

Allison H. Goddard (211098)  
ali@pattersonlawgroup.com  
PATTERSON LAW GROUP  
402 West Broadway, 29<sup>th</sup> 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 FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT REGARDING APPLE INC.'S ETSI AND CERTAIN VALIDITY DEFENSES**

**Department: 13A  
Judge: Hon. Dana M. Sabraw  
Magistrate: Hon. Barbara L. Major  
Hearing Date: June 1, 2018  
Hearing Time: 1:30 pm**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1

2 **1. APPLE’S ETSI IPR POLICY DEFENSE** ..... 1

3 **I. BACKGROUND** ..... 4

4 **A. The ETSI IPR Policy** ..... 4

5 **B. Ensemble’s ETSI Membership** ..... 5

6 **C. Wi-LAN’s ETSI Membership** ..... 6

7 **II. LEGAL STANDARD** ..... 6

8 **A. Summary Judgment** ..... 6

9 **B. Affirmative Defenses** ..... 6

10 **III. ARGUMENT** ..... 8

11 **A. Apple Produced No Evidence Ensemble or Wi-LAN Violated the ETSI IPR**

12 **Policy** ..... 8

13 **i. Apple Produced No Evidence Ensemble Violated the ETSI IPR Policy** ..... 8

14 **ii. No evidence exists that Wi-LAN violated the ETSI IPR Policy** ..... 9

15 **iii. Apple’s Evidence of Wi-LAN’s Belief in Essentiality after November 2007**

16 **is Irrelevant** ..... 10

17 **iv. Apple’s evidence of Mr. Stanwood’s LTE participation after he left**

18 **Ensemble is irrelevant** ..... 11

19 **B. Apple’s Estoppel Defenses also Fail because Apple Cannot Show it Relied**

20 **on Wi-LAN’s Conduct** ..... 12

21 **IV. CONCLUSION** ..... 12

22 **2. APPLE’S INVALIDITY DEFENSES** ..... 12

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 **I. STATEMENT OF FACTS** ..... 14

2 **II. LEGAL STANDARDS** ..... 15

3 **III. SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF VALIDITY OF CLAIMS 9 AND 26 OF THE**

4 **'145 PATENT AND CLAIM 1 OF THE '020 PATENT IS APPROPRIATE** ..... 15

5 **A. Claim 9 Of The '145 Patent (Periodic Bandwidth Request Invention)** ..... 15

6 **B. Claim 26 Of The '145 Patent (Multi-Queue Allocation Invention)** ..... 17

7 i. Non-Anticipation ..... 18

8 ii. Non-Obviousness ..... 18

9 **B. Claim 1 Of The '020 (Bandwidth-On-Demand Invention)** ..... 19

10 i. Non-Anticipation ..... 19

11 ii. Non-Obviousness ..... 20

12 **IV. SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF NON-ANTICIPATION AND NON-**

13 **OBVIOUSNESS OF CLAIM 1 OF THE '757 PATENT IS APPROPRIATE** ..... 20

14 **A. Non-Anticipation** ..... 21

15 **B. Non-Obviousness** ..... 21

16 **V. SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF VALIDITY OF CLAIM 1 OF THE '040**

17 **PATENT IS APPROPRIATE** ..... 22

18 **A. Doshi** ..... 22

19 **B. GSM 4.60** ..... 23

20 **VI. CONCLUSION** ..... 24

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Cases**

*Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*,  
477 U.S. 242 (1986)..... 14

*Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.*,  
832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016) ..... *passim*

*Berg v. Kincheloe*,  
794 F.2d 457 (9th Cir. 1986) ..... 6

*Bettcher, Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.*,  
661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011) ..... 16

*Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*,  
477 U.S. 317 (1986)..... 6

*DSS Tech. v. Apple*,  
855 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2018) ..... *passim*

*Glaxo v. Novopharm*,  
52 F.3d 1043 (Fed. Cir. 1995) ..... 16, 17

*Hynix Semiconductor Inc. v Rambus Inc.*,  
441 F. Supp. 2d 1066 (N.D. Cal. 2006)..... 7, 11

*Hynix Semiconductor Inc. v. Rambus Inc.*,  
645 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2011) ..... 7

*K/S HIMPP v. Hear-Wear Techs.*,  
751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014) ..... *passim*

*Karl Storz Endoscopy-Am., Inc. v. Stryker Corp.*,  
No. 14-cv-00876-RS, 2014 WL 12700984 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2014) ..... 6

*In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig.*,  
No. 2:07-ML-1816-C-RGK, 2010 WL 8759119 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 3,  
2010) ..... 7

1 *Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*,  
475 U.S. 574 (1986)..... 6, 9

2  
3 *Microsoft Corp. v. i4i*,  
564 U.S. 2242 (2011)..... 14

4 **Statutes**

5 35 U.S.C. §102..... 15

6  
7 35 U.S.C. §103(a) ..... 15

8 35 U.S.C. §282..... 14

9 **Other Authorities**

10 Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a)..... 6

11 Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)..... 14

12 Federal Rule of Evidence 702..... 2

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

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.