

TOP PATENT FIRMS

2021 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 in December 2021, and analyzed public applications disposed (or in the case of the first metric, applications filed) between January 1, 2019, and December 31, 2019. 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 in December 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/2021

You can read more about our methodology at
resources.juristat.com/top-firms/2021/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	Choate Hall & Stewart	3	3	
3	Dechert	5	2	
3	Duane Morris	2	5	
5	Fish & Richardson		6	2
6	Cooley LLP		7	4
7	Klarquist Sparkman, LLP	5	7	
8	K&L Gates LLP	3		
8	Wilson Sonsini Goodrich and Rosati			3
10	Goodwin Procter		4	
11	Lathrop Gage LLP	5		
11	Parker Highlander, PLLC	5		
11	Quarles & Brady	5		
11	Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.			5
15	Foley & Lardner			6
16	Bozicevic Field & Francis LLP	10		9
16	Finnegan		7	
16	Jones Day		7	
16	McNeill Baur PLLC		7	
16	Morrison & Foerster			7
21	Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton			8
22	Clark+Elbing LLP	10		
22	Knobbe Martens			10



Data by Juristat

06

TC 1700

Juristat Rank	Firm	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank	Applications Filed Rank
1	Oblon, McClelland, Maier & Neustadt, L.L.P.	4	1	2
2	Fish & Richardson	4	1	4
3	Bracewell LLP	1	1	
4	Dinsmore & Shohl	2	6	8
5	Merchant & Gould	3	5	
6	Foley & Lardner	7	8	6
7	Harness Dickey	4		7
8	Norton Rose Fulbright		1	
8	Cantor Colburn			1
10	Patterson + Sheridan			3
10	Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton		6	9
10	Dority & Manning	10		5
13	Knobbe Martens		8	10
14	Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.	7		
14	Womble Bond Dickinson	7		
16	Brooks Kushman		8	

07

TC 2100

Juristat Rank	Firm	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank	Applications Filed Rank
1	Heslin Rothenberg Farley & Mesiti PC	1	3	
2	Knobbe Martens		2	3
3	Chamberlain Hrdlicka	7	1	
3	Foley & Lardner		3	5
5	Brooks Cameron & Huebsch PLLC	1	8	
6	Hanley Flight & Zimmerman LLC	7	5	
6	Zilka-Kotab, PC	4	8	
8	Fish & Richardson			1
9	Schwegman Lundberg & Woessner			2
10	Ryan, Mason and Lewis, LLP	3		
10	Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton		8	7
12	Cooper Legal Group	4		
12	Nixon & Vanderhye PC	4		
12	Cantor Colburn			4
15	Amin, Turocy & Watson LLP		5	
15	Finnegan		5	
17	Nicholson De Vos Webster & Elliott LLP			6
18	Roberts Calderon Safran & Cole, PC (RCSC)	7		
19	Fletcher Yoder		8	
19	Patterson + Sheridan			8
21	Lowenstein Sandler LLP			9
22	Konrad Raynes Davda & Victor LLP	10		
22	Kowert, Hood, Munyon, Rankin & Goetzel			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	2	5	
3	Fish & Richardson		7	1
3	Harrity & Harrity	7	1	
5	Dentons		2	7
6	Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton		5	5
7	Edell, Shapiro & Finnan, LLC	4	7	
7	Fletcher Yoder	4	7	
9	Banner Witcoff	4		9
9	Van Pelt, Yi & James LLP	1		
11	Holland & Hart LLP			2
11	Honigman LLP		2	
11	Kunzler Bean & Adamson	2		
14	Schwegman Lundberg & Woessner			4
15	Kowert, Hood, Munyon, Rankin & Goetzel			6
16	Leydig, Voit & Mayer		7	
16	Murphy, Bilak & Homiller, PLLC		7	
16	Lee & Hayes	7		
19	Polsinelli PC			8
20	Amin, Turocy & Watson LLP	9		
20	Guntin & Gust, PLC	9		
20	Haynes and Boone, LLP	9		
20	Lowenstein Sandler LLP	9		
24	Patterson + Sheridan			10

09

TC 2600

Juristat Rank	Firm	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank	Applications Filed Rank
1	Fenwick & West LLP	2	2	4
2	FisherBroyles	2	2	
2	Middleton-Reutlinger	2	2	
4	Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Waimey	2	7	
4	Zilka-Kotab, PC	2	7	
6	Lee & Hayes	2		8
7	Knobbe Martens		7	5
7	Kowert, Hood, Munyon, Rankin & Goetzel	2		10
9	Harrity & Harrity		1	
9	Guntin & Gust, PLC	1		
9	Fish & Richardson			1
12	Schwegman Lundberg & Woessner			2
13	Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton			3
14	Amin, Turocy & Watson LLP		7	9
15	North America Intellectual Property Corporation (NAIP)		5	
15	Young Basile		5	
17	Foley & Lardner			6
18	Honigman LLP		7	
18	Leydig, Voit & Mayer		7	
18	Patterson + Sheridan			7
21	Banner Witcoff	9		
21	Fletcher Yoder	9		
21	Shook, Hardy & Bacon	9		
21	Treyz Law Group	9		



Data by Juristat

10

TC 2800

Juristat Rank	Firm	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank	Applications Filed Rank
1	Slater Matsil	3		1
2	Holland & Hart LLP	3	4	
3	Tutunjian & Bitetto, PC	1		9
4	Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton		5	7
4	Haynes and Boone, LLP	10		2
6	Keating & Bennett LLP		1	
6	Ryan, Mason and Lewis, LLP	1		
6	Fish & Richardson		5	8
9	ScienBiziP		2	
10	Studebaker & Brackett PC		3	
10	Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch	3		
10	Brooks Cameron & Huebsch PLLC	3		
10	Eschweiler & Potashnik LLC	3		
10	Hauptman Ham, LLP	3		
10	Kowert, Hood, Munyon, Rankin & Goetzel	3		
10	Cantor Colburn			3
17	Foley & Lardner			4
18	Dority & Manning		5	
18	Dorsey & Whitney		5	
18	Finnegan		5	
18	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius		5	
18	Perkins Coie LLP		5	
18	JCIPRNET			5
24	Schwegman Lundberg & Woessner			6
25	Wells St. John	10		
25	Patterson + Sheridan			10

11

TC 3600

Juristat Rank	Firm	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank	Applications Filed Rank
1	McCoy Russell LLP	1	3	
2	Quinn IP Law	4	2	
2	Anova Law Group	1	5	
4	Bejin Bieneman PLC	6	5	
5	Sinorica		1	
5	The Small Patent Law Group LLP	1		
5	Fish & Richardson			1
8	Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton			2
9	Kaufhold & Dix Patent Law		3	
9	Cantor Colburn			3
9	Fitch, Even, Tabin & Flannery	10	5	
9	Price Heneveld LLP	6		9
13	Harrity & Harrity	4		
13	Schwegman Lundberg & Woessner			4
15	Dority & Manning			5
16	Taft Stettinius & Hollister	6		
16	Knobbe Martens			6
18	Foley & Lardner			7
19	LKGLOBAL		8	
19	Oblon, McClelland, Maier & Neustadt, L.L.P.		8	
19	Venable LLP		8	
19	Young Basile		8	
19	Dickinson Wright PLLC			8
24	C. Tumey Law Group	9		
25	Bracewell LLP	10		
25	Haynes and Boone, LLP			10

12

TC 3700

Juristat Rank	Firm	Allowance Rate Rank	Avg. Office Actions to Allowance Rank	Applications Filed Rank
1	McCoy Russell LLP	1	2	
2	Knobbe Martens		7	1
3	Dority & Manning		6	4
3	Carter, DeLuca & Farrell LLP	3	7	
5	Fish & Richardson		7	5
6	Kaufhold & Dix Patent Law		1	
7	Muncy, Geissler, Olds & Lowe		2	
7	Quinn IP Law		2	
7	Snell & Wilmer		2	
7	Shumaker & Sieffert, P.A.	2		
7	Schwegman Lundberg & Woessner			2
7	Posz Law Group, PLC	7	7	
13	Frost Brown Todd	3		
13	Foley & Lardner			3
15	Haynes and Boone, LLP	5		
15	Lerner David	5		
15	K&L Gates LLP	10		7
18	Harness Dickey			6
19	Greenberg Traurig		7	
19	Michael Best & Friedrich LLP		7	
19	Mintz	7		
19	Shook, Hardy & Bacon	7		
23	Norton Rose Fulbright			8
24	Barnes & Thornburg			9
25	Banner Witcoff	10		
25	Cantor Colburn			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.