

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

Attorneys for Defendant  
DEMARAY LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

VS.

DEMARAY LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 5:20-cv-05676-EJD

**DEMARAY LLC'S REPLY  
MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION TO DISMISS**

**Hearing Date:** March 4, 2021

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT .....	1
II. APPLIED’S DECLARATORY JUDGMENT COMPLAINT LACKS SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION .....	3
A. Applied Fails To Show Any Affirmative Act Of Enforcement By Demaray Directed At Applied.....	3
B. Applied Improperly Relies On Extraneous Evidence And Post- Complaint Conduct .....	5
C. Applied’s Grounds For A Case And Controversy Regarding Indirect Infringement Claims Should Be Rejected .....	8
D. The Court Should Decline To Exercise Discretionary Jurisdiction .....	9
III. THE COURT SHOULD DISMISS APPLIED’S DEFENSES BASED ON ITS UNLAWFUL LICENSING PROVISIONS .....	10
A. Applied’s New Unpleaded Theories Do Not Establish A Claim In The FAC For Which Relief Can Be Granted .....	10
B. The Law Is Clear That Applied’s Unlawful Employee Assignment Provisions Are Entirely Void .....	11
C. Applied’s New Argument Regarding The SRA Also Fails To Support A Plausible Claim For Relief.....	13
IV. CONCLUSION .....	14

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****Page(s)****Cases<sup>1</sup>**

<i>Am. Title Ins. Co. v. Lacelaw Corp.</i> , 861 F.2d 224 (9th Cir. 1988).....	13
<i>Applied Materials, Inc. v. Advanced Micro-Fabrication Equip. (Shanghai) Co.</i> , 630 F. Supp. 2d 1084 (N.D. Cal. May 20, 2009) .....	2, 11, 12, 14
<i>Armorlite Lens Co. v. Campbell</i> , 340 F. Supp. 273 (S.D. Cal. 1972) .....	11, 12
<i>Arris Group, Inc. v. British Telecomms. PLC</i> , 639 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	9
<i>Bal Seal Engineering, Inc. v. Nelson Products, Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 11518601 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2016) .....	7
<i>Benitec Australia, Ltd. v. Nucleonics, Inc.</i> , 495 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	2
<i>Bd. of Trs. of Leland Stanford Junior Univ. v. Roche Molecular Sys., Inc.</i> , 583 F.3d 832 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	10, 11
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. OpenTV Inc.</i> , 2013 WL 2285226 (N.D. Cal. May 23, 2013) (Davila, J.) .....	4
<i>DermaFocus LLC v. Ulthera, Inc.</i> , 201 F. Supp. 3d 465 (D. Del. 2016) .....	8
<i>Dolby Labs., Inc. v. Intertrust Techs. Corp.</i> , 2019 WL 5788574 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 6, 2019) .....	5
<i>Garcia v. Healy</i> , 2019 WL 1230439 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 15, 2019) .....	11
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Acceleron LLC</i> , 587 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	1
<i>Innovative Therapies, Inc. v. Kinetic Concepts, Inc.</i> , 599 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	1

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise noted, internal citations, quotations and subsequent history are omitted, and emphasis is added.

	Page(s)
1 <i>Mass Engineered Design, Inc. v. Planar Sys., Inc.</i> ,	
2 426 F. Supp. 3d 680 (D. Or. 2019).....	8
3 <i>MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> ,	
4 549 U.S. 118 (2007) .....	3
5 <i>Microsoft Corp. v. DataTern, Inc.</i> ,	
6 755 F.3d 899 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	passim
7 <i>OGD Equip. Co. v. Overhead Door Corp.</i> ,	
8 2019 WL 5390589 (E.D. Tex. July 15, 2019).....	1
9 <i>Proofpoint, Inc. v. InNova Patent Licensing</i> ,	
10 2011 WL 4915847 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2011).....	9
11 <i>TSMC Tech., Inc. v. Zond, LLC</i> ,	
12 2015 WL 661364 (D. Del. Feb. 13, 2015) .....	5
13 <i>W.L. Gore &amp; Assocs., Inc. v. AGA Med. Corp.</i> ,	
14 2012 WL 924978 (D. Del. Mar. 19, 2012).....	1
15 <i>Whitewater W. Indus., Ltd. v. Alleshouse</i> ,	
16 --- F.3d ---, 2020 WL 6788760 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 19, 2020).....	10, 12
17 <b>Statutes</b>	
18 California Business & Professions Code § 16600 .....	11, 12, 14
19 California Labor Code § 2870.....	10
20 <b>Rules</b>	
21 Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 .....	1, 2, 11
22 <b>Other Authorities</b>	
23 Restatement (Second) of Judgments § 27 .....	13
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

# **I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

Applied's declaratory judgment First Amended Complaint ("FAC") should be entirely dismissed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) for lack of a case and controversy between Demaray and Applied supporting declaratory judgment subject matter jurisdiction. The Texas complaints show that Demaray's focus is on the actual parties, *e.g.*, Intel and Samsung, using the infringing reactor configurations to produce semiconductor products, not equipment suppliers like Applied. *See Microsoft Corp. v. DataTern, Inc.*, 755 F.3d 899, 907 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (no jurisdiction because "DataTern's litigation strategy appears to involve suing software users, not software suppliers"). It is undisputed that the "Demaray patents ... do not cover all PVD reactor configurations" and that the "reactors provided by Applied Materials, Inc. have many configurations unrelated to bias pulsed DC sputtering." *See* Dkt. 23-1 ¶ 12. Further, Applied admits that in the Texas complaints Demaray did not rely on Applied information for several limitations, *e.g.*, the narrow band-rejection filter. *See* Opp. at 4–5. Under the Federal Circuit's reasoning in *DataTern*, the Texas complaints did not create an objective risk that Demaray would sue Applied. *See* 755 F.3d at 905–06 (no jurisdiction where infringement allegations against purchasers did not rely upon supplier documentation for "key claim limitations").

Unable to point to affirmative enforcement acts by Demaray against Applied, Applied relies on its self-servingly alleged subjective "belief" that the Texas complaints "implicitly accused Applied of infringement." *See* Opp. at 5–6, 13. But it is black letter law that "[t]he test [for declaratory judgment jurisdiction in patent cases] ... is *objective* [and] it is the ***objective words and actions of the patentee that are controlling.***" *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Acceleron LLC*, 587 F.3d 1358, 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2009). Applied's self-serving, subjective claims are not part of the analysis. *See Innovative Therapies, Inc. v. Kinetic Concepts, Inc.*, 599 F.3d 1377, 1382 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (subjective belief does not create jurisdiction); *see also OGD Equip. Co. v. Overhead Door Corp.*, 2019 WL 5390589, at \*8 (E.D. Tex. July 15, 2019) (jurisdiction "requires a determination of whether there was an objective possibility of litigation, ***not a subjective belief.***"); *W.L. Gore & Assocs., Inc. v. AGA Med. Corp.*, 2012 WL 924978, at \*6 (D. Del. Mar. 19, 2012) ("***Plaintiff's subjective belief, absent any action taken by Defendant, is insufficient to generate a substantial***

# 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.