

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  
OPPOSITION TO DEMARAY LLC'S  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO  
FILE SUR-REPLY TO APPLIED'S  
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY  
INJUNCTION**

1 Applied Materials, Inc. (“Applied”) submits this Opposition to Demaray LLC’s  
2 (“Demaray”) Administrative Motion for Leave to File a Sur-Reply to Applied’s Motion for  
3 Preliminary Injunction, Dkt. No. 30 (“Motion”).

4 **I. INTRODUCTION**

5 Demaray’s Motion is Demaray’s second improper attempt to have “the last word” on  
6 Applied’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction. Dkt. No. 14 (“Injunction Motion”). On October  
7 16, 2020, Demaray filed objections to allegedly “new” evidence submitted by Applied in its  
8 Reply, Dkt. No. 29 (“Objections”), but failed to apply the standard for what is considered “new.”  
9 Applied’s Reply evidence is not “new” because it was submitted in direct response to evidence  
10 and arguments raised in Demaray’s Opposition. For example, Demaray raised subject-matter  
11 jurisdiction for the first time in its Opposition by arguing that Demaray never offered Applied a  
12 license. In direct response, Applied submitted evidence to the contrary. Demaray now argues  
13 that this evidence should have been submitted in Applied’s Injunction Motion, ignoring that it  
14 was Demaray—not Applied—who first raised subject-matter jurisdiction in its Opposition.  
15 Demaray does the same with other Article III arguments, including the nature of its allegations  
16 against Applied’s customers, and merits based arguments regarding Applied’s causes of action,  
17 all of which Applied properly responded to in its Reply. By objecting to Applied’s purportedly  
18 “new” evidence and separately seeking leave to file a sur-reply, Demaray seeks to have both (1)  
19 its arguments and evidence unrebutted and (2) the last word. Neither is fair or proper under the  
20 Court’s Local Rules considering the evidence Applied submitted was not “new.”

21 As Demaray notes, counsel for the parties conferred, and to avoid burdening the Court  
22 with the instant papers, Applied offered to not oppose a limited sur-reply of five pages solely to  
23 address the evidence in Applied’s Reply (*i.e.*, not a carte blanche to address any issue raised in  
24 the Reply). Demaray declined and proceeded with the instant Motion, presumably because it  
25 seeks the last word on every argument and issue addressed in Applied’s Reply.<sup>1</sup> At the same

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>1</sup> Applied asked what Demaray contends to be “new arguments and supporting evidence”  
28 warranting a sur-reply, and Demaray effectively responded that the entirety of Applied’s Reply

1 time, Demaray refused to allow Applied to file a response to the Objections to explain why the  
2 evidence submitted in its Reply was not “new.” Ex. B to Lubarsky Decl. For the same reasons  
3 why a sur-reply is not warranted, the Objections should be overruled. Briefing on Applied’s  
4 Injunction Motion is closed and Demaray has not demonstrated why it should be permitted a 10-  
5 page sur-reply on whatever it chooses to respond to from Applied’s Reply.

## 6 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

7 “Courts may allow evidence first presented in a reply if it ‘addresse[s] the same set of  
8 facts supplied in [the] opposition to the motion’ or when it is ‘submitted in direct response to  
9 evidence raised in the opposition.’ In such circumstances the evidence is not considered ‘new.’”  
10 *WeRide Corp. v. Kun Huang*, No. 5:18-cv-07233-EJD, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22915, at \*3–5  
11 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 12, 2019) (Davila, J.) (emphasis added) (quoting *Rayon-Terrell v. Contra Costa*  
12 *Cty.*, 232 F. App’x 626, 629 n.2 (9th Cir. 2007), and *Advanced Media Networks LLC v. Row 44*  
13 *Inc.*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 156649, at \*1 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2014) (such evidence is “not  
14 new”)); *see also Laub v. Horbaczewski*, No. CV 17-6210-JAK (KSx), 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS  
15 158171, at \*3–5 (C.D. Cal. June 24, 2020) (declaration submitted with reply brief “does not  
16 present new factual contentions but responds to arguments Plaintiffs raised in their Opposition”).

17 The moving party is permitted to file declarations in support of a reply brief, *see* L.R. 7-  
18 3(c) (“Any reply to an opposition may include affidavits or declarations[.]”), and the non-moving  
19 party may file objections to such evidence, *see* L.R. 7-3(d)(1). A sur-reply should generally only  
20 be permitted if the evidence submitted with the reply brief is considered “new” evidence under  
21 the appropriate standard, thus warranting an opportunity to respond; however, if the evidence  
22 submitted with the reply brief only responds to evidence and argument made in the opposition  
23 brief, there is no basis for a sur-reply. *WeRide Corp.*, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22915, at \*3–5;

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 was “new,” identifying every issue addressed in the Reply, including “issues of comity and the  
26 applicable legal standard for a preliminary injunction.” Ex. A to Lubarsky Decl. Demaray’s  
27 position is undermined by the limited objections it filed, which—to the extent the Court permits  
28 one—should dictate the bounds of any sur-reply by Demaray.

1 *Yowie North America, Inc. v. Candy Treasure, LLC*, No. 13-CV-1906 BEN (JMA), Dkt. No. 51 at  
2 1–2 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 9, 2013) (denying sur-reply because “a review of the Reply as well as the  
3 supporting declarations reveals that the evidence submitted is not new evidence, but rather is  
4 responsive to the arguments raised in the opposition brief”); *see also Earth Island Inst. v. Nash*,  
5 No. 1:19-cv-01420-DAD-SAB, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 71185, at \*20 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 21, 2020).

### 6 **III. ARGUMENT**

7 Demaray identifies four categories of “new arguments,” tracking the allegedly “new”  
8 evidence identified in its Objections. *See* Mot. at 1–2. However, Applied properly raised these  
9 arguments in its Reply directly in response to the arguments raised in Demaray’s Opposition.

10 **First bullet point: Demaray’s offer to license the Asserted Patents.** This is not “new.”  
11 Demaray first raised subject-matter jurisdiction in its Opposition, including by submitting Mr.  
12 Demaray’s declaration and asserting that he “never approached Applied about licensing the  
13 Demaray patents.” Opp. at 5. To respond to this evidence, Applied submitted correspondence  
14 with its Reply showing that Mr. Demaray did, in fact, offer to license the Asserted Patents—thus  
15 demonstrating Demaray’s assertion was false. Reply at 2. This evidence is therefore not “new”  
16 because it was submitted in direct response to evidence raised in Demaray’s Opposition.<sup>2</sup>

17 **Second bullet point: The relationship between Applied and its customers.** As  
18 explained, Demaray first raised subject-matter jurisdiction in its Opposition, claiming that the  
19 customer suits are not accusing Applied or Applied’s products, but rather only Samsung and  
20 Intel’s alleged configurations. Opp. at 5–8. Applied properly responded to that argument with  
21 evidence (*e.g.*, declarations) clarifying the reality of the nature of Applied’s supply/manufacturing  
22 relationship with its customers and what products/services are provided to them with respect to  
23 \_\_\_\_\_

24 <sup>2</sup> Demaray also incorrectly asserts that Applied bases subject-matter jurisdiction on Demaray’s  
25 offer to license the Asserted Patents. Not so. The allegations in Demaray’s customer suits  
26 establish jurisdiction. *See* Reply at 3–6. Applied submitted Demaray’s email license offer to  
27 correct the record after Demaray represented to the Court that no offer had been made, *id.* at 2,  
28 although such evidence lends further support to finding jurisdiction, *id.*

1 the reactors utilized by Applied's customers as alleged in the customer suits.<sup>3</sup> Reply at 5. This  
2 evidence was necessary to rebut the new argument in Demaray's Opposition and to establish that  
3 subject-matter jurisdiction exists because Demaray's customer suits necessarily include an  
4 implied assertion of infringement against Applied. *See id.* at 2–6. This evidence is therefore not  
5 new because it addresses the same set of facts supplied in Demaray's Opposition.

6 **Third bullet point: Employment agreement of Mukundan Narasimhan.** This is not  
7 “new.” Applied's Motion, unlike a traditional preliminary injunction motion, is procedural in  
8 nature, and, following Federal Circuit precedent from *Katz v. Lear Siegler, Inc.* 909 F2d 1459  
9 (Fed. Cir. 1990), raises the question of whether this action will resolve “major issues” in  
10 Demaray's customer suits. Applied's Motion does not present merits questions of whether  
11 Applied or Demaray has a “likelihood of success” on the merits. *See Mot.* at 7; Reply at 7.  
12 Therefore, Applied did not have to “prove up” the merits of the underlying claims, but instead  
13 properly referred to the contents of the assignment provisions recited in the Amended Complaint,  
14 including Mr. Narasimhan's assignment provision. Dkt. No. 13 ¶¶ 25, 29, 31, 36, 40, 41.

15 In its Opposition, however, Demaray injected the new argument that the Supreme Court in  
16 *eBay* made “likelihood of success” relevant to all injunctions, even those that are procedural in  
17 nature under *Katz*. *See Opp.* at 10–11, 22–23. Further, Demaray made a lengthy substantive  
18 merits argument as to why the assignment provisions are allegedly unlawful. *Opp.* at 11–14.  
19 While Applied disagrees that the merits should be addressed in its Motion, and believes that  
20 alleging the contents of the assignment provisions is sufficient, Applied submitted an exemplar  
21 agreement with its Reply out of an abundance of caution to respond to the merits arguments in  
22 Demaray's Opposition. Reply at 12. The assignment agreement therefore is not “new” because  
23 the primary provisions were already known (they were alleged in Applied's Amended Complaint)  
24 and because it addresses the same set of facts supplied in Demaray's Opposition.

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 <sup>3</sup> Not surprisingly, Demaray has refused to provide its infringement contentions against Samsung  
27 and Intel to Applied or the Court to assess the veracity of Demaray's claims that the customer  
28 suits are directed to the customers' “alleged configurations.” Ex. C to Lubarsky Decl.

# 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.