

**REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED**

1 YAR R. CHAIKOVSKY (SB# 175421)  
yarchaikovsky@paulhastings.com  
2 PHILIP OU (SB# 259896)  
philipou@paulhastings.com  
3 ANDY LEGOLVAN (SB# 292520)  
andylegolvan@paulhastings.com  
4 JOSEPH J. RUMPLER, II (SB# 296941)  
josephrumpler@paulhastings.com  
5 BERKELEY FIFE (SB# 325293)  
berkeleyfife@paulhastings.com  
6 BORIS LUBARSKY (SB# 324896)  
borislubarsky@paulhastings.com  
7 PAUL HASTINGS LLP  
1117 S. California Avenue  
8 Palo Alto, California 94304-1106  
Telephone: 1(650) 320-1800  
9 Facsimile: 1(650) 320-1900

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.

11

12

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

13

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

14

15 APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.,

16 Plaintiff,

17 vs.

18 DEMARAY LLC,

19 Defendant.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CASE NO. 5:20-cv-05676-EJD

**APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.'S  
REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION  
FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION  
TO ENJOIN DEMARAY LLC FROM  
PROCEEDING WITH CUSTOMER  
SUITS DURING THE PENDENCY OF  
THIS ACTION**

**Hearing Date: November 12, 2020**

**Hearing Time: 9:00 a.m.**

**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

|  | <b>Page</b> |
|--|-------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION .....  | 1           |
| II. ARGUMENT .....   | 2           |
| A. The Court Has Subject Matter Jurisdiction Over Applied’s Claims.....  | 2           |
| 1. Demaray’s Allegations Establish a Reasonable Potential It Could<br>Bring Direct Infringement Claims Against Applied .....                             | 3           |
| 2. Demaray’s Allegations Establish a Reasonable Potential It Could<br>Bring Inducement and Contributory Claims Against Applied.....                      | 5           |
| B. The <i>Katz</i> Framework Applies to the Question of Whether to Issue a<br>Preliminary Injunction—not <i>eBay</i> ’s Traditional Four-Part Test ..... | 7           |
| C. Applied’s Noninfringement Claims of the Asserted Patents Will Be<br>Dispositive of the Major Issues in the Customer Suits .....                       | 7           |
| D. Applied’s License and Assignment-Based Noninfringement Claims Will<br>Resolve the Customer Suits .....  | 10          |
| 1. The License Grant in the SRA Is Valid and Enforceable .....   | 11          |
| 2. The Employee Assignment Provisions Are Valid and Enforceable .....  | 11          |
| E. Demaray’s Remaining Arguments Are Unavailing, but Rather Confirm the<br>Customer Suits Should Be Enjoined Under <i>Katz</i> .....                     | 13          |
| III. CONCLUSION.....   | 15          |

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

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

**Page(s)**

**Cases**

*Amazon.com, Inc. v. Corydoras Techs., LLC*,  
No. 1:19-cv-1095, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 57969 (W.D. Tex. Apr. 2, 2020) .....9, 15

*Applied Materials, Inc. v. Advanced Micro-Fabrication Equip. (Shanghai) Co.*,  
630 F. Supp. 2d 1084 (N.D. Cal. 2009) .....11

*Arris Group, Inc. v. British Telecomm. PLC*,  
639 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....5, 6

*Bal Seal Eng’g, Inc. v. Nelson Prods.*,  
2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 195915 (C.D. Cal. Sep. 8, 2016).....8

*Bd. of Trs. v. Roche Molecular Sys.*,  
583 F.3d 832 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....12

*Berkeley\*IEOR v. Teradata Operations, Inc.*,  
No. 17 C 7472, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36563 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 7, 2019) .....9, 10

*Cadence Design Sys. v. OEA Int’l, Inc.*,  
No. CV11-0713, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 106739 (N.D. Cal. Sep. 19, 2011).....8

*Codex Corp. v. Milgo Elec. Corp.*,  
553 F.2d 735 (1st Cir. 1977) .....13

*DermaFocus LLC v. Ulthera, Inc.*,  
201 F. Supp. 3d 465 (D. Del. 2016) .....6

*Dolby Labs., Inc. v. Intertrust Techs. Corp.*,  
No. 19-cv-03371-EMC, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 194022 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 6,  
2019) .....5

*eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, LLC*,  
547 U.S. 388 (2006).....7

*In re Google Inc.*,  
588 F. App’x 988 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....14

*Google Inc. v. Rockstar Consortium U.S. LP*,  
No. C 13-5933 CW, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 53757 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 17, 2014) .....13

*Gray Mfg. Co. v. Ashburn Volunteer Fire & Rescue Dep’t*,  
No. 3:19-cv-801, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 145886 (E.D. Va. Aug. 12, 2020).....8

1 *Hoffmann-La Roche Inc. v. Promega Corp.*,  
 2 No. C-93-1748, 1994 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10174 (N.D. Cal. June 13, 1994) .....6, 12

3 *Kahn v. GMC*,  
 4 889 F.2d 1078 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....13, 14

5 *Katz v. Lear Siegler, Inc.*,  
 6 909 F.2d 1459 (Fed. Cir. 1990)..... *passim*

7 *Mantissa Corp. v. Old Second Bancorp, Inc.*,  
 8 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 103365 (N.D. Ill. June 20, 2018) .....10

9 *Mass Eng. Des., Inc. v. Planar Sys.*,  
 10 426 F. Supp. 3d 680 (D. Or. 2019) .....6

11 *MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.*,  
 12 549 U.S. 118 (2007).....2

13 *Microsoft Corp. v. DataTern, Inc.*,  
 14 755 F.3d 899 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....2, 4, 6

15 *In re Nintendo of Am., Inc.*,  
 16 756 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....1, 8, 9, 13

17 *Ours Tech., Inc. v. Data Drive Thru, Inc.*,  
 18 645 F. Supp. 2d 830 (N.D. Cal. 2009) .....2

19 *Pacesetter Sys. v. Medtronic, Inc.*,  
 20 678 F.2d 93 (9th Cir. 1982).....14

21 *ProBatter Sports, LLC v. Joyner Techs., Inc.*,  
 22 463 F. Supp. 2d 949 (N.D. Iowa 2006).....7, 10

23 *RegenLab USA LLC v. Estar Techs. Ltd.*,  
 24 No. 16-cv-8771, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 131495 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 17, 2017).....7

25 *Spread Spectrum Screening LLC v. Eastman Kodak Co.*,  
 26 657 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....1

27 *Tegic Communs. Corp. v. Bd. of Regents*,  
 28 458 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....8

*TransCore v. Elec. Trans. Consult. Corp.*,  
 563 F.3d 1271 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....8

*USGA v. Arroyo Software Corp.*,  
 69 Cal. App. 4th 607 (1999) .....13

*Valley View Health Care, Inc. v. Chapman*,  
 992 F. Supp. 2d 1016 (E.D. Cal. 2014).....13

1 *Whitewater W. Indus., Ltd. v. Alleshouse,*  
2 No. 17-cv-00501, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 163168 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 26, 2019) .....12

3 **Statutes**

4 Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600 .....12

5 Lab. Code § 2870 .....12

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

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.