

1 David C. Marcus (SBN: 158704)  
david.marcus@wilmerhale.com  
2 AARON THOMPSON (SBN: 272391)  
aaron.thompson@wilmerhale.com  
3 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
4 350 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2100  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
5 Telephone: +1 213 443 5300  
Facsimile: +1 213 443 5400

6 William G. McElwain (*pro hac vice pending*)  
william.mcelwain@wilmerhale.com  
7 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
8 1875 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
9 Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: +1 202 663 6388  
10 Facsimile: +1 202 663 6363

11 Attorneys for Defendants and Counterclaim-Plaintiffs  
*Hughes Communications Inc.,*  
12 *Hughes Network Systems LLC,*  
*DISH Network Corporation,*  
13 *DISH Network L.L.C., and*  
*dishNET Satellite Broadband L.L.C.*  
14

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
16 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

17 The CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF  
TECHNOLOGY,

18 Plaintiff,

19 vs.

20 HUGHES COMMUNICATIONS INC.,  
21 HUGHES NETWORK SYSTEMS LLC,  
DISH NETWORK CORPORATION,  
22 DISH NETWORK L.L.C., and DISHNET  
23 SATELLITE BROADBAND L.L.C.,

24 Defendants.

25  
26  
27 HUGHES COMMUNICATIONS INC.,  
28 HUGHES NETWORK SYSTEMS LLC,  
DISH NETWORK CORPORATION,

Case No. 2:13-cv-07245-MRP-JEM

**ANSWER, DEFENSES, AND  
COUNTERCLAIMS OF  
DEFENDANTS HUGHES  
COMMUNICATIONS, HUGHES  
NETWORK SYSTEMS, DISH  
NETWORK CORPORATION,  
DISH NETWORK L.L.C., AND  
DISHNET TO PLAINTIFF'S  
COMPLAINT**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

CALTECH EXHIBIT 0005

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

DISH NETWORK L.L.C., and DISHNET  
SATELLITE BROADBAND L.L.C.,  
  
Counter-Plaintiffs,  
  
vs.  
  
The CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF  
TECHNOLOGY,  
  
Counter-  
Defendants.

1 Defendants Hughes Communications Inc. (“Hughes Communications”),  
2 Hughes Network Systems LLC (“Hughes Network Systems”),<sup>1</sup> DISH Network  
3 Corporation, DISH Network L.L.C., and dishNET Satellite Broadband L.L.C.  
4 (“dishNET”) (collectively, “Defendants” or “Counterclaim-Plaintiffs”), by and  
5 through their undersigned attorneys, hereby answer the Complaint for Patent  
6 Infringement brought by the Plaintiff, the California Institute of Technology  
7 (“Caltech” or “Plaintiff”), as follows, with each paragraph of the Answer below  
8 responding to the corresponding numbered or lettered paragraph of the Complaint:

9 **ANSWER**

10 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

11 1. Defendants admit that Caltech’s Complaint purports to state a cause of  
12 action under the patent laws of the United States.

13 2. Defendants deny the allegation that Defendants infringe or infringed,  
14 in any way, U.S. Patent No. 7,116,710, U.S. Patent No. 7,421,032, U.S. Patent No.  
15 7,916,781, or U.S. Patent No. 8,284,833 (collectively, “the Asserted Patents”).  
16 Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
17 whether Caltech is the legal owner of the Asserted Patents, or whether the Asserted  
18 Patents were duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark  
19 Office (“Patent Office”), and therefore deny them. Defendants admit that  
20 Caltech’s complaint purports to seek injunctive relief and monetary damages.

21 **THE PARTIES**

22 3. On information and belief, Defendants admit that Caltech is a non-  
23 profit private university organized under the laws of the State of California.  
24 Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
25

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>1</sup> Caltech has defined Hughes Communications and Hughes Network Systems as  
28 the “Hughes Defendants.” For purposes of clarity in responding to Caltech’s  
complaint only, Defendants use the same term

1 the remainder of the allegations in paragraph 3 of the Complaint, and therefore  
2 deny them.

3 4. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph 4 of the Complaint.

4 5. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph 5 of the Complaint.

5 6. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph 6 of the Complaint.

6 7. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph 7 of the Complaint,  
7 except that DISH Network L.L.C is a wholly owned indirect subsidiary of DISH  
8 Network Corporation.

9 8. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph 8 of the Complaint,  
10 except that dishNET is a wholly owned indirect subsidiary of DISH Network  
11 Corporation.<sup>2</sup>

12 9. Defendants admit that EchoStar and DISH Network Corporation were  
13 previously one company, and that in approximately January 2008, DISH  
14 completed the distribution of its technology and set-top box business and certain  
15 infrastructure assets (the “Spin-off”) into a separate publicly-traded company,  
16 EchoStar Corporation (“EchoStar”).

17 10. Defendants admit that Charles W. Ergen serves as the Chairman of  
18 both DISH Network Corporation and EchoStar, and that the Chairman, or certain  
19 trusts established by the Chairman, beneficially owns a substantial majority of the  
20 voting power of the shares of both DISH Network Corporation and EchoStar.  
21 Defendants further admit that, in 2010, DISH Network Corporation accounted for  
22 82.5% of EchoStar’s total revenue and in 2012, DISH Network Corporation  
23 accounted for 49.5% of EchoStar’s total revenue. Defendants admit that in  
24 October 2012, dishNET and Hughes Network Systems entered into a distribution  
25 agreement relating to Hughes satellite internet service. Defendants are without

---

26  
27 <sup>2</sup> Caltech has defined DISH Network Corporation, DISH Network L.L.C. and  
28 dishNet as the “Dish Defendants.” For purposes of clarity in responding to  
Caltech’s complaint only. Defendants use the same term

1 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the remaining allegations  
2 of paragraph 10 of the Complaint, and therefore deny the same.

3 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4 11. Defendants admit that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction of this  
5 action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

6 12. Paragraph 12 of the Complaint sets forth conclusions of law to which  
7 no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed to be required,  
8 however, Defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 12 of the Complaint,  
9 except that Defendants admit that Hughes Network Systems conducts business in  
10 the State of California, including in the Central District of California.

11 13. Paragraph 13 of the Complaint sets forth conclusions of law to which  
12 no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed to be required,  
13 however, Defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 13 of the Complaint,  
14 except that Defendants admit that DISH Network L.L.C., and dishNET conduct  
15 business in the State of California, including in the Central District of California.

16 14. Paragraph 14 of the Complaint sets forth conclusions of law to which  
17 no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed to be required,  
18 however, Defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 14 of the Complaint,  
19 except that Defendants admit, for purposes of this action only, that venue is proper  
20 in this Court under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400.

21 **CALTECH'S ASSERTED PATENTS**

22 15. Defendants admit that the Complaint purports to attach U.S. Patent No.  
23 7,116,710 (the "710 Patent") as Exhibit A. Defendants also admit that the '710  
24 Patent states on its face that it is titled "Serial Concatenation of Interleaved  
25 Convolutional Codes Forming Turbo-Like Codes" and recites an issue date of  
26 October 3, 2006. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to  
27 form a belief as to the remaining allegations in paragraph 15 of the Complaint, and  
28 therefore deny them.

# 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.