

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No. 1:22-cv-22706-RNS

BELL NORTHERN RESEARCH, LLC,

Plaintiff

v.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

HMD AMERICA, INC.; HMD GLOBAL OY;
SHENZHEN CHINO-E COMMUNICATION
CO., LTD.; HON HAI PRECISION
INDUSTRY CO., LTD.; TINNO MOBILE
TECHNOLOGY CORP.; SHENZHEN
TINNO MOBILE CO., LTD.; TINNO USA,
INC.; UNISOC TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.;
SPREADTRUM COMMUNICATIONS USA,
INC.; WINGTECH TECHNOLOGY CO.;
LTD.; WINGTECH INTERNATIONAL,
INC.; BEST BUY CO., INC.; BEST BUY
STORES L.P.; TARGET CORP.; WALMART
INC.

Defendants.

**PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT UNISOC TECHNOLOGIES CO.
LTD.'S MOTION TO DISMISS AND INCORPORATED MEMORANDUM OF LAW**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. INTRODUCTION 1**
- II. LEGAL STANDARDS..... 1**
 - A. Personal Jurisdiction 1
 - B. Rule 8 Pleading Standard 2
- III. ARGUMENT 3**
 - A. This Court Has Specific Personal Jurisdiction Over Unisoc..... 3
 - B. This Court Has Jurisdiction Under Rule 4(k)(2)..... 7
 - C. Defendant’s Arguments Alleging Inadequate Pleading Also Fail 7
 - D. Defendant’s Cases Are Distinguishable..... 8
- IV. CONCLUSION 13**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

AFTG-TG, LLC v. Nuvoton Tech. Corp.,
689 F.3d 1358, (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 10, 11

Alpha Tech. U.S.A. Corp. v. MLSNA Dairy Supply, Inc.,
No. 6:13-cv-1062-Orl-37TBS, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 167884 (M.D. Fla. Nov. 26, 2013)... 10,
11, 12

Asahi Metal Indus. Co. v. Superior Court,
480 U.S. 102 (1987)..... 12

Ashcroft v. Iqbal,
556 U.S. 662 (2009)..... 2, 12, 15

Atmos Nation, LLC v. BnB Enter., LLC,
No. 0:16-cv-62083-CIV, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 135129 (S.D. Fla. Aug. 22, 2017)..... 16

Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly,
550 U.S. 544 (2007)..... 2, 4, 14, 15

Berry v. Budget Rent A Car Sys., Inc.,
497 F. Supp. 2d 1361 (S.D. Fla. 2007). 9

Carmouche v. Tamborlee Mgmt.,
789 F.3d 1201 (11th Cir. 2015). 13

Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.,
575 U.S. 632 (2015)..... 15

Conformis, Inc. v. Zimmer Biomet Holdings, Inc.,
No. 1:19-cv-21499, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 99343 (D. Del. June 3, 2022). 15

Conley v. Gibson,
355 U.S. 41 (1957)..... 2

CTP Innovations, LLC v. Solo Printing, Inc.,
No. 1:14-cv-21499, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 190232 (S.D. Fla. July 15, 2014). 16

Daimler AG v. Bauman,
571 U.S. 117 (2014)..... 12

Elecs. For Imaging, Inc. v. Coyle,
340 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 1, 2

Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.,
563 U.S. 754 (2011)..... 16

Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.,
579 U.S. 93 (2016)..... 16

In re Takata Airbag Prods. Liab. Litig.,
396 F. Supp. 3d 1101 (S.D. Fla. 2019). 14

In re Zantac (Ranitidine) Prods. Liab. Litig.,
Nos. 2924; 20-MD-2924, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 220610 (S.D. Fla. Nov. 24, 2020)..... 14

Int’l Shoe Co. v. Wash.,
326 U.S. 310 (1945)..... 13

K-Tech Telecomms., Inc. v. Time Warner Cable, Inc.,
714 F.3d 1277 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 3

McZeal v. Sprint Nextel Corp.,
501 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 3, 10

MEMC Elec. Materials, Inc. v. Mitsubishi Materials Silicon Corp.,
420 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 4

N. Am. Philips Corp. Am. Vending Sales, Inc.,
3 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1994)..... 8

Phonometrics, Inc. v. Hospitality Franchise Sys., Inc.,
203 F.3d 790 (Fed. Cir. 2000)..... 3, 10

Starr v. Baca,
652 F.3d 1202 (9th Cir. 2011) 3

Touchcom, Inc. v. Bereskin & Parr,
574 F.3d 1403 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 9

United Techs. Corp. v. Mazer,
556 F.3d 1260 (11th Cir. 2009), 13

Viavi Sols. Inc. v. Zhejiang Crystal-Optech Co. Ltd.,
No. 2:21-CV-00378-JRG, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 205106 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 10, 2022)..... 7, 8

World-Wide Volkswagen v. Woodson,
444 U.S. 286 (1980)..... 5, 13

Zanakis v. Scanreco, Inc.,
No. 18-cv-21813-UU, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89210 (S.D. Fla. Feb. 5, 2019). 14

Plaintiff Bell Northern Research, LLC (“Plaintiff” or “BNR”) submits this brief in opposition to the motion to dismiss filed by Defendants Spreadtrum Communications USA, Inc. (“Defendant” or “Spreadtrum”) and Unisoc Technologies Co., Ltd. (“Defendant” or “Unisoc”). (Dkt. 91.) Contemporaneously with the filing of this opposition paper, Plaintiff is filing an unopposed motion to dismiss Spreadtrum from this action, without prejudice. Thus, this brief is only directed to Unisoc’s arguments for dismissal of the action against it.¹

I. INTRODUCTION

Unisoc’s motion to dismiss is fundamentally flawed and should be rejected. The motion rests on an inconclusive declaration and a faulty analysis of personal jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(2). Unisoc also neglects Rule 4(k)(2) in its entirety, which provides a further basis for this Court to exercise personal jurisdiction over it. Moreover, Unisoc’s Rule 12(b)(6) arguments for dismissal of Plaintiff’s infringement claims do not properly address the pleading requirements in patent cases like this one under Rule 8, which BNR has fully satisfied.

Unisoc should not be dismissed from this action as a party. Nor should Plaintiff’s claims for patent infringement against Unisoc be dismissed. There is no basis for any of the relief sought in Unisoc’s motion.

II. LEGAL STANDARDS

A. Personal Jurisdiction

Federal Circuit law governs the issue of whether a court has personal jurisdiction over a defendant in a patent infringement case. *Elecs. For Imaging, Inc. v. Coyle*, 340 F.3d 1344, 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (holding plaintiff established a prima facie case of specific personal jurisdiction

¹ Defendant Hon Hai Precision Industry Co. Ltd (“Hon Hai”) separately filed its own motion to dismiss (Dkt. 78) on the same date as the motion of Unisoc and Spreadtrum. As with Spreadtrum, Plaintiff is filing contemporaneously with this paper an unopposed motion to dismiss Hon Hai from this action, also without prejudice.

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.