

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY
QUALCOMM – OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY – SOURCE CODE**

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

IN RE NEO WIRELESS, LLC
PATENT LITIG.

Case No. 2:22-md-03034-TGB
HON. TERRENCE G. BERG
JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**PLAINTIFF NEO WIRELESS, LLC’S BRIEF IN
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS’ MOTION TO EXCLUDE**

FILED UNDER SEAL

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY
QUALCOMM – OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY – SOURCE CODE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. LEGAL BACKGROUND.....1

II. THE COURT SHOULD DENY DEFENDANTS’ MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE OPINIONS OF MS. HARVEY.3

 A. Background5

 B. Argument.....10

 1. Ms. Harvey Properly Analyzed the Royalty Structure the Contracting Parties Used in Comparable Licenses.10

 2. Ms. Harvey Properly Relies on the Parties’ Negotiations to Further Apportion Comparable Licenses.14

 3. Ms. Harvey’s “Validity Premium” Is Directly Tied to the Facts of the Case.....20

 4. *Ericsson/CSIRO* do not categorically bar consideration of Factor 8, 9, and 10.21

 C. Conclusion.....23

III. THE COURT SHOULD DENY DEFENDANTS’ MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE OPINIONS OF MR. JONES AND DR. MAHON.....23

 A. The General Structure of Neo’s Technical Expert Reports.23

 1. The Mahon Reports24

 2. The Jones Report27

 B. Defendants’ Motion to Exclude Mischaracterizes the Qualified Conclusions in the Jones Report29

 C. Defendants’ Motion to Exclude Mischaracterizes the Basis for the Conclusions in the Mahon Report.....32

 D. Defendants’ Motion Does Not Meet the Legal Standard for Exclusion33

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY
QUALCOMM – OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY – SOURCE CODE

E. Defendants’ Motion Fails to Propose the Scope of Exclusion with Adequate Specificity34

F. Conclusion.....35

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY
QUALCOMM – OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY – SOURCE CODE

STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED

1. Under Rule 702, where an expert’s opinion has “some sort of explanation, the issue . . . should be left to the trier of fact.” *Teenier v. Charter Commc’ns, LLC*, No. 16-CV-13226, 2017 WL 3141051, at *4 (E.D. Mich. July 25, 2017). Given that Neo’s damages expert’s opinion is based on executed license agreements, including their agreed underlying framework, for the asserted patents between Neo and similarly situated parties, should the jury hear Ms. Harvey’s opinions rooted in the specific facts of this case?

Answer: Yes.

2. Under Rule 702, where an expert’s opinion has “some sort of explanation, the issue . . . should be left to the trier of fact.” *Teenier v. Charter Commc’ns, LLC*, No. 16-CV-13226, 2017 WL 3141051, at *4 (E.D. Mich. July 25, 2017). Given Neo’s technical experts’ opinions related to source code are reliable and utilize corroborating evidence and experience, should the jury hear Dr. Mahon’s and Mr. Jones’s opinions on the voluminous source code production they analyzed for this case?

Answer: Yes.

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY
QUALCOMM – OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY – SOURCE CODE**

MOST APPROPRIATE AND CONTROLLING AUTHORITIES

Motion to Exclude the Opinions of Bonnie Harvey

Federal Rule of Evidence 702

EcoFactor, Inc. v. Google LLC, 104 F.4th 243 (Fed. Cir. 2024)

Pavo Solutions LLC v. Kingston Tech. Co., 35 F.4th 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2022)

Vectura Ltd. v. Glaxosmithkline LLC, 981 F.3d 1030 (Fed. Cir. 2020)

Bledsoe v. FCA US LLC, 4:16-cv-14024-TGB-RSW, 2022 WL 4596156
(E.D. Mich. Sept. 30, 2022) (Berg, J.)

Teenier v. Charter Commc 'ns, LLC, No. 16-CV-13226, 2017 WL 3141051
(E.D. Mich. July 25, 2017)

Motion to Exclude the Opinions of Mr. Jones and Dr. Mahon

Federal Rule of Evidence 702

Bledsoe v. FCA US LLC, 4:16-cv-14024-TGB-RSW, 2022 WL 4596156
(E.D. Mich. Sept. 30, 2022) (Berg, J.)

Teenier v. Charter Commc 'ns, LLC, No. 16-CV-13226, 2017 WL 3141051
(E.D. Mich. July 25, 2017)

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.