

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

IN RE: NEO WIRELESS, LLC,  
PATENT LITIGATION

Case No. 2:22-MD-03034-TGB  
HON. TERRENCE G. BERG

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION TO STRIKE OR EXCLUDE CERTAIN PORTIONS OF THE  
TESTIMONY OF DEFENDANTS' EXPERTS**



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. NEO’S MOTION TO STRIKE DEFENDANTS’ EXPERT’S OBVIOUSNESS ANALYSIS HAS ALREADY BEEN DECIDED IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANTS AND SHOULD BE DENIED. .... 1

    A. The Court Should Deny the Motion to Strike As An Attack on the Court’s Prior Ruling on the Same Issue. .... 1

    B. The Background References Are Properly Used to Show a POSITA’s Understanding of the State of the Art. .... 2

    C. Neo’s Criticisms of the Background References Are Inapposite. .... 6

    D. Neo’s Claims of Jury Confusion Are Overblown and Striking the Background References Will Prejudice Defendants. .... 8

II. THE COURT SHOULD NOT EXCLUDE NEO’S DISCUSSIONS WITH AVANCI FROM CONSIDERATION ON DAMAGES ISSUES. .... 9

    A. Neo’s Discussions with Avanci Are Not Subject to Rule 408. .... 10

    B. The Avanci Settlement Discussions are Highly Probative and Not Unduly Prejudicial Under Rule 403. .... 13

III. DR. MAYO’S PROPERLY AND COMPLETELY IDENTIFIED AND DISCLOSED THE SOURCE CODE HE ANALYZED. .... 15

    A. Legal Standard. .... 16

    B. The Mayo Report Identifies All Cited Source Code With Particularity. .... 17

    C. Neo’s Motion Identifies No Prejudice, and None Exists. .... 20

    D. Dr. Mayo Properly Provided Additional Identification of Printouts When [REDACTED] Provided Them. .... 23

IV. UNENFORCEABILITY ..... 25

    A. Defendants’ Experts Properly Rely on the *Adaptix* Litigation. .... 25

    B. The Court’s Order is Clear Defendants Can Rely on Project Angel to Support their Unenforceability Defenses. .... 30

    C. Defendants’ Experts’ Opinions are Reliable. .... 31

V. CONCLUSION..... 33

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**CONTROLLING OR MOST APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY**

<b>CASES</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
<i>Adaptix, Inc. v. Apple, Inc. et al</i> , Civ. No. 5:13-cv-01776 (N.D. Cal.) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , No. 2:15-CV-1455-WCB, 2017 WL 11807449 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 3, 2017) .....	6
<i>American Calcar, Inc. v. Am. Honda Motor Co., Inc.</i> , 768 F.3d 1185 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	32
<i>ASUS Computer Int'l v. Round Rock Rsch., LLC</i> , No. 12-cv-02099 JST (NC), 2014 WL 1463609 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 11, 2014) .....	6
<i>Babcock Power, Inc. v. Kapsalis</i> , 854 F. App'x 1 (6th Cir. 2021).....	27
<i>Baumel v. Barber Power L. Grp.</i> , No. 322CV00170, 2023 WL 6121001 (W.D. N.C. Sept. 18, 2023) .....	26
<i>Better Mouse Co. v. SteelSeries ApS</i> , No. 2:14-CV-198-RSP, 2016 WL 3611560 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 5, 2016) .....	8
<i>C.f. LaserDynamics, Inc. v. Quanta Computer, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 51 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	14
<i>In re Cole v. Patton</i> , No: 6:19-cv-699-Orl-40, 2019 WL 3413525 (M.D. Fla. Jul. 29, 2019) .....	27
<i>ContentGuard Holdings, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , No. 2:13-cv-1112, 2015 WL 4944514 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 19, 2015) .....	8

**CONTROLLING OR MOST APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY**

	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
<i>Deere &amp; Co. v. Int'l Harvester Co.</i> , 710 F.2d 1551 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .....	10, 12
<i>Eggerson v. U.S.</i> , No. 1:5-cv-594, 2006 WL 1720252 (W.D. Mich. 2006).....	27
<i>Engebretsen v. Fairchild Aircraft Corp.</i> , 21 F.3d 721 (6th Cir. 1994) .....	28
<i>Entropic Commc'ns, LLC v. Charter Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , No. 2:22-CV-00125-JRG, 2023 WL 8437839 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 5, 2023) .....	8
<i>EQT Prod. Co. v. Magnum Hunter Prod., Inc.</i> , 768 F. App'x 459 (6th Cir. 2019) .....	24
<i>Ford Motor Co. v. InterMotive, Inc.</i> , No. 4:17-CV-11584-TGB, 2022 WL 4596306 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 30, 2022) .....	27
<i>In re Homestore.com, Inc.</i> , CV 01-11115 RSWL (CWx), 2011 WL 291176 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 25, 2011) .....	25
<i>Howe v. City of Akron</i> , 801 F.3d 718 (6th Cir. 2015) .....	16
<i>Innovention Toys, LLC v. MGA Ent., Inc.</i> , No. 07-6510, 2012 WL 5398476 (E.D. La. Nov. 4, 2012).....	8
<i>Killion v. KeHE Distributors, LLC</i> , 761 F.3d 574 (6th Cir. 2014) .....	29
<i>Kumho Tire Co., Ltd. v. Carmichael</i> , 526 U.S. 137 (1999).....	29

[REDACTED]

**CONTROLLING OR MOST APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY**

	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
<i>Magna Mirrors v. Samvardhana Motherson</i> , No. 1:17-cv-00077-JMB-PJG, Dkt. 661, (W.D. Mich. Nov. 30, 2022) .....	9
<i>Master-Halco, Inc. v. Scillia, Dowling &amp; Natarelli, LLC</i> , 739 F.Supp.2d 125 (D. Conn. 2010).....	11
<i>In re MSTG, Inc.</i> , 675 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	13
<i>Netscape Commc's Corp. v. ValueClick, Inc.</i> , 707 F. Supp. 2d 640 (E.D. Va. 2010) .....	6
<i>Putnam v. Henkel Consumer Adhesives, Inc.</i> , No. 1:05-cv-02011, 2007 WL 4794115 (N.D. Ga. Oct. 29, 2007).....	11
<i>Randall Mfg. v. Rea</i> , 733 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	2, 9
<i>Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. Affymetrix, Inc.</i> , 2019 WL 1298094 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 21, 2019) .....	6
<i>Riverwood Int'l Corp. v. R.A. Jones &amp; Co.</i> , 324 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	7
<i>RJ Control Consultants, Inc. v. Multiject, LLC</i> , 100 F.4th 659 (6th Cir. 2024) .....	24
<i>Roberts ex rel. Johnson v. Galen of Virginia, Inc.</i> , 325 F.3d 776 (6th Cir. 2003) .....	16, 19
<i>Robocast, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , No. 10-1055-RGA, 2014 WL 202399 (D. Del. Jan. 16, 2014) .....	14
<i>SanDisk Corp. v. STMicroelectronics, Inc.</i> , 480 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	10

# 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.