

Exhibit G

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC §
v. § CASE NO. 2:21-cv-00072-JRG
(Lead Case)

T-MOBILE USA, INC., and T-MOBILE §
US, INC. §

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC §
v. § CASE NO. 2:21-cv-00024-JRG
(Member Case)

LYFT, INC. §

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC §
v. § CASE NO. 2:21-cv-00026-JRG
(Member Case)

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., d/b/a UBER §

**DEFENDANT LYFT, INC.’S MOTION TO STRIKE PLAINTIFF’S FIRST AMENDED
DISCLOSURE OF ASSERTED CLAIMS AND INFRINGEMENT
CONTENTIONS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Factual Background 2

III. Argument 5

 A. AGIS’s Infringement Allegations Should Be Limited to the Lyft iOS Application..... 7

 B. AGIS’s Infringement Allegations Related to Storing User Phone Numbers Are Internally Inconsistent. 13

 C. AGIS’s Infringement Allegations Related to Exchanging IP Addresses Are Similarly Inconsistent. 15

IV. Conclusion 17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

Connectel, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.,
391 F. Supp. 2d 526 (E.D. Tex. 2005)..... 5-6

Implicit, LLC v. Huawei Techs. USA, Inc.,
No. 6:17-cv-00182 (E.D. Tex. July 2, 2018) (Dkt. No. 153)..... 6, 11-12

Michael S Sutton Ltd. v. Nokia Corp.,
No. 6:07-cv-203-LED (E.D. Tex. Feb. 13, 2009) (Dkt. No. 59) 6-7

Motorola, Inc. v. Analog Devices, Inc.,
No. 1:03-cv-131, 2004 WL 5633735 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 8, 2004)5

O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Monolithic Power Sys., Inc.,
467 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....5

Salazar v. HTC Corp.,
No. 2:16-cv-01096-JRG-RSP, 2017 WL 3593789 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 20, 2017).....5

Traxcell Techs., LLC v. Huawei Techs. USA Inc.,
No. 2:17-cv-00042, 2017 WL 6559256 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 21, 2017)5, 6

Uniloc 2017 LLC v. Google LLC,
No. 2:18-cv-00492 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 27, 2020) (Payne, J.), Dkt. No. 22712

I. Introduction

Plaintiff AGIS Software Development LLC's ("AGIS") infringement contentions are deficient and cannot stand for two primary reasons. First, AGIS's May 2021 Infringement Contentions include infringement allegations only for Lyft's iOS application, yet it attempts to improperly encapsulate other Lyft products, including applications for other operating systems, such as Android, through the use of boilerplate language. Lyft notified AGIS repeatedly over the course of several months that the boilerplate language was insufficient to provide proper notice of its infringement theories, against any Lyft product other than Lyft's iOS application, but AGIS did nothing in response.

Several months later, after reviewing Lyft's source code, AGIS provided source code contentions and for the very first time updated the infringement allegations to include Lyft's Android application. But source code contentions are meant to provide notice as to *how* the accused products meet the claim limitations; they are not a vehicle for adding new accused products to a case. If AGIS intended to accuse the Lyft Android app in this case, it should have provided the requisite notice months ago with its May contentions pursuant to Local Patent Rule 3-1 and consistent with its obligations. For this reason, AGIS's contentions should be limited to the Lyft iOS applications only.

Second, AGIS's contentions present conflicting theories that are facially untenable. Some of the asserted claims require network participants to store the cellular phone numbers or IP addresses of the other network participants. Other claims require anonymization: One network user does not have access to the telephone number and/or IP address of another network user. Despite the obvious conflict between these two sets of claims, AGIS asserts that the same accused Lyft products infringe both sets of claims. That cannot be. AGIS's contradictory allegations,

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.