

1 Peter H. Kang, SBN 158101
2 pkang@sidley.com
3 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
4 1001 Page Mill Road, Building 1
5 Palo Alto, California 94304
6 Tel: (650) 565-7000
7 Fax: (650) 565-7100

8
9 ADDITIONAL COUNSEL LISTED
10 ON SIGNATURE PAGE

11 Attorneys for Defendant
12 UNIVERSAL REMOTE CONTROL, INC.

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15 SOUTHERN DIVISION

16 UNIVERSAL ELECTRONICS, INC.,
17 Plaintiff and Counterclaim-
18 Defendant,
19 v.
20 UNIVERSAL REMOTE CONTROL,
21 INC.,
22 Defendant and
23 Counterclaimant.

24 Case No. 8:12-CV-00329 AG (JPRx)
25 Assigned to: Hon. Andrew J. Guilford
26 **DEFENDANT UNIVERSAL
27 REMOTE CONTROL, INC.'S
28 SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMISSION
RE: AWARD OF ATTORNEYS'
FEES**

DEF'T UNIVERSAL REMOTE CONTROL, INC.'S SUPP. SUBMISSION RE: AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1	
2	
3 I. INTRODUCTION	1
4 II. RELEVANT BACKGROUND	2
5 III. ARGUMENT	5
6 A. The Hours That URC’s Counsel Actually Expended in This	
7 Litigation Were Reasonable	7
8 B. The Hourly Rates at Which URC Was Actually Billed by	
9 Counsel Were Reasonable	12
10 C. Calculation of the Lodestar Figure	13
11 D. Third-Party Surveys Confirm that URC’s Fee Request Is	
12 Reasonable	13
13 E. Other Factors Further Demonstrate that URC’s Fee Request Is	
14 Reasonable	14
15 F. URC Is Also Entitled to Recover its Expenses, Including its	
16 Expert Witness Fees	16
17 IV. CONCLUSION.....	18
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
1 <i>Blum v. Stenson</i>	
2 465 U.S. 886, 104 S. Ct. 1541, 79 L. Ed. 2d 891 (1984)	12
3 <i>Central Soya Co., Inc. v. Geo. A. Hormel & Co.</i>	
4 723 F.2d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	16, 17
5 <i>Chromalloy Amer. Corp. v. Alloy Surfaces Co.</i>	
6 353 F. Supp. 429 (D. Del. 1973)	12
7 <i>Fischer v. SJB-P.D. Inc.</i>	
8 214 F.3d 1115 (9th Cir. 2000)	6
9 <i>Gates v. Deukmejian</i>	
10 987 F.2d 1392 (9th Cir. 1992)	7
11 <i>Gonzalez v. City of Maywood</i>	
12 729 F.3d 1196 (9th Cir. 2013)	6
13 <i>Hensley v. Eckerhart</i>	
14 461 U.S. 424, 103 S. Ct. 1933, 76 L. Ed. 2d 40 (1983)	6, 7, 15
15 <i>Highmark Inc. v. Allcare Health Mgmt. Sys., Inc.</i>	
16 __ U.S. __, 134 S. Ct. 1744, 188 L. Ed. 2d 829 (2014)	6, 16
17 <i>Innovative Biometric Tech., LLC v. Toshiba Amer. Info. Sys., Inc.</i>	
18 Case No. 09-CV-81046-KLR (S.D. Fla. Aug. 30, 2012)	4
19 <i>Intellect Wireless, Inc. v. HTC Corp.</i>	
20 No. 09 C 2945, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2864 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 8, 2015)	4
21 <i>Kerr v. Screen Guild Extras, Inc.</i>	
22 526 F.2d 67 (9th Cir. 1975)	6, 14
23 <i>Mathis v. Spears</i>	
24 857 F.2d 749 (9th Cir. 1988)	passim
25 <i>Mathis v. Spears</i>	
26 No. CV 80-4481 MRP, 1986 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 235900 (C.D. Cal.	
27 June 27, 1986), <i>aff'd</i> , 857 F.2d 749 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	7
28 <i>Monolith Portland Midwest Co. v. Kaiser Alum. & Chem. Corp.</i>	
407 F.2d 288 (9th Cir. 1969)	7
<i>Moore v. Jas. H. Matthews & Co.</i>	
682 F.2d 830 (9th Cir. 1982)	12
<i>Morales v. City of San Rafael</i>	
96 F.3d 359 (9th Cir. 1996)	6, 14

1 *Oplus Technologies, Ltd. v. Sears Holdings Corp.*
 Case No. 2:12-cv-05707-MRP-Ex (C.D. Cal. Feb. 3, 2014) 4

2

3 *PACT XPP Techs., AG v. Xilinx, Inc.*
 No. 2:07-CV-563-RSP, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 125819
 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 3, 2013) 7

4

5 *Pierce v. Underwood*
 487 U.S. 552, 108 S. Ct. 2541, 101 L. Ed. 2d 490 (1988) 14

6 *PPG Industries, Inc. v. Celanese Polymer Specialties Co.*
 840 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1988) 8

7

8 *Takeda Chem. Indus., Ltd. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.*
 549 F.3d 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 6, 17

9 *Trend Prod. Co. v. Metro Indus., Inc.*
 No. CV 84-7740 AHS, 1989 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11861
 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 11, 1989) 7, 11

10

11 *Water Techs. Corp. v. Calco Ltd.*
 709 F. Supp. 821 (N.D. Ill. 1989) 7

12

13 **STATUTES**

14 35 U.S.C. § 285 5, 6, 16, 17

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Tr.Complete trial transcript (May 6–21, 2014) [ECF No. 398-1]
Tr. Ex.....Admitted trial exhibits (as shown in ECF No. 409)
Kang Decl.....Declaration of Peter H. Kang (filed herewith)
Miro Decl.....Declaration of Douglas A. Miro (filed herewith)
Brookey Decl.....Declaration of Brian K. Brookey (filed herewith)
Supp. Miro Decl.....Supplemental Declaration of Douglas A. Miro
filed with URC’s Reply in support of its Motion for Attorney
Fees (Feb. 23, 2015) [ECF No. 466-1]

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.