



Academia Review-A Multidisciplinary Online Journal

ISSN (Online): 3070-6726

Website: <https://academia.org>

Volume 2, Issue 6, June, 2026



This work is Licenced under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

Comprehensive Analysis Of Patent Litigation And Enforcement Regimes: The United States And The Republic Of Uzbekistan

Timothy Sendek

Adjunct Professor at University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

tim.sendek@akerman.com

Oybek Abdulalev

Lecturer at Tashkent State University of Law

o.abdullayev@tsul.uz

Abstract. Patents and other intangible assets now make up most of the value of large companies. This shift has made patent enforcement systems much more important to investors and trade policy. This article compares how patent lawsuits work in the United States and the Republic of Uzbekistan, two countries with very different legal systems. The United States has a mature, expensive, common-law system. It features mandatory pre-trial discovery, jury trials, a separate administrative court (the Patent Trial and Appeal Board) for challenging patent validity, and damages rules that limit how much a patent owner can recover. Uzbekistan has a civil-law system that is reforming quickly. It keeps infringement cases and validity challenges in separate courts, has no pre-trial discovery, relies heavily on court-appointed experts, and has passed several new laws between 2022 and 2026 that add statutory damages, criminal penalties, and digital customs enforcement. Drawing on laws and current articles from legal practitioners, this article compares the cost, speed, and risk of litigating in each country, and ends with practical guidance for companies and investors who need to protect patents in Central Asia.

Keywords: patent litigation; intellectual property enforcement; comparative law; Uzbekistan; United States; Patent Trial and Appeal Board; doctrine of equivalents; statutory damages; forensic expert evidence; civil law versus common law



Introduction

The global economy has changed a great deal over the last fifty years. In 1975, physical assets made up about 83% of the total value of S&P 500 companies. By 2025, intangible assets - mainly patents, software, data, and brand value - made up more than 90% of that value (Cornerstone Research, n.d.). Because of this shift, patent law is no longer a narrow technical field. It is now central to a country's economic strength and its appeal to investors (Cornerstone Research, n.d.). As a result, how well a country enforces patent rights says a lot about how mature and investment-friendly its legal system is (Lawzana, 2026).

The United States has one of the most developed and adversarial patent systems in the world (Chambers and Partners, 2026a). The number of intellectual property lawsuits filed each year in the US has grown sharply, from fewer than 3,000 in the mid-2000s to nearly 19,000 by 2025. Much of this growth comes from disputes in technology, software, and life sciences (Cornerstone Research, n.d.). Patent cases move through a specialized system of federal courts, alongside an administrative court that offers a separate path for challenging a patent's validity (Chambers and Partners, 2026a).

Uzbekistan, by contrast, has a civil-law system that is changing fast (Lawzana, 2026). As part of its effort to join the World Trade Organization and bring its laws in line with international standards, Uzbekistan has carried out major legal reforms. It merged its formerly independent patent agency into the Ministry of Justice, creating a single authority that handles patent and trademark examinations, investigations, and enforcement. Even so, patent cases are still rare in Uzbek courts compared to the United States. In 2021, for example, Uzbek civil courts heard only seven intellectual property cases in total, and just one of those was a patent case - which the patent owner won. That number rose to 15 cases in 2022 and 36 in 2023, though copyright disputes still made up most of the caseload.

Scope and Methodology

This article compares how patent disputes are handled in the United States and Uzbekistan, focusing on the law as it actually applies in practice. It draws on primary legal sources - the U.S. Patent Act (35 U.S.C.), the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Federal Rules of Evidence, and Uzbekistan's Law on Inventions,



Utility Models and Industrial Designs, along with recent laws that have updated it (Law No. 959, Law ZRU-1080, and Law LRU-1144). It also draws on commentary from legal practitioners, government reports, and industry analyses current through mid-2026. The goal is to identify the key differences between the two systems - in court structure, evidence rules, claim interpretation, remedies, and appeals - that matter most for litigation strategy and cross-border risk management. Because Uzbekistan does not publish as much court data or legal research as the United States, this article relies more on practitioner sources for Uzbekistan than for the U.S. This is a limitation of available information, not a sign of bias, and is noted where it matters.

Jurisdictional Competence and Institutional Forums

The courts and agencies that handle patent disputes in the two countries are built on very different legal principles, as the table below shows.

Patent Validity and Duration Parameters

Legal parameter	United states federal regime	Republic of Uzbekistan National Regime
Invention Patent Term	20 years from the earliest filing date (LegalMax Law, n.d.-b).	20 years from filing; can be extended up to 5 years for pharmaceutical or pesticide inventions (Sojuzpatent, n.d.).
Utility Model Term	Not available under U.S. federal law (only inventions are covered) (PETOŠEVIĆ, n.d.).	5 years from filing; can be extended up to 3 more years if requested and paid for (Sojuzpatent, n.d.).
Industrial Design Term	15 years from the date the patent is granted.	10 years from filing; can be extended up to 5 more years (Japan Patent Office, n.d.).



Legal parameter	United states federal regime	Republic of Uzbekistan National Regime
Substantive Examination	Happens automatically once filing fees are paid.	Must be requested by the applicant within 3 years of filing (Sojuzpatent, n.d.).
Formal Examination Timeline	Varies; usually results in a first response from the examiner within 15 to 20 months.	Must be completed within 2 months of filing (Azizov & Partners, n.d.).
Novelty Grace Period	12 months before filing for disclosures made by the inventor.	6 months before filing for disclosures by the inventor or someone they authorized (PETOŠEVIĆ, 2019).

Substantive Patentability Criteria and Exclusionary Thresholds

Comparing patent litigation in the two countries also means looking at what can be patented, who owns a patent, and what is excluded from protection.

What Cannot Be Patented

In the United States, what counts as patentable subject matter is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 101. Courts have spent decades fighting over this rule, especially when it comes to laws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract ideas. Diagnostic methods, biological sequences, and basic software algorithms have all faced tough scrutiny (Wolf Greenfield, 2025). However, in 2025 and 2026 the USPTO issued updated examination guidelines that made it easier to get protection for borderline diagnostic and software inventions, which should make enforcement more predictable going forward (Wolf Greenfield, 2025).

Uzbekistan's Law on Inventions, Utility Models and Industrial Designs spells out clearly what can and cannot be patented (Japan Patent Office, n.d.). Inventions can be protected if they are a new product - such as a device, chemical,



microorganism strain, or plant or animal cell culture - or a new method, meaning a process for doing something to a physical object using physical means (Japan Patent Office, n.d.). Article 6 of the law lists several things that cannot be patented as inventions or utility models:

- Scientific theories and mathematical methods (PETOŠEVIĆ, n.d.).
- Ways of organizing or managing a business, on their own (PETOŠEVIĆ, 2019).
- Simple symbols, schedules, and rules.
- Algorithms and computer programs on their own (PETOŠEVIĆ, 2019).
- Layouts of integrated circuits (CWB Intellectual Property, 2025a).
- Anything that goes against the public interest, basic human values, or morality - including human embryonic stem cells, edits to the human germline, or the commercial use of human embryos (PETOŠEVIĆ, 2019).

That said, software and business methods can still be patented in Uzbekistan if they are described the right way. Software qualifies if it is written as a series of steps a computer carries out to produce a real technical effect, not just claimed as an abstract idea (PETOŠEVIĆ, 2019). The same goes for business methods: they can be patented if described as a specific set of steps carried out using physical technical means to reach a measurable result.

Who Owns a Patent

Both the United States and Uzbekistan use the "first-to-file" rule: if two people independently invent the same thing, the patent goes to whoever filed first. Under Uzbek law, the right to get a patent belongs to the inventor or whoever inherits that right from them. But if a patent application is filed - or a patent granted - based on stolen work (what the law calls "unlawful borrowing"), the real inventor can go to court to challenge the patent or demand that it be transferred to them (Japan Patent Office, n.d.).

Pre-Trial Evidence Gathering and the Role of Forensic Expert Testimony

How each country gathers and presents evidence is one of the biggest differences between Uzbekistan's civil-law system and the United States' common-law system.



How the United States Gathers Evidence

In the U.S., the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure require a broad pre-trial discovery process. Parties can be forced to hand over internal company documents, source code, emails, and physical prototypes under Rules 26 and 37. Lawyers also rely heavily on "contention interrogatories" - formal written questions that force the other side to explain the basis for their infringement or damages claims before trial (IP/DE, n.d.). If a party fails to share this information before discovery ends, courts often punish them by blocking expert reports that try to rely on evidence that was held back (IP/DE, n.d.).

At trial, both sides typically bring in independent expert witnesses to testify about infringement, validity, and damages (Litigation Authority, n.d.). Under Federal Rule of Evidence 702 and the Supreme Court's Daubert standard, the trial judge has to screen these experts carefully, making sure their opinions are based on solid facts and reliable methods (Litigation Authority, n.d.). Judges apply this standard strictly in jury trials (Oblon, McClelland, Maier & Neustadt (OBWB), n.d.).

For example, an expert who wants to testify about what a "person of ordinary skill in the art" would have known must actually have that level of skill themselves (PTAB Bar Association, n.d.). If they don't, courts will exclude their testimony entirely (PTAB Bar Association, n.d.). Ordinary witnesses - people without expert qualifications - are not allowed to give opinions on the ultimate legal questions of infringement or obviousness. This stops parties from using regular witnesses to avoid the stricter rules that apply to experts (Oblon, McClelland, Maier & Neustadt (OBWB), n.d.).

How Uzbekistan Gathers Evidence

Uzbekistan has no pre-trial discovery process, no depositions, and no formal exchange of internal documents (PETOŠEVIĆ, n.d.). Parties have to gather their own evidence - through public records, official publications, or "trap purchases" of suspected counterfeit goods - before they even file a lawsuit (PETOŠEVIĆ, 2019). The Civil Code and the Commercial Procedure Code do allow a party to ask the court to order someone to hand over specific evidence, but these requests have to be very precise and courts grant them only rarely (PETOŠEVIĆ, n.d.).



Because Uzbek judges usually lack technical training, written opinions from forensic experts carry enormous weight - often deciding the outcome of a case . For a long time, courts only trusted experts from state-run institutions, like the Republican Center for Forensic Activities (named after Kh. Sulaymanova) under the Ministry of Justice, and largely ignored reports from independent private experts (PETOŠEVIĆ, n.d.).

To modernize this system, Uzbekistan's president approved a plan called the Concept for the Development of Forensic Activities for 2021–2025. This let licensed attorneys hire independent forensic organizations to produce expert opinions before or during a lawsuit (PETOŠEVIĆ, n.d.). This effort led to a new law - On Forensic Expert Activity (LRU-1152) - passed in June 2026. The law formally recognizes private forensic experts, allows them to open their own practices, and creates a national Chamber of Forensic Experts to oversee quality, certify experts, and keep an official registry of approved methods.

Even with this reform, courts still rely almost entirely on expert reports to decide technical questions. In practice, this means the forensic expert - not the judge - often decides whether infringement occurred (PETOŠEVIĆ, 2019).

Claim Interpretation, the All-Elements Test, and the Doctrine of Equivalents

In both countries, a patent owner has to show that the accused product or process falls within what the patent actually claims (iPleaders, n.d.).

Claim Construction and the Doctrine of Equivalents in the United States

In the U.S., the meaning of a patent's claims is decided by the judge, as a matter of law, in a pre-trial hearing called a Markman hearing (Stanford Law School, 2016). To prove infringement, the court applies the "all elements test": every single requirement listed in the claim must show up in the accused product or process, either exactly or through an equivalent (iPleaders, n.d.).

Under the Doctrine of Equivalents, a part of the accused product counts as equivalent to a claimed feature if it does substantially the same job, in substantially the same way, to get substantially the same result - known as the "triple identity test." It also counts as equivalent if the differences between the claimed feature and the accused feature would seem minor to someone skilled in the field (iPleaders, n.d.).



Courts have created several rules to stop the Doctrine of Equivalents from being stretched too far and turning patents into overly broad monopolies:

- **Prosecution History Estoppel:** A patent owner cannot claim equivalence for something they gave up or narrowed during the patent application process to get around a rejection (iPleaders, n.d.).
- **The Prior Art Rule (Hypothetical Claims Test):** A patent owner cannot use the Doctrine of Equivalents to cover something that was already known publicly before the invention's priority date - they cannot claim, by equivalence, something they could never have claimed directly (iPleaders, n.d.).
- **Claim Vitiatio:** The doctrine cannot be used in a way that erases a specific requirement from the claim entirely (iPleaders, n.d.).

Claim Scope in Uzbekistan, and the Lack of Clear Rules

Under Article 5 of Uzbekistan's patent law, the protection a patent gives is defined strictly by its claims for inventions and utility models, and by the overall look shown in the images for industrial designs (Japan Patent Office, n.d.).

Uzbek law does recognize the Doctrine of Equivalents, letting a patent owner sue a competitor that uses features equivalent to those in the patent claims (PETOŠEVIĆ, 2019). But because the term "equivalent feature" is never defined in the statute, and there are no binding court decisions or official guidelines that set a clear test, applying the doctrine is highly unpredictable (PETOŠEVIĆ, 2019).

Unlike the U.S., Uzbekistan has no rule like prosecution history estoppel and no prior-art limit on equivalence (PETOŠEVIĆ, 2019). Whether something counts as "equivalent" is decided case by case, entirely by the court-appointed forensic expert (PETOŠEVIĆ, 2019). Without clear limiting rules, the boundaries of a patent can be stretched or narrowed depending on how the forensic expert sees it during the trial - adding a lot of uncertainty (PETOŠEVIĆ, 2019).

Remedial Frameworks: Injunctions, Damages, and the Evolution of Statutory Compensation

The money and court orders available to a successful patent owner shape how effective a country's enforcement system really is.

Damages and Injunctions in the United States



In the U.S., a successful patent owner can get both money damages and a court order stopping the infringement, under 35 U.S.C. §§ 283 and 284. Damages are meant to make up for the harm caused and are usually based on the patent owner's lost profits or a reasonable royalty (Chambers and Partners, 2026a).

However, strict rules limit how damages are calculated (Practical Law (Thomson Reuters), n.d.). If the infringing technology is just one part of a larger product, the damages expert has to isolate the value specifically tied to the patented feature - they cannot use the value of the whole product (Practical Law (Thomson Reuters), n.d.). This rule applies even when damages are based on the smallest sellable part of the product that contains the patented feature (Practical Law (Thomson Reuters), n.d.).

If the infringement was willful, the court can award up to three times the actual damages (Chambers and Partners, 2026a). In "exceptional" cases - where one side's legal position was weak or its conduct was unreasonable - the court can also order it to pay the other side's attorneys' fees (Chambers and Partners, 2026a).

A court order stopping the infringement is not automatic just because infringement was found. The patent owner has to pass a four-part test from the eBay case: show real harm, show that money alone would not fix it, show that the balance of hardship favors them, and show that an injunction would not hurt the public interest (Chambers and Partners, 2026a).

Statutory Damages and Border Enforcement in Uzbekistan

Under Uzbekistan's traditional rules, a patent owner could ask a court to stop unauthorized use, destroy counterfeit goods, and recover actual damages or lost profits, under Articles 11 and 1040 of the Civil Code. In practice, though, recovering actual damages rarely worked (CWB Intellectual Property, 2024). Patent owners had to prove the exact dollar amount they lost, show a direct link between that loss and the infringer's actions, and back it up with detailed financial records (CWB Intellectual Property, 2024). In an economy increasingly built around online sales and hard-to-trace marketplaces, proving actual losses was nearly impossible - leaving patent owners with no real way to recover money (CWB Intellectual Property, 2024).

To fix this, Uzbekistan passed Law No. 959, effective December 12, 2024, which created a new option called "statutory compensation" (CWB Intellectual



Property, 2024). Under this law, a patent owner can ask for statutory compensation instead of trying to prove actual damages (CWB Intellectual Property, 2024). The amount ranges from 20 to 1,000 times the Basic Calculation Value, which works out to roughly \$590 to \$29,500 (CWB Intellectual Property, 2024).

The court decides the exact amount based on how serious the infringement was, how much the infringer was at fault, and standard business practice (CWB Intellectual Property, 2024). This makes it much cheaper and easier to go after small-scale infringers, although the legal standard for setting the amount is still vague (CWB Intellectual Property, 2024).

Early evidence suggests that judges, who generally lack experience valuing intellectual property, tend to award amounts closer to the legal minimum (CWB Intellectual Property, 2024).

Law No. 959 also gave regulators a new tool: patent and trademark violations can now lead to a website or online platform being blocked entirely as an administrative penalty (CWB Intellectual Property, 2024).

A Gap in Protection Against Copying

A notable gap opened up in Uzbekistan's enforcement system on October 3, 2023, when an amendment to the Competition Law removed all rules about copying competitors' products and other intellectual property issues. This stripped the Committee for the Development of Competition and Consumer Protection of its power to act against product copying and unfair competition involving intellectual property. As a result, rightsholders temporarily have no administrative agency to turn to if a competitor closely copies their product design, packaging, or overall look. This authority is supposed to move to the Ministry of Justice eventually, but until that happens, patent owners must rely on slow civil lawsuits in the Economic Court to fight this kind of copying .

7. Administrative Challenges, Appeals, and Post-Grant Review Mechanisms

Both countries have administrative systems for reviewing whether a patent is valid, but the legal standards and the binding effect of these decisions are quite different.



Academia Review-A Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN (Online): 3070-6726
Website: <https://academia.org>
 Volume 2, Issue 6, June, 2026



This work is Licenced under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

Trial Procedural and Evidentiary Parameters

Procedural Parameter	United States Federal Regime	Republic of Uzbekistan National Regime
First-Instance Trial Forum	US District Courts, with federal judges (United States Patent and Trademark Office, 2024).	Economic Courts (for companies) or Civil Courts (for individuals) (PETOŠEVIĆ, n.d.).
Bifurcation of Validity	Validity and infringement are decided together; invalidity is a defense or counterclaim in the same case (United States Patent and Trademark Office, 2024).	Strictly separated; validity can only be challenged before the Board of Appeal at the Ministry of Justice (PETOŠEVIĆ, 2019).
Issue Preclusion of PTAB/Board Decisions	PTAB rulings on validity do not automatically bind district courts, because the two use different legal standards (Akin Gump, n.d.).	Board of Appeal decisions bind the Economic Court unless appealed to the Administrative Court within 6 months (PETOŠEVIĆ, 2019).
Appellate Standing Requirements	A party must show real harm to appeal; this can include being sued, or facing direct or indirect liability risk (PTAB Bar Association, n.d.).	Any "interested" company or individual can immediately appeal a patent grant or validity decision (Japan Patent Office, n.d.).
Admissibility of Lay Opinion	Not allowed on key questions like obviousness,	Allowed, but courts strongly favor forensic



Procedural Parameter	United States Federal Regime	Republic of Uzbekistan National Regime
	infringement, or prior art (Oblon, McClelland, Maier & Neustadt (OBWB), n.d.).	expert reports (PETOŠEVIĆ, 2019).

PTAB Standing and Preclusion in the United States

The Patent Trial and Appeal Board is a very active forum for validity challenges (PTAB Bar Association, n.d.). But if a party wants to appeal a PTAB decision to the Federal Circuit, it has to show real, concrete harm - what courts call "standing" (PTAB Bar Association, n.d.). A party does not need this kind of standing to start a case at the PTAB, only to appeal a loss (PTAB Bar Association, n.d.). The Federal Circuit has said this standing exists if the patent owner has already sued one of the petitioner's customers, or if the petitioner makes a key part of the accused product and faces a real risk of being sued (PTAB Bar Association, n.d.).

One important limit: PTAB rulings on validity do not automatically apply to later district court cases involving different, unchallenged claims of the same patent (Akin Gump, n.d.). The Federal Circuit has explained that this is because the PTAB and the district courts use different standards of proof (Akin Gump, n.d.). At the PTAB, a challenger only needs to show invalidity is "more likely than not." In district court, a patent is presumed valid unless invalidity is proven by "clear and convincing evidence" - a much higher bar (Chambers and Partners, 2026a). Because the standards are different, district courts will not simply adopt PTAB findings, and patent owners keep the right to defend their patent's validity under the higher standard (Akin Gump, n.d.).

Reforms to the Appeals System in Uzbekistan

In Uzbekistan, all validity challenges go through an administrative process (PETOŠEVIĆ, 2019). Under Article 4 of the patent law, the Board of Appeal at the Ministry of Justice is the only body that can hear appeals against the patent office's decisions, oppositions to a patent grant, and challenges to a patent's overall validity (Japan Patent Office, n.d.). The party challenging the patent bears



the full burden of proving it is invalid (World Intellectual Property Organization, n.d.-a).

To simplify the system and remove overlap, Uzbekistan passed Law No. LRU-1144 in May 2026, effective August 8, 2026 (CWB Intellectual Property, 2025b). Before this law, trademark cancellations and patent invalidation claims could be filed either with the Board of Appeal or directly in Economic Court, which created confusion and sometimes conflicting decisions (CWB Intellectual Property, 2025b).

LRU-1144 fixed this by requiring that these cancellation claims go directly to court, leaving the Board of Appeal to focus only on standard validity disputes and appeals of the patent office's examination decisions (CWB Intellectual Property, 2025b).

The law also standardized the fees for appealing examination decisions, replacing the old sliding-scale fee system with a single flat rate (CWB Intellectual Property, 2025b).

Operational and Economic Realities: Timelines, Cost Dynamics, and Strategic Vectors

Anyone navigating a patent dispute in the U.S. or Uzbekistan needs a clear picture of how long it takes, what it costs, and what fees apply in each system.

Prosecution Fees and Speed in the United States

In the U.S., a fee overhaul by the USPTO in January 2025 changed how companies approach patent prosecution and litigation strategy (Sterne Kessler, 2026). To discourage applicants from keeping a chain of pending applications open for years just to target future competitors, the USPTO introduced a new Continuing Application Fee (Sterne Kessler, 2026). This adds a significant surcharge to any continuation application filed six or more years after the original filing date, with an even bigger penalty after nine years (Sterne Kessler, 2026). New fees were also added for filing large Information Disclosure Statements, pushing companies to do their prior-art searches early instead of dumping everything in at the end (Sterne Kessler, 2026).

To balance these changes, the USPTO shortened the wait between paying the issue fee and getting the patent granted (Sterne Kessler, 2026). Applicants in a hurry can also use "Track One" prioritized examination (Wolf Greenfield,



2025). By limiting their claims to ten or fewer, applicants using Track One can typically get a first response from the examiner within 1.5 to 2 months - skipping past a backlog of over 800,000 pending applications as of early 2025 (Wolf Greenfield, 2025).

Digital Reforms and Criminal Penalties in Uzbekistan

Uzbekistan's patent system is going digital fast, and the penalties for infringement are getting much tougher, under the country's Strategy for the Development of the Intellectual Property Sphere (2022–2026) (Uzbekistan.org.ua, n.d.). In May 2025, Law ZRU-1080 modernized how patents are registered and enforced (CWB Intellectual Property, 2025a).

First, ZRU-1080 simplified registration through the Patent and Trademark Office's digital platform, removing the need to submit proof of payment when filing (CWB Intellectual Property, 2025a). Applications are now accepted automatically once an electronic invoice is paid, and approved patents get a QR code in the state registry for verification (CWB Intellectual Property, 2025a).

Second, the law gives applicants more flexibility on fees, letting them extend the three-month deadline to pay grant fees by up to six months, for a 50% surcharge (CWB Intellectual Property, 2025a).

Most notably, ZRU-1080 created criminal penalties for patent infringement for the first time (CWB Intellectual Property, 2025a). Until now, criminal liability only applied to copyright violations. The new law adds Article 149³ to the Criminal Code, which punishes unauthorized use of patents, designs, circuit layouts, and plant varieties when it causes "significant damage" (CWB Intellectual Property, 2025a).

Violators can face fines of about \$1,600 to \$2,400, up to 360 hours of community service, or restricted liberty for up to two years (CWB Intellectual Property, 2025a). If there are aggravating factors - like repeat offenses or organized group activity - the penalties go up to fines of \$2,400 to \$3,200 or two to three years in prison (CWB Intellectual Property, 2025a).

To encourage quick settlements, the law lets first-time offenders avoid criminal liability entirely if they fully pay for the damage within 30 days of being caught (CWB Intellectual Property, 2025a).

Conclusion



Comparing the patent systems of the United States and Uzbekistan reveals a fundamental difference in legal philosophy, court procedure, and risk.

The United States runs a highly developed, party-driven common-law system that gives patent owners extensive pre-trial discovery, solid compensation rules, and fairly predictable outcomes (Chambers and Partners, 2026a). But the very high cost and multi-year timelines of federal litigation make U.S. courts an expensive, high-barrier option (PETOŠEVIĆ, n.d.).

Uzbekistan has built a state-led, civil-law system that offers faster, cheaper administrative and judicial enforcement (Legal 500, n.d.). By centralizing oversight under the Ministry of Justice and rolling out digital tools like the "One Window" customs registry, the government can move quickly to spot infringement, seize counterfeit goods, and block infringing websites (Legal 500, n.d.).

The new statutory compensation system under Law No. 959 gives patent owners a simple way to skip the nearly impossible task of proving actual damages, making it realistic to go after small-scale and online infringers (CWB Intellectual Property, 2024). The new criminal penalties under Article 149³ of the Criminal Code add even more leverage: competitors now face real prosecution or jail time unless they settle and pay full compensation within 30 days (CWB Intellectual Property, 2025a).

That said, Uzbekistan's split court system, lack of pre-trial discovery, and generalist judges create real unpredictability (PETOŠEVIĆ, n.d.). Because courts depend so heavily on the subjective judgment of court-appointed forensic experts to decide infringement and equivalence, the outcome of a trial can be hard to predict (PETOŠEVIĆ, 2019).

For multinational companies and global investors, the choice comes down to this: the United States remains an expensive but reliable forum for major, high-stakes disputes, while Uzbekistan has become a fast-moving, enforcement-friendly market where success depends on registering early, coordinating closely with the Ministry of Justice, and using the new statutory compensation and criminal settlement tools to protect valuable technology (Legal 500, n.d.)

REFERENCES:



1. Akin Gump. (n.d.). Federal Circuit Confirms That PTAB Patentability Findings Do Not Have Issue-Preclusive Effect in District Court.
2. American Bar Association. (n.d.). Uzbekistan Introduces Statutory Compensation Amounts for IPR Infringement.
3. Chambers and Partners. (2026a). Patent Litigation 2026: Comparisons. Retrieved from <https://practiceguides.chambers.com/practice-guides/comparison/1073/18264/28634-28635-28636-28637-28638-28639-28640-28641-28642-28643>
4. Chambers and Partners. (2026b). Patent Litigation 2026 – USA, Texas: Trends and Developments.
5. Cornerstone Research. (n.d.). Intellectual Property Litigation: U.S. Trends in Global Perspective.
6. CWB Intellectual Property. (2025b). Uzbekistan Updates Intellectual Property Framework. Retrieved from <https://cwbip.com/>
7. Department of Cyber Law (Uzbekistan). (n.d.). Intellectual Property in the Digital Age. Retrieved from <https://www.cyber-law.uz/subject/intellectual-property-in-the-digital-age>
8. Genius Journals. (n.d.). Legal Regime of Inventions. Retrieved from <https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/erb/article/view/3070/2626>
9. Gov.uz. (n.d.). The Legal Status of Non-State Forensic Experts Is Being Defined. Retrieved from <https://gov.uz/en/adliya/news/view/96514>
10. Intellect-Business. (n.d.). Basic Information about Legal Protection of Intellectual Property Objects. Retrieved from https://intellect.uz/patent_pr_inven_eng.htm
11. IP/DE. (n.d.). Expert Discovery. Retrieved from <https://ipde.com/blog/tag/expert-discovery/>
12. iPleaders. (n.d.). The Doctrine of Equivalents in Patents: Set Standards to Determine the Equivalents.
13. Japan Patent Office. (n.d.). Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan on Inventions, Utility Models and Industrial Designs (unofficial translation).
14. Lawzana. (2026). The 10 Best IP Litigation & Enforcement Lawyers in Uzbekistan. Retrieved from <https://lawzana.com/ip-litigation-enforcement-lawyers/uzbekistan>.



- 13.MSP Corporate. (n.d.). Patent Coverage in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Retrieved from <https://mspcorporate.com/patent-coverage-in-eeca.html>
- 14.Oblon, McClelland, Maier & Neustadt (OBWB). (n.d.). Lay Witness Opinion Testimony on Ultimate Question of Obviousness Is Inadmissible at Trial.
- 15.Papula-Nevinpat. (n.d.-a). Patents in Eurasia. Retrieved from <https://papula-nevinpat.com/our-operating-area/patents-in-eurasia/>
- 16.Papula-Nevinpat. (n.d.-b). Patenting in Georgia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Ukraine – What You Need to Know. Retrieved from <https://papula-nevinpat.com/>
- 17.PETOŠEVIĆ. (n.d.). Patents – Uzbekistan: Lexology GTDT Practice Guides. Retrieved from <https://www.petosevic.com/resources/guides/patents-uzbekistan-lexology-gtdt-practice-guides>
- 18.Pinsent Masons. (n.d.-a). UPC Needs Own 'Doctrine of Equivalents' Test, Says Mannheim Court. Retrieved from <https://www.pinsentmasons.com/out-law/news/upc-doctrine-of-equivalents-mannheim-court>
- 19.Pinsent Masons. (n.d.-b). How the Doctrine of Equivalents Impacts Patent Protection in Europe.
- 20.Pinsent Masons. (n.d.-c). UPC Again Considers Patent Infringement by Equivalence. Retrieved from <https://www.pinsentmasons.com/out-law/news/upc-considers-patent-infringement-equivalence>
- 21.Practical Law (Thomson Reuters). (n.d.). District Court Correctly Excluded Damages Expert Testimony: Federal Circuit.
- 22.Sterne Kessler. (2022). Federal Circuit Appeals from the PTAB and ITC. Retrieved from <https://www.sterneessler.com/app/uploads/2023/02/2022-FedCirReport-Final-HR-Web.pdf>
- 23.Sterne Kessler. (2026). Strategic Prosecution in 2026: What Patent Examiners Might Do Differently—and What That Means for Your Portfolio.