

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,

Plaintiff,

v.

MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC
f/k/a MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 12-1601-LPS

Original Version Filed: March 5, 2021

Public Version Filed: March 11, 2021

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 13-919-LPS

Original Version Filed: March 5, 2021

Public Version Filed: March 11, 2021

**PLAINTIFF'S OPENING BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF ITS
MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Of Counsel:

Seth Ard
Beatrice Franklin
Max Straus
SUSMAN GODFREY, LLP
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
New York, NY 10019
sard@susmangodfrey.com
bfranklin@susmangodfrey.com
mstraus@susmangodfrey.com

SMITH, KATZENSTEIN & JENKINS LLP
Neal C. Belgam (No. 2721)
Eve H. Ormerod (No. 5369)
1000 West Street, Suite 1501
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 652-8400
nbelgam@skjlaw.com
eormerod@skjlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Arendi S.A.R.L.

John Lahad
Ibituroko-Emi Lawson
Burton DeWitt
Robert Travis Korman
Brenda Adimora
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100

Houston, TX 77002-5096
jlahad@susmangodfrey.com
elawson@susmangodfrey.com
bdewitt@susmangodfrey.com
tkorman@susmangodfrey.com
badimora@susmangodfrey.com

Kalpana Srinivasan
1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, CA 90067
ksrinivasan@susmangodfrey.com

Kemper Diehl
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3800
Seattle, WA 98101-3000
kdiehl@susmangodfrey.com

Dated: March 5, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
NATURE AND STAGE OF PROCEEDINGS	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	3
ARGUMENT.....	5
1. IPR Estoppel bars defendants from asserting the invalidity of the asserted claims in view of the following prior art, including in combination.....	6
2. Google and Motorola impermissibly combine multiple references and devices in a single alleged piece of prior art.....	25
A. <i>Defendants’ Apple Data Detector System did not exist.</i>	26
B. <i>Defendants’ LiveDoc System did not exist:</i>	31
C. <i>Defendants’ Selection Recognition Agent did not exist.</i>	32
D. <i>Defendants’ Eudora System did not exist.</i>	34
3. The two demonstrative Apple Data Detector and LiveDoc laptops do not qualify as prior art.....	35
4. Google and Motorola have failed to present any evidence supporting the affirmative defenses of equitable estoppel, waiver, unclean hands, laches, or limitation on damages under 35 U.S.C. § 286.	37
A. <i>35 U.S.C. § 286 does not limit the damages sought by Arendi</i>	37
B. <i>The limitation on damages under 35 U.S.C. § 288 does not apply.</i>	38
C. <i>The record does not support Defendants’ defenses of equitable estoppel, waiver, or unclean hands.</i>	39
D. <i>Motorola’s laches defense does not apply. Arendi does not seek damages from more than six years pre-suit.</i>	39
CONCLUSION	40

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Advanced Display Sys., Inc. v. Kent State Univ.</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	26
<i>Am. Tech. Ceramics Corp. v. Presidio Components, Inc.</i> , No. 14CV6544KAMGRB, 2019 WL 365709 (E.D.N.Y. Jan. 30, 2019)	8, 36
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	4, 6
<i>Bradford Co. v. Jefferson Smurfit Corp.</i> , No. 2000-1511, 2001 WL 35738792 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 31, 2001).....	38
<i>California Inst. of Tech. v. Broadcom Ltd.</i> , No. CV 16-3714-GW(AGRX), 2019 WL 8192255 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 9, 2019), <i>order corrected</i> , No. CV 16-3714-GW, 2019 WL 8807924 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2019)	7
<i>CEATS, Inc. v. Cont'l Airlines, Inc.</i> , 526 F. App'x 966 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	13
<i>Clearlamp, LLC v. LKQ Corp.</i> , No. 12 C 2533, 2016 WL 4734389 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 18, 2016)	6
<i>Cordance Corp. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 631 F. Supp. 2d 484 (D. Del. 2009).....	39
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 251 F.3d 955 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	5
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1, 86 S. Ct. 684, 15 L. Ed. 2d 545 (1966).....	25
<i>HP Inc. v. MPHJ Technology Investments, LLC</i> , 817 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	8
<i>Hyatt v. Boone</i> , 146 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	30
<i>Microchip Tech. Inc. v. Aptiv Servs. US LLC</i> , No. 1:17-CV-01194-JDW, 2020 WL 4335519 (D. Del. July 28, 2020).....	6, 8
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Biscotti, Inc.</i> , 878 F.3d 1052 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	26

Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.,
545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....26

Nextec Applications v. Brookwood Cos.,
703 F. Supp. 2d 390 (S.D.N.Y. 2010)26

Oil-Dri Corp. of Am. v. Nestlé Purina Petcare Co.,
No. 15 C 1067, 2019 WL 861394 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 22, 2019).....7, 8

SAS Institute, Inc. v. Iancu,
138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018).....7, 8

SCA Hygiene Prod. Aktiebolag v. First Quality Baby Prod., LLC,
137 S. Ct. 954 (2017).....40

Scripps Clinic & Rsch. Found. v. Genentech, Inc.,
927 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1991), *overruled on other grounds by Abbott Labs.
v. Sandoz, Inc.*, 566 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....26

Shaw Industries Group, Inc. v. Automated Creel Systems, Inc.,
817 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....8

Studiengesellschaft Kohle, m.b.H. v. Dart Indus., Inc.,
726 F.2d 724 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....26

Wasica Fin. GmbH v. Schrader Int’l, Inc.,
432 F. Supp. 3d 448, 453 (D. Del. 2020).....6, 7, 8

Willis Elec. Co. v. Polygroup Macau Ltd.,
No. 15-CV-3443-WMW-KMM, 2019 WL 5541407 (D. Minn. Oct. 28, 2019)6, 24

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102.....1, 25, 35

35 U.S.C. § 103.....25, 30, 35

35 U.S.C. § 282.....5

35 U.S.C. §§ 285-2883, 4

35 U.S.C. § 286.....3, 37, 38, 40

35 U.S.C. § 288.....3, 38, 39

35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(2).....6, 7

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.