

1 JOHN ALLCOCK (Bar No. 98895)
john.allcock@dlapiper.com
2 SEAN C. CUNNINGHAM (Bar No. 174931)
sean.cunningham@dlapiper.com
3 ERIN GIBSON (Bar No. 229305)
erin.gibson@dlapiper.com
4 ROBERT WILLIAMS (Bar No. 246990)
robert.williams@dlapiper.com
5 TIFFANY MILLER (Bar No. 246987)
tiffany.miller@dlapiper.com
6 DLA PIPER LLP (US)
401 B Street, Suite 1700
7 San Diego, California 92101-4297
Tel: 619.699.2700
8 Fax: 619.699.2701

9 ROBERT BUERGI (Bar No. 242910)
robert.buergi@dlapiper.com
10 AMY WALTERS (Bar No. 286022)
amy.walters@dlapiper.com
11 DLA PIPER LLP (US)
2000 University Avenue
12 East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2215
Tel: 650.833.2000
13 Fax: 650.833.2001

14 Attorneys for Plaintiff
APPLE INC.

MARK C. SCARSI (Bar No.
183926)
mscarsi@milbank.com
ASHLEE N. LIN (Bar No.
275267)
anlin@milbank.com
MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY &
MCCLOY LLP
2029 Century Park East, 33rd Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel: 424.386.4000
Fax: 213.629.5063

CHRISTOPHER J. GASPAR
(admitted pro hac vice)
cgaspar@milbank.com
MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY
& MCCLOY LLP
28 Liberty Street
New York, NY 10005
Tel: 212.530.5000
Fax: 212.822.5019

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
17 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

18 APPLE INC.,
19 Plaintiff,
20 v.
21 WI-LAN, INC.,
22 Defendant.

CASE NO. 3:14-cv-2235-DMS-BLM
(lead case);
CASE NO. 3:14-cv-1507-DMS-BLM
(consolidated)

APPLE INC.'S TRIAL BRIEF



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

25 AND RELATED
26 COUNTERCLAIMS

27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

	<u>Page</u>
I. APPLE DOES NOT INFRINGE THE ASSERTED CLAIMS	1
A. Wi-LAN Cannot Establish Direct Infringement of the Asserted Patents.	2
B. Wi-LAN Cannot Establish Induced Infringement of the Asserted Patents.	3
C. Wi-LAN Cannot Establish Willful Infringement of the Asserted Patents.	4
II. WI-LAN’S INFLATED DAMAGES CLAIM IS CONTRARY TO THE LAW AND FACTS.	5
III. OWNERSHIP OF THE ’757 PATENT	5
IV. FORESEEABLE EVIDENTIARY AND PROCEDURAL ISSUES.	6
A. Wi-LAN Does Not Need a Rebuttal Case at Trial.	6
B. Apple’s Pending Objection to the Untimely Declaration of Dr. Madisetti.	6
C. Impact of Summary Judgment Motion Order.	7
1. Apple’s “User” and “Allocation” Defenses.	7
2. Apple’s Defense Based on Multiple Alleged Direct Infringers.	7
3. Wi-LAN’s “Capable of Infringing” Theory.	8
D. Impact of Wi-LAN’s Election of Claims.	10
1. Admissibility of Background Regarding Asserted Patents and Claimed Inventions.	10
2. The Testimony of Wi-LAN’s “Patent Office” Expert Is Irrelevant with Invalidity Out of the Case.	11
3. Apple Should Be Permitted to Reference Wi-LAN’s Decision to Drop Four Asserted Patents.	11
E. Impact of Daubert Motion Order.	11
1. Objection to Wi-LAN’s Anticipated Damages Presentation.	11
2. Dr. Madisetti Should Not Be Permitted to Offer a “Benchmark” Opinion Articulated for the First Time in Wi-LAN’s Daubert Opposition Brief.	14
3. Professor Prince and Mr. Kennedy Should Not Be Permitted to Offer the Apportionment Theory Articulated for the First Time in Wi-LAN’s Daubert Opposition Brief.	14
4. Dr. Madisetti’s Opinions Regarding Apple’s Alleged Intent/Knowledge/Willfulness.	15
F. Apple’s Objection to Untimely Produced and Identified Documents on Wi-LAN’s Exhibit List.	15

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

(continued)

	<u>Page</u>
G. Apple’s Objection to Combined Documents on Wi-LAN’s Exhibit List.....	16
H. Maintenance of Prior Objections and Positions.....	17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

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

Page

CASES

ACCO Brands, Inc., v. ABA Locks Mfrs. Co., Ltd.,
501 F.3d 1307 (2007) 2

Ameranth, Inc. v. Genesis Gaming Sols., Inc.,
No. 11-cv-0189, 2014 WL 12577148 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 4, 2014)..... 9

Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Rec. Prods.,
876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 4

Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Marchon Eyewear, Inc.,
672 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 9

Ball Aerosol and Specialty Container, Inc. v. Limited Brands, Inc.,
555 F.3d 984 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 9

Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Marvell Tech. Grp., Ltd.,
No. 09-cv-290, 2012 WL 5463669 (W.D. Pa. Nov. 7, 2012) 4, 11

Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys.,
135 S. Ct. 1920 (2015) 3

Commonwealth Sci. & Indus. Research Org. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.,
809 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 12

DataQuill Ltd. v. High Tech Comput. Corp.,
887 F. Supp. 2d 999 (S.D. Cal. 2011) 13

Dynacore Holdings Corp. v. U.S. Philips Corp.,
363 F.3d 1263 (Fed. Cir. 2004) 2

Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.,
773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 3, 13

Fujitsu Ltd. v. Netgear Inc.,
620 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2010) 8, 9

Garretson v. Clark,
111 U.S. 120 (1884) 12, 13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(continued)

	<u>Page</u>
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	

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.