Case 3:14-cv-02235-DMS-BLM Document 386 Filed 06/01/18 PageID.20731 Page 1 of 4



Wi-LAN responds to Apple's objections to the declaration of Wi-LAN's infringement expert, Dr. Vijay Madisetti, that Wi-LAN attached to its opposition of Apple's summary judgment motion. (ECF No. 380.) Apple objects to certain portions of Dr. Madisetti's declaration as purportedly offering "new" opinions. Wi-LAN respectfully disagrees.

Dr. Madisetti's declaration is fully consistent with the opinions Dr. Madisetti provided in his expert report and at deposition. Dr. Madisetti's declaration responds to Apple's motion for summary judgment to correct a number of inaccurate statements about his infringement opinions. For example, Apple incorrectly argued that Dr. Madisetti admitted certain claimed functionality was not present on the accused iPhones as sold. Wi-LAN's opposition corrected Apple's statements by citing to Dr. Madisetti's report, his deposition testimony, Apple documents, as well as Dr. Madisetti's declaration. *See*, *e.g.*, (ECF No. 358) (Wi-LAN Opp.) at 11, n. 6; 12, n. 8; 14.

Moreover, Apple's summary judgment motion is largely based on new theories that Apple raises for the first time on summary judgment. For example, Apple presented an indefiniteness argument not raised in its expert reports. (ECF No. 330 at 7.) Apple also presents a new non-infringement theory that bandwidth must be allocated to individual iPhone apps (as opposed to connections), which Apple did not raise in its expert reports or its interrogatory responses setting forth Apple's non-infringement theories. (ECF No. 330 at 5-8). Even if Apple could show Dr. Madisetti presented any new theory, which it does not, Apple's objection should be denied in light of Apple's new arguments as well as the public policy reasons favoring deciding matters on the merits. *DR Sys. v. Eastman Kodak Co.*, 08-CV-669-H (BLM), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 104080, *37-40 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 9, 2009) (denying motion to strike declaration submitted with summary judgment briefing alleged to contain "entirely new opinions" and stating "public policy reasons weigh in favor of deciding the matter on the merits").

Dated: June 1, 2018 Respectfully submitted, 1 2 3 /s/ Allison Goddard By: 4 Allison H. Goddard (211098) ali@pattersonlawgroup.com 5 PATTERSON LAW GROUP 402 West Broadway, 29th Floor San Diego, CA 92101 6 (619) 398-4760 7 (619) 756-6991 (facsimile) 8 Robert Cote rcote@mckoolsmith.com 9 Brett Cooper bcooper@mckoolsmith.com 10 Kevin Schubert kschubert@mckoolsmith.com 11 Christopher McNett (298893) cmcnett@mckoolsmith.com 12 McKOOL SMITH, P.C. One Bryant Park, 47th Floor 13 New York, NY 10036 (212) 402-9400 14 (212) 402-9444 (facsimile) 15 Seth Hasenour shasenour@mckoolsmith.com 16 MCKOOL SMITH, P.C. 300 W. 6th Street, Suite 1700 Austin, TX 78701 17 (512) 692-8700 18 (512) 692-8744 (facsimile) 19 Attorneys for Defendant, Wi-LAN Inc. 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27



PROOF OF SERVICE I hereby certify that on June 1, 2018, I caused a copy of this pleading to be delivered via CM/ECF on the counsel of record. Dated: June 1, 2018 By: /s/ Allison Goddard 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.

