



Evan H. Langdon

PARTNER, ITC PRACTICE CHAIR

elangdon@frlip.com
202-507-4899
Washington DC



Evan Langdon is an experienced first-chair trial attorney who focuses his practice on Section 337 investigations before the ITC, intellectual property litigation in U.S. district courts, and appeals before the Federal Circuit. Evan counsels clients on the nuances of navigating fast-paced ITC Section 337 litigation involving patents, trademarks, trade dress, and other unfair acts.

Evan's practice is dedicated to representing U.S. and foreign companies on intellectual property matters before the ITC and U.S. district courts. He leverages his mechanical engineering background and experience as a primary examiner at the United States Patent and Trademark Office to litigate disputes across a wide variety of industries including LED lighting and display devices, mobile electronic devices and chipsets, data processing systems, semiconductors, lighting control devices, consumer electronics and accessories, shoes, household appliances, automotive, electronic eyewear, sporting equipment, and various mechanical devices.

Recognized among the nation's top ITC Section 337 practitioners by Chambers USA and Chambers Global, Evan has represented clients in more than 40 ITC Section 337 investigations. He is adept at navigating the unique and complex procedural and technical issues of Section 337 investigations, and the rigorous economic analyses required for domestic industry and public interest. Evan also guides clients through post-investigation enforcement efforts.

Prior to joining Fabricant Rubino & Lambrianakos LLP, Evan was a partner at Nixon Peabody LLP, serving as the leader of the ITC Section 337 team. Prior to Nixon Peabody, Evan was a partner at Adduci, Mastriani and Schaumberg LLP.

CREDENTIALS

Education

- Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law, J.D., magna cum laude, 2009
- Villanova University, B.S., Biomedical Engineering, cum laude, 2002

Bar & Court Admissions

- District of Columbia
- Virginia
- U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
- U.S. Court of Appeals, Federal Circuit

Representative Experience

- Representing Complainant Monolithic 3D™ Inc. in a patent infringement investigation involving 3D NAND and HBM DRAM memory chips against SK Hynix and KIOXIA. The investigation is ongoing. Certain NAND and DRAM Memory Chips, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1472.
- Representing Complainant in a Section 337 patent infringement investigation involving 4G/5G wireless communication devices against Qualcomm, T-Mobile, DISH Wireless, EchoStar, HTC, and LGE, among others. The investigation is ongoing.
- Representing a group of respondents in a patent infringement suit involving synthetic braiding hair filed by JBS Hair. The investigation is ongoing. Certain Pre-Stretched Synthetic Braiding Hair and Packaging Therefor (II), ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1457.
- Represented Complainant IngenioSpec, LLC in a patent infringement investigation involving electronic eyewear against DJI, Brilliant Labs, and Even Realities, among others, resulting in multiple favorable settlements with respondents prior to hearing. Certain Electronic Eyewear Products, Components Thereof, and Related Charging Apparatuses (II), ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1455.
- Represented Complainant Aardvark in a patent infringement investigation involving nasal irrigation devices against RhinoSystems d/b/a Naväge and Spa Sciences, among others, resulting in multiple favorable settlements with respondents and default exclusion orders prior to hearing. Certain Nasal Devices and Components Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1444.
- Represented Complainant IngenioSpec, LLC in a patent infringement investigation involving electronic eyewear against Meta, Valve, HTC, and ByteDance, resulting in multiple favorable settlements with respondents prior to hearing. Certain Electronic Eyewear Products, Components Thereof, and Related Charging Apparatuses, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1423.
- Represented a group of respondents in a patent infringement suit involving synthetic braiding hair filed by JBS Hair, resulting in complainant withdrawing the complaint before the evidentiary hearing. Certain Pre-Stretched Synthetic Braiding Hair and Packaging Therefor, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1415.
- Represented Complainant IngenioSpec, LLC in a patent infringement investigation involving electronic eyewear against Luxottica, Magic Leap, and XREAL, among others, resulting in multiple favorable settlements with respondents prior to hearing. Certain Electronic Eyewear Products and Components Thereof, USITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1383.
- Represented Complainant AGIS Software Development LLC in a patent infringement investigation, resulting in multiple favorable settlements with respondents prior to hearing. Certain Location-Sharing Systems, Related Software, Components Thereof, and Products Containing Same, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1347.
- Represented Respondent Henson Holdings, LLC d/b/a SelectSoma in a Section 337 investigation brought by Purple Innovation, LLC relating to alleged trademark and trade dress infringement of certain pillows and seat cushions. The investigation instituted in September 2022. The case settled favorably prior to the hearing. Certain Pillows and Seat Cushions, Components Thereof, and Packaging Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1328.

- Represented Respondent Comerg LLC, which manufactures plant extraction, remediation, and fraction distillation systems, in a Section 337 investigation against complainant Apeks, LLC. The investigation was instituted in April 2022. The investigation ended favorably when the complainant withdrew its complaint. Certain Centrifuge Utility Platform and Falling Film Evaporator Systems and Components Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1311.
- Represented Complainant Easton Diamond Sports, LLC, one of the most recognizable brands in baseball and softball equipment, in a Section 337 investigation relating to patent infringement of respondents' composite baseball and softball bats. The investigation instituted in October 2021 and settled favorably prior to hearing. Certain Composite Baseball and Softball Bats and Components Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1283.
- Represented Complainant The Regents of the University of California in a groundbreaking patent enforcement campaign to protect its rights in a revolutionary new generation of light bulb technology known as filament LED that was invented by a Nobel laureate-led team at UC Santa Barbara. The campaign includes litigation before the U.S. International Trade Commission, the U.S. District Courts for the Central District of California and Eastern District of New York, and the Patent Trial and Appeal Board at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Certain Filament Light-Emitting Diodes and Products Containing Same (II), ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1220; and Certain Filament Light-Emitting Diodes and Products Containing Same, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1172.
- Represented Complainant Solas OLED Ltd., the leading owner and licensor of technology focused on the organic light-emitting diode (OLED) market, in a Section 337 investigation against respondents Samsung and BOE Technology Group relating to patent infringement of respondents' OLED displays. The investigation was instituted in February 2021. The investigation settled favorably after the hearing. Certain Active Matrix OLED Display Devices and Components Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1243.
- Represented Respondent Chemtron Biotech, Inc., which manufactures global rapid diagnostic tests, in a Section 337 investigation against complainant ARK Diagnostics, Inc., alleging patent infringement. The investigation was instituted in January 2021. The investigation ended favorably when complainant withdrew its complaint. Certain Gabapentin Immunoassay Kits and Test Strips, Components Thereof, and Methods Therefor, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1239.
- Represented Respondent Price Point NY, which sells vaping and smoking accessories, in a Section 337 investigation against Complainant Juul Labs, Inc., alleging patent infringement. The investigation settled favorably prior to hearing. Certain Vaporizer Cartridges and Components Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1211.
- Represented Respondent Lifetime Brands, Inc., a leading global provider of kitchenware, tableware, and other products used in the home, in a Section 337 investigation against complainant L&L Candle Company, alleging patent infringement. The investigation settled favorably after a dispositive claim construction ruling. Certain Electronic Candle Products and Components Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1195.
- Represented Respondent Ecopure Filter Co. Ltd. in a patent-based investigation against Electrolux Home Products, Inc. and KX Technologies, LLC. The case settled favorably prior to the hearing. Certain Water Filters and Components Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1126.

- Represented Complainant Ultravision Technologies, LLC, in a patent-based investigation against various respondents. The case settled favorably prior to the hearing. Certain Modular LED Display Panels and Components Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1114.
- Represented Respondent Chauvet & Sons, Inc., in a patent-based investigation against Fraen Corporation. The case settled favorably prior to the hearing. Certain LED Lighting Devices and Components Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1107.
- Represented Complainant BiTMICRO, LLC, in a patent-based investigation against Samsung, SK Hynix, and other downstream respondents. The case was designated for the 100-day hearing and tried for domestic industry in February 2018. The ALJ found a domestic industry for BiTMICRO and the Commission affirmed. The case settled favorably during the evidentiary hearing. Certain Solid State Storage Drives, Stacked Electronics Components and Products Containing Same, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1097.
- Represented Complainant Qualcomm Incorporated in a patent-based investigation against Apple. The case was tried in September 2018 and the ALJ issued a final initial determination finding a violation of Section 337. The case settled favorably prior to the Commission Opinion. Certain Mobile Electronic Devices and Radio Frequency and Processing Components Thereof (ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1093).
- Represented Respondent Lowe's Companies Inc. in a patent-based investigation against Philips Lighting. A hearing was held in July 2018, and the ALJ found a violation in-part. On review, the Commission reversed the ALJ and issued a notice of no violation of Section 337. Certain LED Lighting Devices, LED Power Supplies, and Components Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1081.
- Represented Complainant Qualcomm Incorporated in a patent-based investigation against Apple. The case was tried in June 2018, and the ALJ found no violation in September 2018. On review, the Commission affirmed no violation. The case subsequently settled favorably. Certain Mobile Electronic Devices and Radio Frequency and Processing Components Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1065.
- Represented Respondent SanDisk and Western Digital in a patent-based investigation against Memory Technologies, LLC. The case settled favorably prior to the hearing. Certain Flash Memory Devices and Components Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 1337-TA-1034.
- Represented Respondent Razor USA LLC in a patent-based investigation against Segway, Inc. The case settled favorably prior to the hearing. Certain Personal Transporters and Components Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1021/1007.
- Represented Respondent 3S-Smart Software Solutions, GmbH, in a patent-based investigation against Rockwell Automation, Inc. The case settled favorably prior to hearing. Certain Industrial Control System Software, Systems Using Same and Components Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1020.
- Represented Complainants Razor USA LLC and Inventist, Inc., in a patent-based investigation against various respondents. The case was tried in February 2017, and the ALJ issued an initial determination of no violation in May 2017. The Commission determined not to review, and the findings were appealed to the Federal Circuit. The Federal Circuit remanded the investigation to the Commission for further proceedings. Certain Motorized Self-Balancing Vehicles, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1000.
- Represented Respondent Oxford Nanopore Technologies Ltd. in a patent-based investigation against Illumina, Inc. The case settled favorably prior to hearing. Certain Nanopores and Products Containing Same, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-991.

- Represented Complainant Jacobs Vehicle Systems, Inc., in a patent-based investigation against Fiat Chrysler Automobiles and FCA. The case settled favorably prior to hearing. Certain Variable Valve Actuation Devices and Automobiles Containing the Same. ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-954.
- Represented Complainant Converse, Inc., in a trademark and trade dress dispute against Skechers, New Balance, Walmart Stores, Inc., Highline United LLC, and other respondents that defaulted or settled. The case was tried in July 2015, and the ALJ issued a finding of violation as to certain products and recommended a general exclusion order in November 2017. The Commission reversed the ALJ's findings of violation and Converse appealed these findings to the Federal Circuit. In October 2018, the Federal Circuit vacated the Commission's determination and remanded for further proceedings. Certain Footwear Products, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-936.
- Certain Flash Memory Chips and Products Containing the Same, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-893. Represented Complainant Spansion LLC in a patent-based investigation against Macronix and other downstream respondents. The case was tried in October 2014. The case settled favorably prior to the ALJ's initial determination.
- Represented Respondent AIE in a trademark dispute against The Clorox Company. The case settled favorably prior to hearing. Certain Laundry and Household Cleaning Products and Related Packaging, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-891.
- Represented Respondent Roederer Champagne Louis Roederer and Maisons Marques & Domaines USA Inc. in patent-based dispute against Lamina Packaging Innovations. The case was designated for the Commission's first 100-day hearing and tried for domestic industry in May 2013. The ALJ found no violation based on no domestic industry. The Commission affirmed and terminated the investigation. Certain Products Having Laminated Packaging, Laminated Packaging, and Components Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-874.
- Represented Complainant Emerson Electric Co. in a trademark dispute against Anaheim Manufacturing Co. The case settled favorably on the first day of the hearing. Certain Food Waste Disposers and Components and Packaging Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-838.
- Represented Respondent Winplus North America Inc. in patent-based investigation against Robert Bosch LLC. The case settled favorably prior to hearing. Certain Wiper Blades, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-816.
- Represented Respondent Apple Inc. in a patent-based investigation against Via Technologies, Inc. The case settled favorably prior to hearing. Certain Electronic Devices with Graphics Data Processing Systems, Components Thereof, and Associated Software, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-813.
- Represented Respondent Apple Inc. in a patent-based investigation against S3 Graphics Co. Ltd. The case settled favorably prior to hearing. Certain Computing Devices with Associated Instructions Sets and Software, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-812.
- Represented Otter Products, LLC, in a patent and trademark-based investigation against various respondents. The case was tried in April 2012 and the ALJ found a violation in June 2012. The Commission affirmed and issued a general exclusion order. Protective Cases and Components Thereof Complainant, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-780.

- Represented Lutron Electronics Co., Inc., in a patent-based investigation against various respondents. On summary determination, the ALJ found a violation. The Commission affirmed and issued a general exclusion order. Certain Lighting Control Devices Including Dimmer Switches and Parts Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-776.
- Represented Rolls-Royce Group in a patent-based dispute against United Technologies Corporation. The case settled favorably prior to hearing. Certain Turbomachinery Blades, Engines and Components Thereof, ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-751.

Recognition

- Chambers USA and Chambers Global, America's Leading Lawyers for Business (since 2021 for International Trade: Intellectual Property (Section 337) (nationwide)
- Patexia, "The Top 25 Performing" Section 337 Intellectual Property Attorneys (since 2025)
- Business Today, "Top 10 Most Influential Section 337 Intellectual Property Lawyers in USA" (2023)
- Managing Intellectual Property, IP Star (since 2022)
- Chambers Global, "Leader in the Field" for Investment Funds: Intellectual Property (2022)

Writings

- "Intellectual Property Enforcement before the International Trade Commission," Intellectual Property & Technology Law Journal (June 2022)
- "Pilot Program: Expediting Case-Dispositive Intellectual Property Issues at the International Trade Commission," Intellectual Property & Technology Law Journal (May 2022)
- "The Impact of Overturning *eBay v MercExchange*," IPWatchdog (March 2020)
- "Universities Should Consider ITC for IP Protection," Tech Transfer Tactics (February 2020)
- "The Case for Early Adjudication of Potentially Dispositive Issues at the USITC," Landslide (May/June 2018)
- "Does the ITC Need eBay?," Bloomberg BNA (July 2013)
- "ITC Gets Creative to Limit NPE Access Under Section 337," Law360 (April 2013)

Presentations

- "Strategic Patent Enforcement for Operating Companies," The IP Strategy Summit: NYC, New York, NY (November 19, 2025)
- "Navigating Section 337: Strategies for Success in Investigations," The Knowledge Group Webinar (November 10, 2025)
- "Winning at the ITC: Strategies for Success in Section 337 Investigations," IPWatchdog LIVE 2025, Arlington, VA (March 4, 2025)

- “The ITC and Patent Enforcement: How Is Section 337 Being Used as Part of a Global Licensing Strategy,” LES 2024 Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA (October 21, 2024)
- “Navigating 337 Investigations: Pathways to Success at the ITC,” IPWatchdog LIVE 2024, Arlington, VA (October 1, 2024)
- “Defending the ITC: The Last Line of Defense for Inventors,” US Inventors Second Annual Conference, Alexandria, VA (September 27, 2023)
- “IP Actions at the International Trade Commission,” 26th Annual Symposium on Intellectual Property Law and Policy, University of Akron School of Law (March 25, 2024)
- “Standard Essential Patents & Section 337: Litigating SEPs at the ITC,” Standards, Patents, & Competition Masters™ 2023, Ashburn, VA (November 2023)
- “Why and How 97% of IP Portfolio Owners Destroy Most of the Value in their Portfolios,” US Inventors First Annual Conference, Alexandria, VA (October 21, 2023)
- “IP Litigation Trends and Strategies,” IIPLA USA 2023, Palo Alto, CA (October 2023)
- “Evaluating the Unique Challenges of Satisfying Domestic Industry Requirements,” 15th Annual Practitioners’ Think-Tank on ITC Litigation & Enforcement (March 2023)
- “Section 337 Litigation at the ITC,” Litigating Patents and Trade Secrets Remedies Summit (January 18, 2023)
- “High Stakes Patent Litigation: The ITC vs. District Court,” IPWatchdog LIVE 2022, Dallas, TX (September 11, 2022)
- “337 Investigations: Leverage & Strategy at the ITC,” Patent Litigation Masters™ 2022, Washington DC (May 23, 2022)
- “Eliminating Counterfeit Whack-a-Mole: How to Use U.S. Trade Remedies to Develop and Implement an Effective, Affordable, and Integrated Battle Plan to Combat the Online Sale of Counterfeit Goods,” International Trademark Association (INTA) 2020 Annual Meeting, Virtual Roundtable (November 18, 2020)
- “Don’t Tread on My IP: The Role of Domestic and Foreign Actors in Shaping Intellectual Property Law,” American University Business Law Review Symposium, Webinar (November 13, 2020)
- “In Search of Injunctive Relief in Patent Infringement Litigation,” IPWatchdog Virtual CON2020, Webinar (September 3, 2020)
- “Direct Enforcement of University IP—A Case Study of UC Santa Barbara’s Enforcement of Patent Rights Against Retailers,” AUTM 2019 Eastern Region Meeting, Raleigh, NC (October 3, 2019)
- “Section 337 and Unfair Trade Practices,” Japan Intellectual Property Association (October 26, 2017)
- “Developments in Domestic Industry,” IPO’s ITC Committee Conference, San Francisco, CA (June 29, 2017)
- “Supreme Court Observations: Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank,” AIPLA ITC Committee Panel Teleconference on Ground Rules at the ITC (June 25, 2015)