

1 IRELL & MANELLA LLP
Morgan Chu (70446)
2 MChu@irell.com
Benjamin W. Hattenbach (186455)
3 BHattenbach@irell.com
C. Maclain Wells (221609)
4 MWells@irell.com
1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900
5 Los Angeles, California 90067-4276
6 Telephone: (310) 277-1010
Facsimile: (310) 203-7199

7 Attorneys for Defendant
8 DEMARAY LLC

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11 SAN JOSE DIVISION

13 APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.,) Case No. 5:20-cv-05676-EJD
)
14 Plaintiff,) **DEMARAY LLC’S OPPOSITION TO**
) **APPLIED MATERIALS’ MOTION FOR**
15 vs.) **PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**
)
16 DEMARAY LLC,) **Hearing Date: November 12, 2020**
) **Hearing Time: 9:00 a.m.**
17 Defendant.)
18)

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

	<u>Page</u>
I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
II. SUMMARY OF FACTS	3
III. DISCUSSION	5
A. The Court Lacks Subject Matter Jurisdiction Over Applied’s Claims.....	5
B. Applied Has Not Proven Entitlement To The Extraordinary Remedy It Seeks	8
C. Applied Applies The Wrong Legal Standard In Requesting An Extraordinary Remedy Based Upon Unfounded Licensing/Ownership Claims	10
D. Applied Bases Its Request Upon On Contract Provisions Already Adjudicated In This District To Be Unlawful	11
E. The Customer Suit Exception Does Not Warrant Enjoining The Texas Actions	16
1. Intel And Samsung Are Not Mere Resellers Of Applied Reactors	16
2. Intel’s And Samsung’s Supposed Agreement To Be Bound Would Leave Major Open Issues Unresolved.....	17
3. Applied Does Not Allege Or Show That It Is The Only Intel And Samsung PVD Reactor Supplier	19
4. Major Issues Present In Texas Are Lacking From The Present Case	20
5. Applied Again Applies The Wrong Legal Standard	22
F. Convenience Factors Do Not Favor One Forum Over The Other	23
IV. CONCLUSION	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases¹	
<i>Alfarah v. City of Soledad</i> , No. 5:15-cv-05569-EJD, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 82624 (N.D. Cal. June 24, 2016) (J. Davila).....	11
<i>Alltrade, Inc. v. Uniweld Products, Inc.</i> , 946 F.2d 622 (9th Cir. 1991).....	15, 25
<i>Am. Acad. of Sci. v. Novell, Inc.</i> , No. C-91-4300 EFL, 1992 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20145 (N.D. Cal. July 9, 1992).....	17, 21
<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. Corydoras Techs., LLC</i> , No. 1:19-cv-1095-RP, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 57969 (W.D. Tex. Apr. 2, 2020)	10
<i>Applied Materials, Inc. v. Advanced Micro-Fabrication Equip., Inc.</i> , 630 F. Supp. 2d 1084 (N.D. Cal. May 20, 2009)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Ass'n for Molecular Pathology v. U.S. Patent & Trademark Office</i> , 689 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	5
<i>Axis Reinsurance Co. v. Northrop Grumman Corp.</i> , No. 2:17-cv-08660-AB, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 222622 (C.D. Cal. June 21, 2018).....	9
<i>Berkeley*IEOR v. Teradata Operations, Inc.</i> , No. 17 C 7472, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36563 (N.D. Ill. March 7, 2019).....	21
<i>Church of Scientology v. United States Dep't of the Army</i> , 611 F.2d 738 (9th Cir. 1979).....	25
<i>Cisco Sys. v. TiVo, Inc.</i> , No. C 12-02766 RS, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 112923 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 10, 2012)	16
<i>Codex Corp. v. Milgo Electronic Corp.</i> , 553 F.2d 735 (1st Cir. 1977)	24
<i>Corydoras Techs., LLC v. Best Buy Co.</i> , No. 2:19-cv-00304-JRG-RSP, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 45578 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 16, 2020).....	22
<i>Crossbow Tech., Inc. v. YH Tech.</i> ,	

¹ Unless otherwise noted, internal citations, quotations and subsequent history are omitted,
and emphasis is added unless otherwise indicated.

1	531 F. Supp. 2d 1117 (N.D. Cal. 2007)	5
2	<i>Del Mar Avionics v. Quinton Instruments Co.</i> ,	
3	645 F.2d 832 (9th Cir. 1981).....	9
4	<i>eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C.</i> ,	
5	547 U.S. 388 (2006)	23
6	<i>Erfindergemeinschaft UroPep GbR v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> ,	
7	No. 2:15-CV-1202-WCB, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 55205 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 26,	
8	2016).....	21
9	<i>Finisar Corp. v. Cheetah Omni, LLC</i> ,	
10	No. 11-cv-15625, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 198501 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 19, 2012)	23
11	<i>Futurewei Techs., Inc. v. Acacia Research Corp.</i> ,	
12	737 F.3d 704 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	16
13	<i>In re Google Inc.</i> ,	
14	588 F. App'x 988 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	23
15	<i>Intersearch Worldwide, Ltd. v. Intersearch Group, Inc.</i> ,	
16	544 F. Supp. 2d 949 (N.D. Cal. 2008)	16
17	<i>Katz v. Lear Siegler, Inc.</i> ,	
18	909 F.2d 1459 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	<i>passim</i>
19	<i>Kline v. Burke Constr. Co.</i> ,	
20	260 U.S. 226 (1922)	9, 15
21	<i>Microchip Tech., Inc. v. United Module Corp.</i> ,	
22	No. CV-10-04241-LHK, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 73276 (N.D. Cal. July 7,	
23	2011).....	20
24	<i>Microsoft v. DataTern</i> ,	
25	755 F.3d 899 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	<i>passim</i>
26	<i>Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co. v. Payless Shoesource, Inc.</i> ,	
27	No. C-11-1892 EMC, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 112346 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 9, 2012)	15
28	<i>Native Fed'n of the Madre De Dios River & Tributaries v. Bozovich Timber Prods.</i> ,	
	491 F. Supp. 2d 1174 (2007).....	5
	<i>In re Nintendo of Am., Inc.</i> ,	
	756 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	23
	<i>Open Text, S.A. v. Box, Inc.</i> ,	
	36 F. Supp. 3d 885 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (J. Davila).....	9, 11, 24
	<i>Pacesetter Sys. Inc. v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> ,	

1	678 F.2d 93 (9th Cir. 1982).....	10, 16, 24, 25
2	<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. De Lara,</i>	
3	No. 20-cv-410-MMA (MSB), 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 52724 (S.D. Cal. Mar.	
	26, 2020).....	14
4	<i>Proofpoint, Inc. v. InNova Patent Licensing, LLC,</i>	
5	No. 5:11-CV-02288-LHK, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 120343 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 17,	
	2011).....	15, 19
6	<i>Proofpoint, Inc. v. InNova Patent Licensing,</i>	
7	No. 5:11-cv-02288-LHK, 2011 WL 4915847 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2011).....	8, 16, 25
8	<i>RegenLab USA LLC v. Estar Techs. Ltd.,</i>	
9	No. 16-cv-08771 (ALC), 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 131495 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 17,	
	2017).....	22
10	<i>Robert Bosch LLC v. Pylon Mfg. Corp.,</i>	
11	659 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	23
12	<i>Sillage LLC v. Kenrose Perfumes Inc.,</i>	
13	No. 8:14-cv-02043-CAS(RNBx), 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 75965 (C.D. Cal. June	
	9, 2015).....	19
14	<i>Spread Spectrum Screening LLC v. Eastman Kodak Co.,</i>	
15	657 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	<i>passim</i>
16	<i>Tegic Communs. Corp. v. Bd. of Regents,</i>	
17	458 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	15, 16, 17, 19
18	<i>Telebrands Corp. v. Nat'l Exp., Inc.,</i>	
	No. 12-6671, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 140279 (D.N.J. Oct. 2, 2014).....	22
19	<i>Titan Tire Corp. v. Case New Holland, Inc.,</i>	
20	566 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	13, 14, 24
21	<i>Ultra Prods., Inc. v. Best Buy Co.,</i>	
22	No. 09-1095, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78678 (D.N.J. Sept. 1, 2009)	22
23	<i>Vantage Point Tech., Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.,</i>	
	2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 675 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 6, 2015)	10, 22, 26
24	<i>Wenke v. Forest Labs., Inc.,</i>	
25	No. 5:14-cv-01898-EJD, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 68176 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 23,	
	2018) (J. Davila).....	14
26	<i>Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.,</i>	
27	555 U.S. 7 (2008)	11, 14
28		

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.