

**UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C.
Before the Honorable Dee Lord
Administrative Law Judge**

In the Matter of

CERTAIN SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICES,
SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE PACKAGES,
AND PRODUCTS CONTAINING SAME

Inv. No. 337-TA-1010

**RESPONDENTS' RESPONSE TO TESSERA COMPLAINANTS'
PETITION FOR REVIEW**

PUBLIC VERSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Summary of Response 1

 A. No Domestic Industry Based On Tessera’s Licensing Activities..... 1

 B. The ID Properly Determined That Micron Does Not Have A Domestic Industry In The ‘007 Patent Under Subsections 337(a)(3)(A) And (B)..... 5

 C. The ID Properly Found That GlobalFoundries Does Not Have A Domestic Industry in the ‘136 Patent That Tessera Can Claim As Its Own..... 6

 D. Tessera Failed to Prove Infringement of the Non-tested ‘136 Accused Products .. 7

 E. The ID Correctly Found That ████████ Holds A License To The ‘136 Patent 9

II. The ID Properly Found Tessera Did Not Establish a Substantial Investment in Licensing These Three Patents-in-Suit..... 10

 A. The ID Followed Commission Precedent and Policy In Concluding Tessera Had Failed to Establish Portfolio Licensing as Domestic Industry..... 13

 1. Tessera Presented Methodologies Notably Different From Those of the Precedents it Cites..... 15

 2. Mr. Martinez’s Allocation was Criticized as Arbitrary and Rejected Because It Was Unreliable..... 21

 3. The Record Supports the ID’s Finding that Mr. Martinez’s Allocations were Rendered Unreliable by his EOU Methodology 22

 B. The ID Correctly Assessed the Commission’s “Nexus” Requirement..... 25

 1. The Allocations were Properly Considered as to Nexus 26

 2. Mr. Martinez’s Expert Testimony was Not Reliable 27

 3. Tessera did Not Present Sufficient Evidence on Nexus..... 28

 C. The ID Properly Found Tessera Did Not Establish Substantiality As To Investments in Exploitation of Each Patent Through Licensing 33

 D. The ID Properly Addressed Valuation..... 37

 E. The ID Correctly Found that Mr. Martinez’s Biased Survey Methodology Unreliably Inflated Tessera’s Domestic Industry Claims..... 41

 F. The ID Properly Found Mr. Martinez’s Allocation Was Equally Unavailing As to Direct Expenditures 46

III.	The ID Properly Determined That Micron Did Not Make a Significant Investment In Articles Protected by the ‘007 Patent.....	47
A.	The Commission Should Decline Review Because There Can Be No Violation Of Section 337 With Respect To The ‘007 Patent In Light Of Tessera’s Concession Of Invalidity.....	47
B.	The ID Properly Applied Commission Precedent When Considering Micron’s Investments Relating To Articles Protected By The ‘007 Patent	48
IV.	The ID Properly Determined That Globalfoundries Did Not Have a Domestic Industry in the ‘136 Patent	51
A.	The Evidence Confirms the ID’s Finding that Tessera Failed Its Burden of Establishing GlobalFoundries Is Licensed to the ‘136 Patent	53
1.	Tessera Did Not [REDACTED]	55
2.	Tessera Concedes the [REDACTED] Does Not Expressly Reference the ‘136 Patent or Grant a Broad License.....	55
3.	Tessera Failed to Prove that [REDACTED]	56
4.	IBM Did Not [REDACTED]	63
B.	The ID Properly Determined that GlobalFoundries’ Investment in Manufacturing Products for [REDACTED] Is Insignificant	64
V.	The ID Correctly Found That the Untested Accused Products do not Infringe the ‘136 Patent.....	66
A.	Factual Background	67
B.	The Tested Products Are Not Representative of The Untested Accused Products	71
1.	The ID Applied the Correct Legal Framework for Representative Products	71
C.	There Is No Direct Evidence That The Untested Products Infringe The Asserted Claims	77
1.	Tessera’s Reason No. 1 Is Not Sufficient Basis To Review The ID’s Determination	79
2.	Tessera’s Reason No. 2 Is Not Sufficient Basis To Review The ID’s	



Determination 80

3. Tessera’s Reason No. 3 Is Not Sufficient Basis To Review The ID’s
Determination 80

4. Tessera’s Reason No. 4 Is Not Sufficient Basis To Review The ID’s
Determination 81

5. Tessera’s Reason No. 5 Is Not Sufficient Basis To Review The ID’s
Determination 81

6. Tessera’s Reason No. 6 Is Not Sufficient Basis To Review The ID’s
Determination 82

D. Other Reasons The Untested Accused Products Do Not Infringe 82

VI. The ID Correctly Found That [REDACTED] Holds a License to the ‘136 Patent 83

A. Tessera Failed in Its Discovery Obligations Because It Did Not Identify [REDACTED] as
a Licensee and Failed to Produce Documents Relating to the License 85

B. IBM was Authorized to Grant a Broad License to [REDACTED] 87

C. The License Agreement Went into Effect on [REDACTED], and Remains in Effect
..... 91

D. The License Agreement Authorizes [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Under the ‘136 Patent..... 92

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

AA Sales & Assocs. v. JT&T Prods. Corp.,
No. 98 C 7954, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15429 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 18, 2000).....59

Bazak Int’l Corp. v. Tarrant Apparel Grp.,
378 F. Supp. 2d 377 (S.D.N.Y. 2005).....83

Beloit Corp. v. Valmet Oy,
742 F.2d 1421 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....47

Brennan v. Bally Total Fitness,
153 F. Supp. 2d 408 (S.D.N.Y. 2001).....94

Certain Audio Digital-to-Analog Converters,
Inv. No. 337-TA- 499, 2004 WL 3121325 (Nov. 15, 2004).....37

*Certain Computers & Computer Peripheral Devices, & Components Thereof, &
Prod. Containing Same*, USITC Inv. No. 337-TA-841, 2014 WL 5380098,
Comm’n Op. (Jan. 9, 2014)53

Certain Devices for Mobile Data Comm’n,
Inv. 337-TA-809, Order No. 41, 2012 WL 4829456 (Sep. 6, 2012)53

Certain Dynamic Random Access Memories,
Inv. No. 337-TA-242 Commission Opinion on Violation, Remedy, Bonding,
and Public Interest at 43 (Nov. 5, 1987).....11

Certain Electronic Imaging Devices,
Inv. No. 337-TA-850, 2013 WL 5956227 (Sept. 30, 2013), *rev’d in part on
other grounds*, Comm’n Op. (Apr. 21, 2014).....72

Certain Integrated Circuit Chips and Products Containing Same
Inv. No. 337-TA-859, Comm’n Op. at 36 (Aug. 2014).....50

Certain Male Prophylactic Devices,
Inv. No. 337-TA-546, USITC Pub. 4005, Comm’n Op.50

Certain Optical Waveguide Fibers,
Inv. No. 337-TA-189, Commission Memorandum Opinion (June 19, 1985),
USITC Pub. 1754 (Sept. 1985).....11

Certain Optoelectronic Devices for Fiber Optic Communications,
Inv. No. 337-TA-860, Comm’n Op. at 12-13 (May 9, 2014).....10, 45

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.