

**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-MPT

**OPENING BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF APPLE INC.'S RENEWED MOTION FOR
JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW AND MOTION FOR A NEW TRIAL**

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

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

Attorneys for Defendant Apple Inc.

Dated: January 28, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. BACKGROUND 1

II. LEGAL STANDARDS 2

III. THE '075 PATENT 2

 A. GSM 04.83 And GSM 04.08 Render The Claims Obvious..... 3

 B. The '068 Patent Combined With GSM 04.83 And 04.08 Render The Claims Obvious..... 7

 C. MMI Presented No Evidence iPhones Release Calls As Accused Or That The Accused DISCONNECT Message Meets All Claim Elements..... 7

 1. MMI Presented No Evidence That Any iPhones Has Ever Released A Second Call As Described In The Accused GSM “Abnormal Case.” 8

 2. MMI Presented No Evidence That The Accused DISCONNECT Message Contains “An Information Element That Indicates That The Wireless System Is To Immediately Release The Incoming Call.” 9

IV. THE '068 PATENT 10

 A. Bayless Discloses All Limitations, Including Claim 23’s “Only A Single” Predetermined Selection Operation. 11

 B. It Is Undisputed That Bayless Discloses All Limitations Of Claim 24. 14

 C. MMI Presented No Evidence That Apple Performs Each Step Or That The “Predetermined Selection Operation” And “Selecting And Determining” Limitations Are Met..... 14

 1. The Asserted Claims Require Steps Performed “By The User,” And MMI Produced No Evidence That Apple Performed These Steps..... 14

 2. MMI Presented No Evidence That The iPhone Displays Call Handling Options In Response To A “Predetermined Selection Operation.” 15

 3. MMI Presented No Evidence That The iPhone Allows “Selecting And Determining” By The User. 18

V. THE '078 PATENT 18

 A. MMI’s Infringement Case Is Based On A New And Unsupported Claim Construction Argument..... 19

 1. MMI’s Original Infringement Theory Was Disproved At Trial. 19

 2. MMI’s New Theory Was Wrong And Prejudicial..... 20

 B. Kyocera Discloses All Limitations Of Claim 73. 22

C.	Kyocera and Lucent Together Render Obvious Claim 73.....	25
1.	Kyocera And Lucent Disclose All Elements Of Claim 73.	25
2.	Clear And Convincing Evidence Demonstrates It Would Have Been Obvious To Combine Kyocera With Lucent.	26
VI.	A NEW TRIAL IS REQUIRED.....	28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<u>CASES</u>	
<i>Acumed LLC v. Advanced Surgical Servs., Inc.</i> , 561 F.3d 199 (3d Cir. 2009).....	2
<i>Becton Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Group LP</i> , No. 02-1694, 2006 WL 890995 (D. Del. Mar. 31, 2006)	30
<i>Belden Techs., Inc. v. Superior Essex Communs. LP</i> , 802 F. Supp. 2d 555 (D. Del. 2011)	6, 24, 25, 30
<i>Blackboard, Inc. v. Desire2Learn, Inc.</i> , 574 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	13
<i>Greenleaf v. Garlock, Inc.</i> , 174 F.3d 352 (3d Cir. 1999).....	2
<i>In re Androgel Antitrust Litig. (No. II)</i> , No. 09-2084, 2012 WL 5352986 (N.D. Ga. Oct. 30, 2012).....	29
<i>In re GPAC Inc.</i> , 57 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	5, 30
<i>In re Shepard</i> , 50 C.C.P.A. 1439 (CCPA 1963)	14
<i>Integra Lifesciences I, Ltd. v. Merck KGaA</i> , 496 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	6, 7, 24
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	5, 27
<i>Lab. Skin Care, Inc. v. Ltd. Brands, Inc.</i> , 757 F. Supp. 2d 431 (D. Del. 2010)	29
<i>Lotus Dev. Corp. v. Paperback Software Int’l</i> , 740 F. Supp. 37 (D. Mass. 1990)	13
<i>Lucent Techs, Inc. v. Extreme Networks, Inc.</i> , 231 F.R.D. 453 (D. Del. 2005).....	29
<i>MFS, Inc. v. Dilazaro</i> , 771 F. Supp. 2d 382 (E.D. Pa. 2011)	2

Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Ltd. P’ship,
131 S. Ct. 2238 (2011) 29

Mirror Worlds, LLC v. Apple, Inc.,
784 F. Supp. 2d 703 (E.D. Tex. 2011), *aff’d* 692 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 15

Norian Corp. v. Stryker Corp.,
363 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 29

Northview Motors, Inc. v. Chrysler Motors Corp.,
227 F.3d 78 (3d Cir. 2000)..... 2

O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.,
521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 17, 19

Pannu v. Iolab Corp.,
155 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 1998)..... 2, 22

Perkin–Elmer Corp. v. Computervision Corp.,
732 F.2d 888 (Fed. Cir. 1984)..... 2

PharmaStem Therapeutics, Inc. v. Viacell, Inc.,
491 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 8

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 21

Ricoh Co, Ltd. v. Quanta Computer Inc.,
550 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 15

Soverain Software LLC v. Newegg Inc.,
No. 11-1009, 2013 WL 216406 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 22, 2013) 1

Union Carbide Corp. v. Am. Can Co.,
724 F.2d 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1984)..... 5

Voter Verified, Inc. v. Premier Election Solutions, Inc.,
698 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 15

Wyers v. Master Lock Co.,
616 F.3d 1231 (Fed Cir. 2010)..... 2, 6, 27

RULES

Fed. R. Civ. P. 59 1, 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.