

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

IN RE NEO WIRELESS, LLC §
PATENT LITIG. § 2:22-MD-03034-TGB
§
§ HON. TERRENCE G. BERG
§

NEO WIRELESS, LLC, § 2:22-CV-11403-TGB
Plaintiff, §
v. § HON. TERRENCE G. BERG
AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR §
CO., INC. & HONDA §
DEVELOPMENT & §
MANUFACTURING OF §
AMERICA, LLC, § JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
Defendants. §

NEO WIRELESS, LLC, § 2:22-CV-11405-TGB
Plaintiff, §
v. § HON. TERRENCE G. BERG
NISSAN NORTH AMERICA §
INC. & NISSAN MOTOR §
ACCEPTANCE CORPORATION §
a/k/a NISSAN MOTOR §
ACCEPTANCE COMPANY § JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
LLC, §
Defendants. §

**PLAINTIFF NEO WIRELESS, LLC'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS
HONDA AND NISSAN'S MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS
OF WILLFUL AND INDUCED PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. WILLFULNESS AND INDUCEMENT FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS4

III. APPLICABLE STANDARD6

IV. ARGUMENT.....7

 A. Defendants’ Pre-Suit Knowledge Coupled With Its Subsequent
 Actions Allows This Court To Plausibly Infer Honda And Nissan
 Willfully Infringed.7

 1. Neo Plausibly Alleged Defendants Received Pre-Suit Notice
 of the Asserted Patents.....8

 2. Defendants’ Pre-Suit Knowledge Coupled With Their
 Subsequent Actions Further Allows the Court to Infer
 Defendants’ Culpability.....11

 3. At a Minimum, Neo has Plausibly Alleged Intentional
 Infringement Since the Filing of the Original Complaint.14

 B. Neo Adequately Pleaded that Defendants Had Knowledge of and
 Encouraged Others to Directly Infringe the Asserted Patents.16

 1. Neo Sufficiently Alleged Honda and Nissan Had Both Pre-Suit
 and Post-Suit Knowledge of the Asserted Patents.17

 2. Neo Sufficiently Alleged Honda and Nissan Intended to
 Induce Infringement Through a Numerous Concrete Facts
 and Examples.....19

 C. In the Alternative, Neo Requests Leave to Amend.....22

V. CONCLUSION.....23

:

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Addiction & Detox. Inst., LLC v. Aharonov
2015 WL 631959 (E.D. Mich. Feb. 13, 2015)11

Ashcroft v. Iqbal
556 U.S. 662 (2009)1, 2

Bayer Healthcare LLC v. Baxalta Inc.
989 F.3d 964 (Fed. Cir. 2021)8

Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly
550 U.S. 544 (2007)6

BillJCo, LLC v. Apple Inc.
No. 6:21-CV-00528-ADA, 2022 WL 299733 (W.D. Tex. Feb. 1, 2022).....15

Brice Env. Servs. Corp. v. Arcadis U.S., Inc.
2022 WL 1032930 (D. Alaska Apr. 6, 2022).....12

Crehan v. Countrywide Bank, FSB
No. 1:11 CV 613, 2012 WL 4341049 (W.D. Mich. Feb. 15, 2012)9

DSU Med. Corp. v. JMS Co., Ltd.
471 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2006)19

Eko Brands, LLC v. Adrian Rivera Maynez Enter., Inc.
946 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2020)8

Ericsson Inc. v. TCL Comm. Tech. Holdings, Ltd.
2017 WL 5137401 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 4, 2017).....15

Georgetown Rail Equip. Co. v. Holland L.P.
867 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2017)8

Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.
579 U.S. 93 (2016) 1, 7, 10, 11

Hilgraeve, Inc. v. Symantec Corp.
 272 F. Supp. 2d 613 (E.D. Mich. 2003) 1

Hill v. Snyder
 878 F.3d 193 (6th Cir. 2017) 6

In re Bill of Lading Transmission & Proc. Sys. Patent Lit.
 681 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 7, 16, 17

In re Seagate Tech., LLC
 497 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2007) 1, 15

IOENGINE, LLC v. PayPal Holdings, Inc.
 2019 WL 330515 (D. Del. Jan. 25, 2019) 3, 11, 15

JDS Techs., Inc. v. Avigilon USA Corp.
 2015 WL 3603525 (E.D. Mich. June 15, 2015) 10, 11, 17

John Keeler & Co., Inc. v. Heron Point Seafood, Inc.
 2016 WL 6839615 (N.D. Ohio July 8, 2016) 11

Lifetime Indus., Inc. v. Trim-Lok, Inc.
 869 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 16

Malibu Boats, LLC v. MasterCraft Boat Co., LLC
 No. 3:16-cv-82-TAV-HBG
 2016 WL 8286158 (E.D. Tenn. Oct. 28, 2016) 10, 11

Mentor Graphics Corp. v. EVE-USA, Inc.
 851 F.3d 1275 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 13, 15

Michigan Motor Techs. LLC v. Volkswagen Aktiengesellschaft
 472 F. Supp. 3d 377 (E.D. Mich. 2020) passim

Nalco Co. v. Chem-Mod, LLC
 883 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2018) 16, 20

*National Institute for Strategic Tech. Acquisition &
 Commercialization v. Nissan of N. Am.*
 No. 11-11039, 2012 WL 3600289 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 21, 2012) 19, 20, 21

...

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.