

2013-1625, -1631, -1632, -1633

---

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

ERICSSON INC. and  
TELEFONAKTIEBOLAGET LM ERICSSON,  
*Plaintiffs-Appellees,*

v.

D-LINK SYSTEMS, INC., NETGEAR, INC., ACER, INC.,  
ACER AMERICA CORPORATION, and GATEWAY, INC.,  
*Defendants-Appellants,*

and

DELL, INC.,  
*Defendant-Appellant,*

and

TOSHIBA AMERICA INFORMATION SYSTEMS, INC.  
and TOSHIBA CORPORATION,  
*Defendants-Appellants,*

and

INTEL CORPORATION,  
*Intervenor-Appellant,*

and

BELKIN INTERNATIONAL, INC.,  
*Defendant.*

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas  
in case no. 10-CV-0473, Chief Judge Leonard Davis.

---

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL BRIEF FOR  
PLAINTIFFS-APPELLEES, ERICSSON INC. AND  
TELEFONAKTIEBOLAGET LM ERICSSON**

---

February 20, 2014

*(Counsel Listed on Next Page)*

---

Broadcom v. Ericsson

Douglas A. Cawley  
Theodore Stevenson, III  
Warren Lipschitz  
MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.  
300 Crescent Court, Suite 1500  
Dallas, TX 75201  
(214) 978-4000

John B. Campbell  
Kathy H. Li  
MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.  
300 W. 6th Street, Suite 1700  
Austin, TX 78701  
(512) 692-8700

John M. Whealan  
4613 Merivale Road  
Chevy Chase, MD 20815  
(202) 994-2195

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs-Appellees,  
Ericsson Inc. and Telefonaktiebolaget LM  
Ericsson*

## CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

Ericsson Inc. and Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson certify the following:

1. The full name of every party represented by me is:

Ericsson Inc. and Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson

2. The name of the real party in interest (if the party named in the caption is not the real party in interest) represented by me is:

Not Applicable

3. All parent corporations and any publicly held companies that own 10 percent or more of the stock of the party represented by me are:

Ericsson Inc. is wholly-owned by Ericsson Holding II Inc., which in turn is wholly-owned by Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson. Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson is publicly held and trades in the United States through American Depository Receipts under the name LM Ericsson Telephone Company.

4. The names of all law firms and the partners or associates that appeared for the party represented by us in the trial court or are expected to appear in this Court are:

McKool Smith P.C.: Douglas A. Cawley, Theodore Stevenson, III, Samuel F. Baxter, John B. Campbell, Jr., Ada E. Brown (no longer at McKool Smith P.C.), Ashley N. Moore, Bradley W. Caldwell (no longer at McKool Smith P.C.), John A. Curry (no longer at McKool Smith P.C.), Brandon M. Jordan, Holly E. Engelmann, Jason A. Blackstone, Justin T. Nemunaitis (no longer at McKool Smith P.C.), Kathy H. Li, Kevin L. Burgess, Ryan A. Hargrave, Travis E. DeArman

John M. Whealan

Dated: February 20, 2014

/s/ Douglas A. Cawley  
DOUGLAS A. CAWLEY

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST .....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	vi
TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	ix
STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES .....	1
STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION.....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	2
STATEMENT OF ISSUES .....	3
STATEMENT OF CASE .....	4
STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	6
I. Ericsson.....	6
II. Technology Overview .....	7
A. The '568 Patent .....	9
B. The '215 Patent .....	10
C. The '625 Patent .....	13
III. Ericsson's Licensing Program For Its Standard-Essential Patents.....	16
A. Ericsson's Comparable Licenses for the Patents-in-Suit .....	17
B. Ericsson's Pre-Suit Negotiations with Defendants .....	22
IV. The Proceedings Below .....	23
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	24

STANDARD OF REVIEW .....	26
ARGUMENT .....	28
I. Defendants Infringe Ericsson’s Valid ’568, ’215, and ’625 Patents.....	28
A. The District Court did Not Err in Denying JMOL as to Infringement of the ’568 Patent .....	28
1. Substantial evidence supports the jury’s finding that the ’568 Patent is infringed.....	28
2. The district court correctly instructed the jury that the accused products infringe if they are reasonably capable of infringement.....	32
B. The District Court did Not Err in Denying JMOL as to Infringement of the ’215 Patent .....	34
1. Substantial evidence supports the jury’s finding that the ’215 Patent is infringed.....	34
2. The district court correctly construed “type identifier field” (TIF).....	38
C. The District Court did Not Err in Denying JMOL as to Infringement or Invalidity of the ’625 Patent .....	41
1. Substantial evidence supports the jury’s finding that the ’625 Patent is infringed.....	41
2. Substantial evidence supports the jury’s finding that the ’625 Patent is not anticipated.....	45
D. Substantial Evidence Supports the Jury’s Factual Finding that Defendants Directly Infringed and Also Induced Infringement of the Asserted Method Claims .....	48
1. Defendants directly infringe the asserted method claims .....	48

# 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.