

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

MOBILEMEDIA IDEAS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 10-258-SLR

PUBLIC - REDACTED VERSION

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF APPLE INC.'S
MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW AND/OR MOTION FOR NEW
TRIAL PURSUANT TO RULES 50(b) AND 59**

Richard K. Herrmann (# 405)
Mary B. Matterer (# 2696)
MORRIS JAMES LLP
500 Delaware Avenue, Suite 1500
Wilmington, DE 19801-1494
(302) 888-6800
rherrmann@morrisjames.com
mmatterer@morrisjames.com

Luann L. Simmons
Melody Drummond Hansen
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3823
(415) 984-8700
lsimmons@omm.com
mdrummondhansen@omm.com

Joseph J. Mueller
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
(617) 526-6000
joseph.mueller@wilmerhale.com

Tara D. Elliott
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 663-6000
tara.elliott@wilmerhale.com

Attorneys for Defendant Apple Inc.

Dated: October 31, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LEGAL STANDARDS	3
III. THE ASSERTED CLAIMS ARE INVALID AS A MATTER OF LAW	3
A. The Asserted Claims Are Indefinite For Pure Functional Claiming.....	3
B. The Asserted Claims Are Obvious In View Of Prior Art.....	6
1. Applying “Polite Ignore” To Cellular Technology Was Obvious As A Matter Of Law.....	7
2. There Were No Material Factual Disputes Relating To Obviousness	10
C. The Asserted Claims Are Invalid For Lack Of Written Description	11
IV. THE JURY’S INFRINGEMENT FINDING IS NOT SUPPORTED BY SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE	12
A. MMI Failed To Present Sufficient Evidence That Any Accused iPhone Has The Claimed “Alert Sound Generator” Or “Control Means”	13
B. For The iPhone 3G, iPhone 4 GSM, And iPhone 4 CDMA, MMI Failed To Present Sufficient Evidence Of Infringement.....	16
V. THE COURT SHOULD GRANT JMOL OF NO DAMAGES	17
VI. IN THE ALTERNATIVE, APPLE SEEKS AN ALTERATION OF JUDGMENT AND/OR NEW TRIAL UNDER RULE 59	20
VII. CONCLUSION.....	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

<i>Al-Site Corp. v. VSI Int'l., Inc.</i> , 174 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	15
<i>Aristocrat Techs. Austl. PTY Ltd. v. Int'l Game Tech.</i> , 521 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	3, 6
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Group, LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	16
<i>BIC Leisure Prods., Inc. v. Windsurfing Int'l Inc.</i> , 1 F.3d 1214 (Fed.Cir.1993).....	19
<i>Blackboard, Inc. v. Desire2Learn, Inc.</i> , 574 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	4, 5, 6
<i>Cimline, Inc. v. Crafcro, Inc.</i> , 413 Fed. Appx. 240 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	10
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	12, 13, 15, 17
<i>EON Corp. IP Holdings LLC v. AT&T Mobility LLC</i> , 785 F.3d 616 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	6
<i>Frank's Casing Crew & Rental Tools, Inc. v. Weatherford Int'l, Inc.</i> , 389 F.3d 1370, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	2, 12, 15, 16, 17
<i>Function Media, LLC v. Google Inc.</i> , 708 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	5, 6
<i>Greenleaf v. Garlock, Inc.</i> , 174 F.3d 352 (3d Cir. 1999).....	3
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	6, 7, 8, 10, 11
<i>Noah Sys. Inc. v. Intuit Inc.</i> , 675 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	3, 5, 6
<i>Pannu v. Iolab Corp.</i> , 155 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	3
<i>Prometheus Labs., Inc. v. Roxane Labs., Inc.</i> , 805 F.3d 1092 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>R+L Carriers, Inc. v. Qualcomm, Inc.</i> , 801 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	19
<i>Ring & Pinion Serv. Inc. v. ARB Corp. Ltd.</i> , 743 F.3d 831 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	6, 15
<i>Senju Pharm. Co. v. Lupin Ltd. & Lupin Pharm., Inc.</i> , No. CV 11-271-SLR, 2013 WL 4101820 (D. Del. Aug. 9, 2013), <i>aff'd sub</i> <i>nom. Senju Pharm. Co. v. Lupin Ltd.</i> , 780 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	19, 20
<i>Soverain Software LLC v. Newegg Inc.</i> , 705 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	11
<i>Teva Pharm. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	3
<i>Western Union Co. v. MoneyGram Payment Sys., Inc.</i> , 626 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	7, 9
<i>Wyers v. Master Lock Co.</i> , 616 F.3d 1231 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	10
<i>Ziarno v. Am. Nat'l Red Cross</i> , 55 Fed. Appx. 553 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	11
 <u>STATUTES</u>	
35 U.S.C. § 252.....	19
35 U.S.C. § 307.....	19
35 U.S.C. §112.....	2, 4, 5, 15

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendant Apple Inc. renews its Rule 50 motion for judgment as a matter of law (“JMOL”) that claims 12 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. RE 39,231 (the “231 Patent”) asserted by Plaintiff MobileMedia Ideas, LLC (“MMI”) are invalid and not infringed.

JMOL of invalidity is appropriate for at least three reasons. First, the asserted claims are *indefinite* because they claim functions without disclosing sufficient corresponding structure. For example, regarding the means-plus-function limitation “alert sound generator for generating the alert sound,” MMI’s expert testified that the only disclosed structure for performing this function was a box, “alert sound generator 13,” and admitted that the patent “tells us nothing about what’s inside the box.” Trial Tr. at 449:11-21, 1066:13-18. Failures to disclose sufficient structure for this and another limitation render the asserted claims indefinite as a matter of law.

Second, Apple presented clear and convincing evidence that the asserted claims are *obvious*—the claimed invention is the application of a concededly known technique (what MMI called “polite ignore”) to an existing technology (cell phones) ready for the alleged improvement. MMI was forced to characterize the invention as applying specifically to the cellular context—notwithstanding that the patent itself broadly characterized the alleged invention as applying to landlines, cordless phones, *and* cell phones—in light of the clear and convincing trial evidence that others conceived of the general concept of “polite ignore” first. MMI presented no evidence of secondary indicia of non-obviousness of the cellular application of “polite ignore,” but instead relied on conclusory expert testimony in conflict with the evidence and law. Moreover, the lack of any nonobvious advance is further confirmed by the absence of any written description of special techniques for adapting “polite ignore” to the cellular context.

Third, the asserted claims are invalid because they fail to satisfy the *written description*

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.