

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.

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

**APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.'S  
OPPOSITION TO DEMARAY LLC'S  
MOTION TO DISMISS**

**Hearing Date: March 4, 2021  
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. BACKGROUND .....	3
A. Demaray’s Customer-Suit Complaints Rely Exclusively on Applied’s Reactors and Product Materials to Support Infringement Allegations .....	3
B. Demaray’s Customer Suits Created a Reasonable Apprehension of Suit Against Applied .....	5
C. Applied’s Declaratory Judgment Action Asserting Non-Infringement based on License .....	7
D. Applied’s Declaratory Judgment Action Asserting Non-Infringement based on Assignment Provisions.....	9
III. ARGUMENT .....	9
A. The Court Has Subject Matter Jurisdiction Over Applied’s Claims.....	9
1. Demaray Asserts a Factual Challenge to Jurisdiction Under Rule 12(b)(1)—Thus Requiring Introduction of Extrinsic Evidence.....	9
2. Standard for Assessing Article III “Case or Controversy” .....	10
3. Demaray’s Customer Suits Establish a Reasonable Potential It Could Bring Direct Infringement Claims Against Applied .....	11
4. Demaray’s Customers Suits Also Establish a Reasonable Potential It Could Bring Inducement and Contributory Claims Against Applied.....	14
5. Demaray’s Offer to License and Refusal to Covenant Not to Suit Applied Further Weighs in Favor of Finding a Controversy .....	15
B. Enjoining the Customer Suits under the Customer-Suit Rule is the Most Efficient and Convenient Way to Resolve All Actions .....	16
C. Demaray’s Motion Under Rule 12(b)(6) Should Be Denied .....	18
D. Applied has Pleaded Sufficient Facts for a Plausible Claim for Relief Based on License .....	19
E. Applied has Pleaded Sufficient Facts for a Plausible Claim for Relief for Non-Infringement based on the Assignment Provisions.....	21
1. A Finding of Non-Infringement based on the Assignment Provisions in this Action Would Not Restrain Trade or Employee Mobility.....	22
2. Roche Confirmed that an Assignment Provision that, as Drafted, Could Reach Post-Termination Inventions Is Not Invalid as to Pre-Termination Inventions .....	23

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
3. There Is an Open Factual Question as to Whether the Named Inventors Conceived of the Invention During Employment and with Applied’s Confidential Information.....	25
IV. CONCLUSION .....	25

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Applied Materials, Inc. v. Advanced Micro-Fabrication Equip. (Shanghai) Co.</i> 630 F. Supp. 2d 1084 (N.D. Cal. May 20, 2009).....	23
<i>Armorlite Lens Co. v. Campbell,</i> 340 F. Supp. 273 (S.D. Cal. 1972).....	24
<i>Arris Group, Inc. v. British Telecomm. PLC,</i> 639 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	13, 14
<i>Bal Seal Eng'g, Inc. v. Nelson Prods.,</i> No. 8:13-cv-1880-JLS-KESx, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 195915 (C.D. Cal. Sep. 8, 2016) .....	15
<i>Bd. of Trs. of the Leland Stanford Junior Univ. v. Roche Molecular Sys.,</i> 583 F.3d 832 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	22, 24
<i>Bd. of Trs. v. Roche Molecular Sys.,</i> 487 F. Supp. 2d 1099 (N.D. Cal. 2007) .....	24
<i>Demaray v. Intel,</i> No. 6:20-cv-634, Dkt. No. 1-3 .....	14
<i>DermaFocus LLC v. Ulthera, Inc.,</i> 201 F. Supp. 3d 465 (D. Del. 2016).....	14
<i>Dolby Labs., Inc. v. Intertrust Techs. Corp.,</i> No. 19-cv-03371-EMC, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 194022 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 6, 2019) .....	13
<i>Edison v. United States,</i> 822 F.3d 510 (9th Cir. 2016).....	10
<i>Hoffmann-La Roche Inc. v. Promega Corp.,</i> No. C-93-1748, 1994 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10174 (N.D. Cal. June 13, 1994).....	15
<i>Kanbar v. O'Melveny &amp; Myers,</i> 849 F. Supp. 2d 902 (N.D. Cal. 2011) .....	18, 19
<i>Mass Eng. Des., Inc. v. Planar Sys.,</i> 426 F. Supp. 3d 680 (D. Or. 2019) .....	15
<i>Max Sound Corp. v. Google, Inc.,</i> 147 F. Supp. 3d 948 (N.D. Cal. 2015) .....	10, 13

1 *MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.*,  
 2 549 U.S. 118 (2007).....10

3 *Microsoft Corp. v. DataTern, Inc.*,  
 4 755 F.3d 899 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....11, 13, 14

5 *Prasco, LLC v. Medicis Pharm. Corp.*,  
 6 537 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....13

7 *Pratt v. Whole Foods Mkt. Cal., Inc.*,  
 8 No. 5:12-cv-05652-EJD, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 46409 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 31,  
 9 2014) .....10

10 *Retail Prop. Trust v. United Bhd. of Carpenters & Joiners of Am.*,  
 11 768 F.3d 938 (9th Cir. 2014).....19

12 *Safe Air For Everyone v. Meyer*,  
 13 373 F.3d 1035 (9th Cir. 2004).....9

14 *Valley View Health Care, Inc. v. Chapman*,  
 15 992 F. Supp. 2d 1016 (E.D. Cal. 2014).....18

16 *Whitewater W. Indus. v. Alleshouse*,  
 17 Nos. 2019-1852, 2019-2323, 2020 U.S. App. LEXIS 36394 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 19,  
 18 2020) ..... *passim*

19 **Other Authorities**

20 Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1).....9, 10

21 Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).....18

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.