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This Note analyzes how the landmark United States Supreme Court case of Lawrence v. Texas has been used by the Fifth Circuit in Reliable Consultants, Inc. v. Earle to extend “sexual privacy interests” into the commercial realm. This Note begins by exploring the historical trend of cases that have led to the birth of sexual privacy. The Fifth Circuit in Reliable was given the task to decide whether the Texas legislature’s statutory proscription of promoting or selling devices used for sexual stimulation infringed on a mere commercial right or an individual’s right to sexual privacy. After the Fifth Circuit held in favor of the plaintiff -businesses that sold sexual devices, the defendant-state petitioned for a rehearing en banc. The majority that denied the rehearing curiously refrained from filing an opinion; however, the judges who did not agree with the Reliable majority filed dissenting opinions to the denial for rehearing. Because both the majority opinion and dissents to Reliable use Lawrence as the key case influencing their opinions, this Note critically scrutinizes the Lawrence decision in correlation to the dissenting judges’ arguments and finds that although the dissenting opinions are correct in that the majority is stretching the applicability of Lawrence too far, they are wrong in their reasoning as to why this is so.

COMMENT

Current Trends in Inequitable Conduct are Adverse to Patent Policy as Seen Through the Exemplary Case of Big Pharma
Joshua M. Austin .......................................................... 33

This Comment explores the rather difficult and rapidly changing field of patent law, discussing specifically the doctrine of inequitable conduct, a defense raised by the infringing party by which a patent can be rendered unenforceable. Recent trends in inequitable conduct, as it has been used by the Federal Circuit, have made this confusing area of law even more so. This comment identifies these confusions and the Federal Circuit’s failure to maintain clear cut precedent. This Comment further discusses the impacts of these current trends, postulating that these trends go so far as to undercut the principal policy purposes behind patent law itself. Finally, this Comment will give a concrete example of the impact of these trends and uncertainties by looking at an industry particularly impacted by such rules, that of Big Pharmaceutical companies.
NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
LAW REVIEW ONLINE JOURNAL

Volume 1  Fall 2009  Number 1

BOARD OF EDITORS

Editor-in-Chief
Steven L. Boldt

Managing Editor
Daniel Kegl

Research Editor
Alison Saunders

Lead Articles Editors
Joshua M. Austin
Alexis Costello
Nhu T. Tran

Online Journal Editor
Jakub M. Krynski

Notes and Comments Editors
Katarzyna A. Kowalska
Jason Racine
Christopher G. Sparks

ASSISTANT EDITORS

Joshua E. Bidzinski
Aaron Galloway
Matthew J. Hafeli

Mariam Hafezi
Michael P. Hantsch
Andrew Loeffler

Elizabeth McGuan
Catherine M. Reif
Rebecca Stephens

STAFF

Erica J. Balkum
Shannon Barnaby
Christina Chojnacki
Matthew Dowd
Jamie Esser
Jessica Fiocchi

Alexander Geocaris
Amanda Hamilton
Matthew J. Jakobsze
Richard Johnson
Chad Lewis
Emily Martin
Jason Meares

Benjamin W. Meyer
Devon Noble
Kristen Shaffer
Carrie Thompson
Brae Tilton
Zach Townsend

FACULTY ADVISORS
Dean Jennifer Rosato & Professor Mark W. Cordes

Special thanks to Lynne Smith, Robin Boyes, Barbara Manning, Pamela Sampson, Diana Grace, Frank Lima, John Austin, and Therese Clarke Arado for administrative and support purposes.

Member, National Conference of Law Reviews