UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

IN RE NEO WIRELESS, LLC PATENT LITIG.

Case No. 2:22-md-03034-TGB

Hon. Terrence G. Berg

DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF NEO'S LICENSING NEGOTIATIONS WITH AVANCI



CONCISE STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED

1. Should plaintiff Neo Wireless LLC ("Neo") be compelled to produce its patent licensing negotiations with third-party Avanci, LLC ("Avanci") where:

- Avanci is the world's largest automotive OEM patent licensing entity for 4G/LTE cellular patents, and Neo is asserting its patents against the Defendant automotive OEM's 4G/LTE cellular technology;
- Each Defendant is a licensee of Avanci;
- Neo admitted in an interrogatory response that it was negotiating with Avanci to secure a patent license that would cover each of the asserted patents, each of the Defendants, and the alleged infringement asserted in this case;
- Avanci permitted at least one Defendant (Ford) to produce in discovery its patent license negotiations with Avanci; and
- Neo seeks damages in the form of a "reasonable royalty" under 35 U.S.C.
 §284 and the Federal Circuit has held that a patentee's negotiations to license its asserted patents are squarely relevant to the reasonable royalty determination.

Defendants' answer: Yes.

CONCURRENCE PURSUANT TO L.R. 7.1(a)

Pursuant to L.R. 7.1(a), the parties met-and-conferred on numerous occasions regarding the relief sought in this Motion. The Court held a Status Conference on September 13, 2023 to discuss the parties' discovery dispute, and authorized the Defendants to file this Motion.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

CON	CISE S	STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED	i
CON	CURR	ENCE PURSUANT TO L.R. 7.1(a)	i
TAB	LE OF	AUTHORITIES	iii
I.	INTRODUCTION		
II.	BACKGROUND		
	A.	Summary of Neo's Patent Infringement Claims	1
	B.	The Avanci 4G/LTE Patent Pool	2
	C.	Defendants' Requests for Neo's Licensing Negotiations	3
	D.	The Present Discovery Dispute Regarding Avanci	4
III.	ARGUMENT		5
	A.	The "claim charts/analyses" exchanged between Neo and Avanci	5
	В.	Neo's communications with Avanci about a "group resolution of this litigation" are relevant and are not privileged	10
IV	CON	CLUSION	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

R F. 408
Rules
hought, Inc. v. Oracle Corp., No. 12-CV-05601, 2014 WL 3940294 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 11, 2014)
embrandt Pat. Innovations, LLC v. Apple Inc, No. C 14-05093, 2016 WL 427363 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 4, 2016)
hoenix Sols. Inc. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., 254 F.R.D. 568 (N.D. Cal. 2008)
re Smirman, 267 F.R.D. 221 (E.D. Mich. 2010) (Zatkoff, J.)
frate v. Warner Norcross & Judd, LLP, 335 F.R.D. 378 (E.D. Mich. 2020)
igh Point Sarl v. Sprint Nextel Corp., No. 09-2269-CM-DJW, 2012 WL 1533213 (D. Kan. Apr. 30, 2012) 8
eorgia-Pacific Corp. v. U.S. Plywood Corp., 318 F. Supp. 1116 (S.D.N.Y.1970)2, 7
ricsson, Inc. v. D-Link Systems, Inc., 773 F. 3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014)7



I. INTRODUCTION

The Avanci patent license is highly relevant to this case and reflects a "reasonable royalty." (*See* ECF No. 175, PageID.11061.) Defendants seek relevant evidence Neo is withholding regarding (i) Avanci's determination as to whether Neo's asserted patents cover the 4G/LTE cellular "standards" Neo relies on to allege infringement in this case, and (ii) Avanci's determination of Neo's share of the Avanci license fee that is attributable to the asserted patents. Neo *admits* its negotiation with Avanci was directed to the asserted patents and the Defendants, all of whom are Avanci licensees. Neo's "privilege" objection to disclosing this highly relevant factual information is factually unsupported, contrary to the law, and should be overruled. For the reasons detailed below, the Court should compel Neo to produce the materials exchanged with Avanci in licensing negotiations.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Summary of Neo's Patent Infringement Claims

Neo asserts that Defendants infringe six U.S. patents through the inclusion of "4G/LTE" cellular modem devices in Defendants' vehicles. The asserted patents make no reference to vehicles or automotive technology. Rather, they are directed exclusively to low-level features operating, if at all, inside of a cellular "modem" chipset supplied to the Defendants for incorporation in their vehicles. The term "4G/LTE" refers to published "standards" that manufacturers of cellular modem



DOCKET

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.

