Edward R. Nelson III (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
Texas Bar No. 00797142
Christopher G. Granaghan (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
Texas Bar No. 24078585
ed@nelbum.com
chris@nelbum.com
NELSON BUMGARDNER CONROY P.C.
3131 West Seventh Street, Suite 300
Fort Worth, Texas 76107
Telephone: (817) 377-9111
Facsimile: (817) 377-3485

Timothy E. Grochocinski (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
Illinois Bar No. 6295055
Charles Austin Ginnings (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
New York Bar No. 4986691
tim@nelbum.com
austin@nelbum.com
NELSON BUMGARDNER CONROY P.C.
15020 S. Ravinia Avenue, Suite 29
Orland Park, Illinois 60462
Telephone: (708) 675-1974

Ryan E. Hatch
California Bar No. 235577
ryan@hatchlaw.com
HATCH LAW PC
13323 Washington Blvd., Suite 302
Los Angeles, CA 90066
Telephone: (310) 279-5076

Attorneys for Plaintiff
FIRSTFACE CO., LTD.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
**SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

| | |
|---|---|
| FIRSTFACE CO., LTD.,<br><br>Plaintiff,<br><br>v.<br><br>APPLE INC.,<br><br>Defendant. | CASE NO. 3:18-cv-02245-JD<br><br>**PLAINTIFF'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT** |

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

**Cases**

## I. SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON THE POWER BUTTON LIMITATIONS.

Apple fails to rebut Firstface's showing that the accused products practice the power button limitations. Instead of addressing the merits, Apple argues Firstface waived every possible theory of how its products could practice the power button limitations. Firstface has waived nothing. But the Court need not wade into these arguments. The undisputed evidence shows that Apple successfully argued to the PTAB that a device with a button identical to the accused products' power button meets the power button limitations. This estops Apple from maintaining that the accused products do not satisfy the power button limitations. The Court should grant partial summary judgment on this basis alone.

### A. Judicial Estoppel Bars Apple from Disputing Infringement of These Limitations.

Apple's arguments that judicial estoppel does not apply are based on misrepresentations of the PTAB record. Apple first argues that its position on the power button limitations is consistent with its position in the IPRs because, "[b]efore the PTAB, Apple explained that Firstface's own infringement theories, if accepted, also showed invalidity." ECF 257 at 9. Apple provides the Court with a side-by-side comparison of Firstface's infringement contentions with one of Apple's IPR petitions, and argues that "[b]y pointing to Firstface's infringement theories, Apple did not concede them." *Id.* But Apple did not mention Firstface's infringement theories before the PTAB, let alone state that its arguments were based on them. The side-by-side comparison in Apple's response does not appear anywhere in the record before the PTAB. Nor do Firstface's infringement contentions. Apple argued, without reservation, that the "sleep/wake button" in the iOS 3.1 User Guide, which functioned exactly like the Accused Products, met the power button limitations. ECF 241-6 at 30-31, 66-67; ECF 241-7 at 28, 66. Apple's attempt to run from that argument smacks of the very opportunism that judicial estoppel is meant to preclude.

Second, Apple argues that it "did not persuade the PTAB to take a position regarding the 'On/Off' limitation" because "the prior art's satisfaction of that limitation was not at issue in the IPR." ECF 257. Apple does not (and cannot) dispute that the Board found that the iOS 3.1 User Guide discloses "a power button configured to turn on *and* off the terminal by pressing" because it describes "an additional 'Sleep/Wake' button that turns the power on and off." ECF 241-8 at 17-18; ECF 241-9 at 21, 54. It does not matter that Firstface did not dispute that the iOS 3.1 User Guide discloses the power button limitations—judicial estoppel does not require that an issue was contested. *See Baughman v. Walt Disney*

DOCKET ALARM

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts

Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research

With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips

Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

**LAW FIRMS**
Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

**FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS**
Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

**E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS**
Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.