICK TOWNSEND	13	2		
SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG & WOESSNER	14	3		
OBLON	15			4
PERKINS COIE	16	5		
BAKER BOTTS	16	8		9
PATTERSON + SHERIDAN	18	7		
HANLEY FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN	19		8	
STERNE KESSLER	19		8	
DORITY & MANNING	21			9
EVERSHEDS SUTHERLAND (US)	21			9
KOWERT, HOOD, MUNYON, RANKIN & GOETZEL	21			9
LEE & HAYES	21	9		
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER	21			9
MARSHALL GERSTEIN IP	21			9
MORGAN LEWIS	21			9
FOLEY & LARDNER	28	10		

10

TC 2800

Firm	Juristat Rank	Applications Filed Rank	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank
SLATER MATSIL	1	1	2	
MARBURY LAW GROUP	2		2	6
BROOKS, CAMERON & HUEBSCH	3		1	10
KOWERT HOOD MUNYON RANKIN & GOETZEL	3		8	3
SCIENBIZIP	5			1
DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA	6		2	
ESCHWEILER & POTASHNIK	6		2	
JCIPRNET	6	2		
SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP	6		2	
STUDEBAKER & BRACKETT	6			2
WELLS ST. JOHN	6		2	
VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS	6		8	6
BAKERHOSTETLER	13			3
FOLEY & LARDNER	13	3		
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER	13			3
KILPATRICK TOWNSEND	16	4		
HAYNES AND BOONE	17	5		
AMIN, TUROCY & WATSON	18			6
OBLON, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT	18			6
SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG & WOESSNER	18	6		
FISH & RICHARDSON	18	8		10
MUNCY, GEISSLER, OLDS & LOWE	22	7		
DALY, CROWLEY, MOFFORD & DURKEE	23		8	
MASCHOFF BRENNAN	23		8	
TRASKBRITT	23		8	
PATTERSON + SHERIDAN	26	9		
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH	27	10		
GREENBERG TRAURIG	27			10
MORGAN LEWIS	27			10
QUARLES & BRADY	27			10
SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY, & PRESSER	27			10

11

TC 3600

Firm	Juristat Rank	Applications Filed Rank	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank
DARROW MUSTAFA	1		1	1
BCIP LAW	2		3	5
PRICE HENEVELD	3		3	7
FISH & RICHARDSON	4	1		
SINORICA	4			1
MCCOY RUSSELL	4		3	10
BOOKOFF MCANDREWS	7		2	
SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG & WOESSNER	7	2		
BEJIN BIENEMAN	7		9	5
DINSMORE	7	7	7	
KAUFHOLD & DIX PATENT LAW	11			3
KNOBBE MARTENS	11	3		
QUINN IP LAW	11			3
FOLEY & LARDNER	14	4		
KILPATRICK TOWNSEND	15	5		
BRACEWELL	16		6	
CANTOR COLBURN	16	6		
TAFT	16		8	10
HONIGMAN	19			7
SNELL & WILMER	19			7
PERKINS COIE	21	8		
FINNEGAN	22	9		
LEE & HAYES	22	9		
MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF	24		10	
YOUNG BASILE	24			10



12

TC 3700

Firm	Juristat Rank	Applications Filed Rank	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank
MCCOY RUSSELL	1		2	2
SNELL & WILMER	2		7	2
CARTER DELUCA FARRELL & SCHMIDT	3		1	10
KNOBBE MARTENS	3	1		10
SINORICA	5			1
SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG & WOESSNER	6	2		
HAYNES AND BOONE	6		4	10
POSZ LAW GROUP	6		9	5
FOLEY & LARDNER	9	3		
SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT	9		3	
DORITY & MANNING	11	4		
MCANDREWS	11		4	
MUNCY, GEISSLER, OLDS & LOWE	11			4
RUTAN & TUCKER	11		4	
HARNESS IP	15	5		
KAUFHOLD & DIX PATENT LAW	15			5
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE	15	10	7	
FISH & RICHARDSON	18	6		
HOWARD & HOWARD	19			7
K&L GATES	19	7		
KLARQUIST	19			7
CANTOR COLBURN	22	8		
CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS	22	8		
BANNER WITCOFF	24		9	
BARNES & THORNBURG	24			9
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON	24		9	
MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH	27			10
SHAY GLENN	27			10

13

WANT A CLOSER LOOK AT THESE METRICS?

These lists are determined by the very same data that makes our analytics tool so robust. Schedule a consultation with our team to learn more – and see your firm's data.

Contact us at:
sales@juristat.com
314-655-6600
www.juristat.com



ABOUT JURISTAT

What if obtaining a patent was faster, easier, and more predictable? What if we could remove some of the uncertainty and complexity that comes with trying to get a patent at the USPTO?

These questions – and the quest to minimize uncertainty and maximize success – are what drive us.

Innovative law firms and companies use Juristat to improve prosecution outcomes, make more strategic business decisions, and streamline the most tedious tasks associated with obtaining a patent at the USPTO.