TOP PATENT FIRMS

2020 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 November 2020 and January 2021, and analyzed public applications disposed (or in the case of the first metric, applications filed) between January 1, 2018, and December 31, 2018. 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 the 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 between November 2020 and January 2021. 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/2020

You can read more about our methodology at
resources.juristat.com/top-firms/2020/faq

05

TC 1600

Juristat Rank	Firm	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank	Applications Filed Rank
1	Dentons	1	1	1
2	Wilson Sonsini	7	9	3
3	Bozicevic, Field & Francis LLP	3		7
3	Dechert	7	3	
3	Klarquist	4	6	
6	Wolf Greenfield	6		5
7	Cooley LLP		9	4
7	Sheppard Mullin	10	3	
9	Fish & Richardson			2
9	Goodwin Procter		2	
9	Troutman Pepper	2		
12	Kilpatrick Townsend	10		6
12	Oblon	10	6	
12	Quarles & Brady	4		
15	Jones Day		5	
16	Sterne Kessler		6	
17	Myers Bigel, P.A.	7		
18	Knobbe Martens			8
18	Mintz			8
20	BakerHostetler		9	
20	Barnes & Thornburg		9	
20	McNeill Baur PLLC		9	
20	Polsinelli		9	
20	Seed IP		9	
20	Womble Bond Dickinson		9	
26	Foley & Lardner			10

Data by Juristat

06

TC 1700

Juristat Rank	Firm	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank	Applications Filed Rank
1	Oblon	1	1	2
2	Harness Dickey	1	6	6
3	Foley & Lardner	5	6	3
4	Kilpatrick Townsend	7	4	5
5	Merchant & Gould	1	4	
6	Fish & Richardson	6	8	4
7	Cantor Colburn	10	8	1
8	Dinsmore	9	2	9
9	Knobbe Martens	10	2	10
10	Snell & Wilmer	1		
11	Patterson + Sheridan LLP	8		7
12	BakerHostetler		8	
12	Dority & Manning, P.A.			8

Data by Juristat

07

TC 2100

Juristat Rank	Firm	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank	Applications Filed Rank
1	Ryan, Mason and Lewis, LLP	1	1	
2	Garlick & Markison	3	2	
3	Knobbe Martens		4	3
4	Nixon & Vanderhye PC	7	2	
4	Konrad Raynes & Victor LLP	3	6	
4	Van Pelt, Yi & James LLP	2	7	
7	Foley & Lardner		7	4
8	Fletcher Yoder		4	9
8	Fish & Richardson			1
10	Cantor Colburn		7	7
10	Schwegman Lundberg & Woessner			2
12	Patterson + Sheridan LLP	7		8
13	Kilpatrick Townsend		10	6
14	Brooks, Cameron & Huebsch, PLLC	5		
14	Nicholson De Vos Webster & Elliott LLP			5
16	Lowenstein Sandler	6		
17	Womble Bond Dickinson	7		
18	Kowert, Hood, Munyon, Rankin & Goetzel	10		10
19	Loza & Loza LLP		10	

Data by Juristat

08

TC 2400

Juristat Rank	Firm	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank	Applications Filed Rank
1	Lee Hong Degerman Kang & Waimey		2	3
2	Adeli LLP	1	6	
3	MBHB	2	9	
3	Harrity & Harrity, LLP	8	4	
5	Kowert, Hood, Munyon, Rankin & Goetzel	5		8
5	Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP		4	9
5	Dentons		6	7
5	Fish & Richardson			1
5	Leydig Voit & Mayer Ltd		1	
10	Guntin & Gust, PLC	2		
10	Van Pelt, Yi & James LLP	2		
10	Fenwick & West		2	
10	Kilpatrick Townsend			2
14	Amin, Turocy & Watson LLP	10	6	
14	Schwegman, Lundberg & Woessner			4
16	Lee & Hayes, PLLC	5		
16	Lowenstein Sandler	5		
16	Holland & Hart			5
19	Slater Matsil, LLP			6
20	Polsinelli	9		
20	Finnegan Henderson		9	
20	Murphy, Bilak & Homiller		9	
20	Perkins Coie		9	
20	Sheppard Mullin		9	
22	Banner & Witcoff	10		
22	Sage Patent Group			10

Data by Juristat

09

TC 2600

Juristat Rank	Firm	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank	Applications Filed Rank
1	Fenwick & West	3	1	4
2	Guntin & Gust, PLC	1	2	10
3	Dentons	4	7	9
4	MBHB	5	4	
5	Kilpatrick Townsend			1
6	Finnegan Henderson	7	7	
6	Fish & Richardson			2
6	Leydig Voit & Mayer Ltd		2	
6	Zilka-Kotab, PC	2		
10	Schwegman, Lundberg & Woessner			3
11	Hanley Flight & Zimmerman		4	
11	Michael Best		4	
13	Knobbe Martens			5
13	Kowert, Hood, Munyon, Rankin & Goetzel	5		
15	Foley & Lardner			6
16	Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP		7	
16	Conley Rose, P.C.		7	
16	Haynes and Boone, LLP	7		
16	Lee & Hayes, PLLC	7		
16	Morgan Lewis	7		
16	Patterson + Sheridan LLP			7
22	Baker Botts			8

Data by Juristat

10

TC 2800

Juristat Rank	Firm	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank	Applications Filed Rank
1	Fenwick & West	3	1	
2	Brooks, Cameron & Huebsch, PLLC	4	2	
3	Ryan, Mason and Lewis, LLP	1	7	
4	Slater Matsil, LLP	10		1
5	Scully Scott Murphy & Presser PC	10	2	
5	Kilpatrick Townsend		7	5
7	Tutunjian Bitetto	1		
7	Haynes and Boone, LLP	10		3
9	Quarles & Brady		2	
9	Studebaker & Brackett PC		2	
9	Marbury Law Group	8	6	
9	Cantor Colburn			2
13	Fish & Richardson		7	8
14	Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt			4
15	Eschweiler & Potashnik LLC	5		
15	Roberts Calderon Safran & Cole, PC	5		
15	TraskBritt, P.C.	5		
18	Schwegman, Lundberg & Woessner			6
19	Harness Dickey		7	
19	Harrity & Harrity, LLP		7	
19	Oblon		7	
19	Sughrue Mion, PLLC		7	
19	Thomas Horstemeyer, LLP		7	
19	Foley & Lardner			7
25	Daly, Crowley, Mofford & Durkee, LLP	8		
26	JCIPRNET			9
27	Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP	10		
27	Dorsey & Whitney LLP	10		
27	McClure, Qualey & Rodack, LLP	10		
27	Wells St. John	10		
27	Patterson + Sheridan LLP			10

11

TC 3600

Juristat Rank	Firm	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank	Applications Filed Rank
1	McCoy Russell	1	6	
2	Honigman LLP	6	2	
3	Bejin Bieneman PLC	3	6	
4	LKGLOBAL	6	4	
4	Price Heneveld LLP	3	9	10
4	Taft Stettinius & Hollister	1	9	
7	Young Basile	6	6	
8	Cantor Colburn			1
8	Sinorica		1	
10	Kaufhold & Dix Patent Law		2	
10	Kilpatrick Townsend			2
12	Fish & Richardson			3
12	MBHB	3		
14	Knobbe Martens			4
15	Brooks Kushman			5
15	Fitch, Even, Tabin & Flannery		5	
17	Dickinson Wright	6		
17	Foley & Lardner			6
19	Schwegman, Lundberg & Woessner			7
20	Harness Dickey			8
20	Haynes and Boone, LLP			8
22	Oblon			
22	Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts			
24	Lee & Hayes, PLLC	10		

Data by Juristat

12

TC 3700

Juristat Rank	Firm	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank	Applications Filed Rank
1	McCoy Russell	1	2	
2	Snell & Wilmer	4	4	
3	Carlson Gaskey & Olds PC	6		4
4	Knobbe Martens			1
4	Sinorica		1	
6	Lerner David	2		
6	Schwegman, Lundberg & Woessner			2
8	Foley & Lardner			3
8	Kaufhold & Dix Patent Law		3	
8	Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP	3		
11	Haynes and Boone, LLP	4		
12	Howard & Howard		5	
12	K&L Gates			5
12	Posz Law Group, PLC		5	
12	Price Heneveld LLP	9	8	
16	Banner & Witcoff	6		
16	Fish & Richardson			6
18	Harness Dickey			7
18	Shay Glenn LLP		7	
20	Barnes & Thornburg		8	
20	Cantor Colburn			8
20	Oblon		8	
20	Shumaker & Sieffert	8		
24	Dickinson Wright	9		
24	Dority & Manning, P.A.			9
24	Frost Brown Todd	9		
27	Kilpatrick Townsend			10

Data by Juristat

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.