

Allison H. Goddard (211098)
ali@pattersonlawgroup.com
PATTERSON LAW GROUP
402 West Broadway, 29th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 398-4760
(619) 756-6991 (facsimile)

*Attorneys for Defendant,
Wi-LAN Inc.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

APPLE INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

WI-LAN INC.,

Defendant.

WI-LAN INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

No. 3:14-cv-2235-DMS-BLM (Lead Case); Consolidated with 3:14-cv-01507-DMS-BLM
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
DEFENDANT WI-LAN INC.'S
MOTION TO STRIKE EXPERT
OPINIONS REGARDING STRICKEN
PRIOR ART REFERENCES AND
UNDISCLOSED INVALIDITY
THEORIES**

**Department: 13A
Judge: Hon. Dana M. Sabraw
Magistrate: Hon. Barbara L. Major**

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

- I. INTRODUCTION.....1
- II. STATEMENT OF RELEVANT FACTS1
- III. ARGUMENT.....4
 - A. Legal Standards for Striking Expert Testimony.....4
 - B. Fuja Report (’757 Patent)5
 - 1. Ericsson with Ericsson IP Traffic5
 - 2. Ericsson with Klayman6
 - C. Hochwald Report (’040 Patent).....7
 - 1. Doshi with Calvignac7
 - 2. GSM with Ermel and Hartmann8
 - 3. Written Description8
 - D. Lanning Report (Bandwidth Patents)9
 - 1. Chuah ’254 with Sau9
 - E. “Background Prior Art”9
- IV. CONCLUSION.....10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

Avago Techs. Gen. IP Pte Ltd. v. Elan Microelecs. Corp.,
 No. C04-05385, 2007 WL 2103896 (N.D. Cal. July 20, 2007),
aff'd, 2007 WL 2433386 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 22, 2007).....4

Bayer Healthcare Pharm., Inc. v. River's Edge Pharm., LLC,
 No. 1:11-cv-1634, 2015 WL 11142427 (N.D. Ga. May 21, 2015).....passim

Chemfree Corp. v. J. Walter, Inc.,
 No. CIV. 1:04-cv-3711, 2008 WL 4845129 (N.D. Ga. Aug. 27,
 2008)5

Elbit Sys. Land & C4I Ltd. v. Hughes Network Sys., LLC,
 No. 2:15-cv-00037, 2017 WL 2651618 (E.D. Tex. June 20, 2017).....4, 6, 8, 10

MediaTek Inc. v. Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.,
 No. 11-CV-5341, 2014 WL 690161 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 21, 2014).....4

O2 Micro Int'l, Ltd. v. Monolithic Power Sys., Inc.,
 467 F. 3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2006)4

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 1026

35 U.S.C. § 112passim

I. INTRODUCTION

On March 2, 2018, this Court ordered Apple's amended invalidity contentions stricken because Apple's late addition of additional prior art references, obviousness combinations, claim charts, and Section 112 defenses would unduly prejudice Wi-LAN. (ECF No. 297 at 3.) Despite the Court's ruling, Apple continues to advance its stricken invalidity theories through the opinions in three of its expert reports. Wi-LAN immediately requested that Apple remove the portions of its expert reports that were subject to the Court's order so that Wi-LAN's experts could clearly respond to Apple's invalidity arguments that remained in the case. Ten days later (and three days before expert rebuttal reports were due), Apple agreed only to withdraw portions of one report addressing only one of the six patents-in-suit. After continued requests from Wi-LAN (and meeting and conferring), Apple eventually agreed to withdraw some additional expert testimony, but these withdrawals are insufficient. Apple's three expert reports still contain invalidity opinions not supported by Apple's June 29, 2017 Invalidity Contentions and which were stricken by the Court's order. Accordingly, Wi-LAN is forced to move the Court to strike the unsupported portions of the experts' opinions.

II. STATEMENT OF RELEVANT FACTS

On June 19, 2014, Apple filed this declaratory judgment action against Wi-LAN. The patents in suit are U.S. Patent No. 8,537,757 (the "757 patent"), U.S. Patent No. 8,311,040 (the "040 patent"), U.S. Patent No. 8,457,145 (the "145 patent"), U.S. Patent No. 8,462,723 (the "723 patent"), U.S. Patent No. 8,462,761 (the "761 patent"), and U.S. Patent No. 8,615,020 (the "020 patent"). On June 29, 2017, Apple served its Invalidity Contentions on Wi-LAN.

1 On January 2, 2018, ten days prior to the close of fact discovery and without
2 asking the Court for leave to amend, Apple served Amended Invalidity
3 Contentions on Wi-LAN, adding 29 newly alleged prior art references, plus new
4 combinations and new Section 112 invalidity theories that were not disclosed in
5 Apple's original invalidity contentions. On January 11, 2018, Wi-LAN moved to
6 strike these amended contentions. Apple admitted that its Amended Invalidity
7 Contentions contained new invalidity theories. (*See* ECF No. 266 at 1–2; ECF No.
8 293.)

9 On February 19, 2018, the parties exchanged expert reports. Apple's expert
10 reports included the report of Dr. Bertrand Hochwald (alleging invalidity of the
11 '040 Patent), the report of Dr. Thomas Fuja (alleging invalidity of the '757 Patent),
12 and the report of Mr. Mark Lanning (alleging invalidity of the four other patents-
13 in-suit, called the "Bandwidth Patents"). All three expert reports relied on prior art
14 references, combinations, and/or Section 112 invalidity theories that were newly
15 disclosed in Apple's improper Amended Invalidity Contentions.

16 In addition, the Lanning report relies on the "MAC Proposal" and
17 "Fiberless" prior art references in its invalidity theories. These two references
18 were not included in either Apple's original or amended contentions, and the Court
19 denied Apple's motion for leave to amend its invalidity contentions to include
20 these references. (ECF No. 302.)

21 On March 2, 2018, the Court granted Wi-LAN's motion to strike Apple's
22 amended invalidity contentions, striking Apple's amended contentions in their
23 entirety as unduly prejudicial to Wi-LAN. (ECF No. 297 at 3.) The Court's Order
24 is clear that "Apple's amendments include[d] at least two new obviousness
25 combinations (Chuah and Sau, Ericsson and Ericsson IP Traffic), twenty two new
26 background references, two new claim charts (UMTS and Carvalho) and
27 amendments to Apple's Section 112 defenses." (*Id.*)

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.