

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 JACOB ANDERSON (Bar No. 265768)
 jacob.anderson@dlapiper.com
 7 DLA PIPER LLP (US)
 401 B Street, Suite 1700
 8 San Diego, California 92101-4297
 Tel: 619.699.2700
 9 Fax: 619.699.2701

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

15 Attorneys for
 16 APPLE INC.

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 18 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

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

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

CASE NO. 3:14-cv-02235-DMS-BLM
 (lead case)

**APPLE INC.'S OBJECTIONS TO
 CERTAIN EXHIBITS TO BE USED
 WITH JIM SKIPPEN AND RELATED
 TESTIMONY**

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

27 AND RELATED
 28 COUNTERCLAIMS

1 In order to avoid disrupting the presentation of evidence at trial with multiple
2 preservation objections, Apple Inc. (“Apple”) respectfully submits for the record
3 the following written objections to certain exhibits Wi-LAN plans to use with its
4 witness James Skippen (PX-108, PX-118, PX-119 and PX-120) and expected
5 testimony by Mr. Skippen. The exhibits at issue are unadjusted license agreements
6 and unadjusted royalty rate sheets. Apple expects Wi-LAN to use these exhibits
7 and testimony to support Wi-LAN’s unapportioned and unadjusted damages claim,
8 which is legally flawed. Therefore, these exhibits and expected testimony should
9 not be admitted for the reasons stated in Apple’s *Daubert* motion briefing and trial
10 brief, and as more prejudicial than probative under Federal Rule of Evidence 403.
11 Dkt. Nos. 333, 373, 433.

12 As stated in Apple’s *Daubert* motion, Wi-LAN’s unapportioned and
13 unadjusted damages theories are contrary to Federal Circuit law. The exhibits and
14 testimony at issue are expected to form the basis for Wi-LAN’s damages claim, yet
15 do not “allow the jury to weigh the economic value of the patented feature against
16 the economic value of the features and services covered by the license agreement.”
17 *DataQuill Ltd. v. High Tech Comput. Corp.*, 887 F. Supp. 2d 999, 1021-25 (S.D.
18 Cal. 2011); *Uniloc USA Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*, 632 F.3d 1292, 1318 (Fed. Cir.
19 2011) (evidence for damages “must be tied to the relevant facts and circumstances
20 of the particular case”); *Whitserve, LLC v. Comput. Packages, Inc.*, 694 F.3d 10, 30
21 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *AVM Techs., LLC v. Intel Corp.*, No. 10-610-RGA, 2013 WL
22 126233, at *3 (D. Del. Jan. 4, 2013) (“a patentee may not argue that prior licenses
23 granting rights to entire portfolios of patents are comparable to a license that the
24 parties would have negotiated for a single asserted patent.”).

25 Wi-LAN cannot use these exhibits and testimony to prop up royalty
26 opinions without “tak[ing] into account the very types of apportionment principles
27 contemplated in *Garretson*.” *Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.*, 773 F.3d 1201,
28 1228 (Fed. Cir. 2014). Without the required adjustments, these exhibits “serve[] no

1 purpose other than to increase the reasonable royalty rate above rates more clearly
2 linked to the economic demand for the claimed technology.” *LaserDynamics, Inc.*
3 *v. Quanta Comput., Inc.*, 694 F.3d 51, 80-81 (Fed. Cir. 2012).

4 Wi-LAN has failed to do what the Federal Circuit requires. Therefore, for
5 the reasons stated above and as set forth in Apple’s *Daubert* briefing (Dkt. Nos.
6 333, 373) and in Apple’s trial brief (Dkt. No 433), Apple respectfully requests that
7 the Court sustain Apple’s objection to Wi-LAN’s use of such unapportioned and
8 unadjusted exhibits and testimony as violating the Federal Circuit’s apportionment
9 requirements and Federal Rule of Evidence 403.

10
11 Dated: July 25, 2018

DLA PIPER LLP (US)

12 By /s/ Sean C. Cunningham

13 JOHN ALLCOCK
14 SEAN C. CUNNINGHAM
15 ERIN GIBSON
16 ROBERT BUERGI
17 ROBERT WILLIAMS
18 TIFFANY MILLER
19 JACOB ANDERSON
20 AMY WALTERS

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
Attorneys for
APPLE INC.

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

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on July 25, 2018, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk’s Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the CM/ECF registrants.

/s/ Sean C. Cunningham
Sean C. Cunningham