ı	1	
1 2 3 4 5 6	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	
8	Attorneys for Defendant DEMARAY LLC	
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
12		
13	APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.,) Case No. 5:20-cv-09341-EJD
14	Plaintiff,) DEMARAY LLC'S OPPOSITION-IN-) PART TO APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.'S
15	VS.) MOTION TO SHORTEN TIME
16	DEMARAY LLC,) FOR AN EARLIER HEARING OR) DETERMINATION ON THE PAPERS ON
17	Defendant.	DEMARAY LLC'S MOTION FOR A SUBSEQUENT CASE MANAGEMENT
18		CONFERENCE (DKT. 108)
19		
20 21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		



Demaray opposes-in-part Applied's motion for an expedited hearing or a determination on the papers ("Motion") (Dkt. 108) on Demaray's Motion for a Subsequent Case Management Conference (Dkt. 92). Applied misstates Demaray's stated position during the meet and confer process in its motion and supporting attorney declaration. During the meet and confer, Demaray told counsel for Applied in writing via e-mail on December 27, 2021: Demaray does not oppose Applied filing a motion to shorten time for a CMC. Demaray's motion is set for hearing in April 2022. As we have stated before, we think that a CMC as soon as the Court's schedule permits would be appropriate. Demaray believes that a CMC is necessary and does not agree that ruling on the papers is appropriate. Counsel for Applied's sworn statement that "Demaray did not oppose Applied's request that the Court decide Demaray's motion on the papers and without oral argument" (Dkt. 108) directly contradicts Demaray's stated position regarding the appropriateness of resolution on the papers and is not accurate. For avoidance of doubt, Demaray opposes-in-part Applied's Motion because, given the complexity of the issues, Demaray believes that hearing from the parties would benefit the Court and the Court should not enter a schedule on the papers.

Demaray agrees that the Court should hold a further CMC as soon as its schedule permits. Last week, the parties submitted a fourth updated Joint CMC Statement (Dkt. 106) setting forth their positions on a number of issues and competing proposed case schedules. The case management issues before the Court are complex, involving not only this matter, but potential coordination of co-pending cases in Texas and four IPRs (two now instituted) that Applied chose to file in the Patent Office, all of which potentially impact an appropriate schedule here. In addition, in the updated Joint CMC Statement, Demaray pointed out that "[i]t is still unclear ... whether affirmative infringement claims against Applied or affirmative invalidity claims by

¹ Counsel for Applied emailed after receiving Demaray's written position purporting to restate and change Demaray's position. Applied relies on their restatement in the Motion as opposed to what Demaray actually said. Demaray's position remains what it said, not Applied's self-serving restatement.



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

Case 5:20-cv-09341-EJD Document 109 Filed 12/28/21 Page 3 of 3

Applied will be at issue in this case." <i>Id.</i> at 4. As Demaray has consistently told this Court, it			
needs targeted discovery on Applied's reactors to make infringement determinations. See Dkt. 27			
at 6-8 (Prior CMC Statement requesting targeted discovery); Dkt. 69 at 3-4 (Updated CMC			
requesting the same), Dkt. 82 at 4-6 (Updated CMC requesting the same). Applied's reactor			
configurations are not publicly available, rendering Demaray presently unable to ascertain specific			
details regarding filters or other protective mechanisms central to its determination of whether			
Applied infringes. To that end, Demaray proposed that Applied "provide targeted product			
disclosures detailing its use of the claimed reactor configurations by December 31 [and]			
[o]nce Applied provides the required details on its products and processes Demaray will timely			
make infringement determinations." Dkt. 106 at 5-6. Demaray also addressed the need to modify			
the default schedule in the Patent Local Rules stating: "it unclear how Applied proposes the parties			
conduct claim construction disclosures before disclosures are made regarding affirmative claims			
for infringement and invalidity—the order of disclosures under the Patent Local Rules." <i>Id.</i> at 19.			
Given the complexity of these issues, De	emaray respectfully requests that the Court, at its		
earliest convenience, either (1) hold a hearing on Demaray's motion for a subsequent CMC or (2)			
simply hold a subsequent CMC.			
Dated: December 28, 2021	Respectfully submitted, IRELL & MANELLA LLP		
	By: /s/ C. Maclain Wells		
	C. Maclain Wells Attorneys for Defendant DEMARAY LLC		
	·		

