

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

MIDWEST ENERGY EMISSIONS CORP.)
and MES INC.,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
v.) C.A. No. 19-1334 (CJB)
)
ARTHUR J. GALLAGHER & CO., et al.,)
)
Defendants.)

CERT DEFENDANTS' BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL

Kenneth L. Dorsney (#3726)
Cortlan S. Hitch (#6720)
MORRIS JAMES LLP
500 Delaware Avenue, Suite 1500
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 888-6800
kdorsney@morrisjames.com
chitch@morrisjames.com

*Attorneys for Defendants
CERT Operations IV LLC,
CERT Operations V LLC,
CERT Operations RCB LLC,
CERT Operations II LLC,
Senescence Energy Products, LLC,
Springhill Resources LLC,
Buffington Partners LLC,
Bascobert (A) Holdings LLC,
Larkwood Energy LLC,
Cottbus Associates LLC,
Marquis Industrial Company, LLC,
Rutledge Products, LLC*

Dated: April 5, 2024

Table of Contents

| | | |
|--------------|--|----|
| I. | Introduction | 1 |
| II. | Legal Standard | 1 |
| III. | A New Trial is Warranted on the Contributory Infringement Verdict Because the Jury Instructions Contained Prejudicial Errors and the Verdict is Against the Clear Weight of the Evidence..... | 1 |
| A. | Instructing the Jury that It Could Only Consider Refined Coal “as Sold and Delivered During the Damages Period” when Evaluating Substantial Non-infringing Uses Was Erroneous and Prejudicial | 1 |
| B. | The Jury’s Verdict of Contributory Infringement Is Against the Clear Weight of the Evidence..... | 3 |
| IV. | A New Trial Is Warranted on the Induced Infringement Verdict Because the Jury Instructions Contained Prejudicial Errors Requiring a New Trial and the Verdict is Against the Clear Weight of the Evidence..... | 4 |
| A. | Failing to Instruct the Jury that CERT Must Actually Encourage Performance of Each Step Was Erroneous and Prejudicial..... | 4 |
| B. | Failing to Instruct the Jury that CERT’s Actions, Rather Than Other Factors, Must Have “Actually Caused” the Power Plants to Perform Each and Every Step Was Erroneous and Prejudicial | 6 |
| C. | The Jury’s Verdict of Induced Infringement Is Against the Clear Weight of the Evidence..... | 6 |
| V. | The Jury’s Verdict of Willfulness Is Against the Clear Weight of the Evidence..... | 8 |
| VI. | Refusing to Instruct the Jury that it Should Disregard Value or Revenue Associated with Section 45 Tax Credits Was Erroneous and Prejudicial | 9 |
| VII. | The Trial Record is Based on Prejudicial Evidentiary Errors Requiring a New Trial. | 10 |
| A. | Permitting Mr. O’Keefe to Testify to Subjects that Were Beyond His Expertise or that Are Not the Subject of Expert Testimony Was Erroneous | 10 |
| B. | The Court Erroneously Permitted Plaintiffs’ Expert Mr. Green to Testify as to a Reasonable Royalty Based on Licenses That Are not Comparable and Were not Properly Apportioned... | 13 |
| C. | The Court Erroneously Allowed Testimony Regarding the Money Received by Jeff Green Over the Life of the Refined Coal Program..... | 15 |
| VIII. | The Jury’s Damages Award Was Against the Clear Weight of the Evidence. | 17 |
| IX. | A New Trial Is Required on Infringement of Claim 2 of the 517 Patent and Consequently on Damages Because the Jury’s Award May Be Based on a Claim That Is Not Infringed..... | 18 |
| X. | Conclusion | 20 |

Table of Authorities

Cases

| | |
|--|---------------|
| <i>Aqua Connect, Inc. v. TeamViewer US, Inc.</i> , C.A. No. 18-1572-MN, 2023 WL 6387791 (D. Del. Sept. 29, 2023) | 19 |
| <i>AVM Techs., LLC v. Intel Corp.</i> , 334 F. Supp. 3d 623 (D. Del. 2018)..... | 3, 7, 8 |
| <i>Bullen v. Chaffinch</i> , 336 F. Supp. 2d 342 (D. Del. 2004)..... | 1 |
| <i>Crowley v. Chait</i> , 322 F. Supp. 2d 530 (D.N.J. 2004)..... | 12 |
| <i>Eko Brands, LLC v. Adrian Rivera Maynez Enterprises, Inc.</i> , 946 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2020)..... | 8 |
| <i>Environmental Manufacturing Solutions, LLC v. Peach State Labs, Inc.</i> , No. 6:09-cv-395-Orl-28DAB, 2011 WL 1262659 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 31, 2011)..... | 2 |
| <i>Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... | 1, 9 |
| <i>Evolved Wireless, LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. CV 15-542-JFB-SRF, 2019 WL 3765926 (D. Del. Aug. 9, 2019)..... | 1, 13, 15, 17 |
| <i>Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.</i> , 563 U.S. 765 (2011)..... | 5 |
| <i>Golden v. U.S.</i> , 955 F.3d 981 (Fed. Cir. 2020)..... | 6 |
| <i>GREE, Inc. v. Supercell Oy</i> , 2020 WL 4288350 (E.D. Tex. 2020)..... | 13 |
| <i>Hodosh v. Block Drug Co., Inc.</i> , 833 F.2d 1575 (Fed. Cir. 1987)..... | 2 |
| <i>HZNP Medicines LLC v. Actavis Lab'ys UT, Inc.</i> , 940 F.3d 680 (Fed. Cir. 2019)..... | 5 |
| <i>In re Bill of Lading Transmission & Processing Sys. Pat. Litig.</i> , 681 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... | 2 |

In re Paoli R.R. Yard PCB Litig.,
35 F.3d 717 (3d Cir.1994)..... 10

IOENGINE, LLC v. PayPal Holdings, Inc.,
607 F. Supp. 3d 464 (D. Del. 2022)..... 14

Island Intellectual Prop. LLC v. Deutsche Bank AG,
2012 WL 526722 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 14, 2012)..... 13

Kia v. Imaging Sciences Intern., Inc.,
CA No. 08–5611, 2010 WL 3431745 (E.D. Pa. Aug. 30, 2010)..... 12

LaserDynamics, Inc. v. Quanta Computer, Inc.,
694 F.3d 51 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 16, 17, 18

Lexmark Int’l., Inc. v. Static Control Components, Inc.,
572 U.S. 118 (2014)..... 6

Microsoft Corp. v. DataTern, Inc.,
755 F.3d 899 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 5, 7

Orbital Eng’g, Inc. v. Buchko,
578 F.Supp.3d 727 (W.D. Pa. 2022)..... 13

Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int’l, Inc.,
904 F.3d 965 (Fed. Cir. 2018)..... 15

Takeda Pharm. U.S.A., Inc. v. West-Ward Pharm. Corp.,
785 F.3d 625 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 7

TC Tech. LLC v. Sprint Corp.,
1:16-CV-00153-RGA, 2019 WL 5295232 (D. Del. Oct. 18, 2019)..... 14

University of Texas Southwestern Med. Center v. Nassar,
570 U.S. 338 (2013)..... 6

Vectura Ltd. v. GlaxoSmithKline LLC,
397 F. Supp. 3d 579 (D. Del. 2019)..... 1

Verizon Servs. Corp. v. Vonage Holdings Corp.,
503 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 19, 20

Vita-Mix v. Basic Holding, Inc.,
581 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 8

Waldorf v. Shuta,
142 F.3d 601 (3d Cir. 1998)..... 10

WesternGeco L.L.C. v. ION Geophysical Corp.,
913 F.3d 1067 (Fed. Cir. 2019)..... 20

Wrinkl, Inc. v. Facebook, Inc.,
No. 20-cv-1345-RGA, 2021 WL 4477022 (D. Del. Sep. 30, 2021)..... 9

Statutes

26 U.S.C. § 45..... 9

35 U.S.C. § 271(c) 3

Rules

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

Fed. R. Evid. 702 10, 14

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.