

1 David C. Marcus (SBN 158704)
david.marcus@wilmerhale.com
2 James M. Dowd (SBN 259578)
james.dowd@wilmerhale.com
3 Matthew J. Hawkinson (SBN 248216)
matthew.hawkinson@wilmerhale.com
4 Aaron Thompson (SBN 272391)
aaron.thompson@wilmerhale.com
5 Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
350 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2100
6 Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: (213) 443-5300
7 Facsimile: (213) 443-5400

8 William F. Lee (*pro hac vice*)
william.lee@wilmerhale.com
9 Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
10 Boston, MA 02109
Telephone: (617) 526-6000
11 Facsimile: (617) 526-5000

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

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

17 THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF
18 TECHNOLOGY,

19 Plaintiff,

20 vs.

21 HUGHES COMMUNICATIONS INC.,
22 HUGHES NETWORK SYSTEMS LLC,
23 DISH NETWORK CORPORATION,
24 DISH NETWORK LLC, and DISHNET
25 SATELLITE BROADBAND LLC,

26 Defendants.

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

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS
AND AUTHORITIES IN
SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS'
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT**

FILED UNDER SEAL

The Hon. Mariana R. Pfaelzer
United States District Court Judge
Hearing Date: March 27, 2015
Time: 1:30 PM
Place: Courtroom 12

27
28
MEMORANDUM ISO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
Case No. 2:13-cv-07245-MRP-JEM

Table of Contents

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

MOTION NO. 1: CALTECH’S DAMAGES THEORY IS INVALID AS A
MATTER OF LAW UNDER THE ENTIRE MARKET VALUE RULE 1

 I. UNDISPUTED FACTS 2

 A. The Accused Products 2

 B. Caltech’s Damages Theory 5

 1. Royalty Base 6

 2. Royalty Rate 7

 II. ARGUMENT 9

MOTION NO. 2: THE ASSERTED ’781 PATENT CLAIMS ARE INVALID ... 13

 A. Undisputed Facts 13

 B. Argument 17

 1. Divsalar Invalidates Claim 19 17

 2. Divsalar Invalidates Claim 16 19

 3. Caltech’s Attempt To Distinguish Divsalar Fails As A
 Matter Of Law 20

MOTION NO. 3: THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OF THE ’833 PATENT ARE
INVALID UNDER THE WRITTEN DESCRIPTION REQUIREMENT 26

 I. UNDISPUTED FACTS 26

 A. Argument 27

 1. Written Description Requires An Objective Showing
 That The Inventors Possessed The Full Scope Of What Is
 Claimed 27

 2. The Asserted ’833 Patent Claims Fail The Written
 Description Requirement 27

MOTION NO. 4: ALL THE ASSERTED CLAIMS ARE INVALID BASED
ON IMPROPER INVENTORSHIP 30



1	MOTION NO. 5: CALTECH'S INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS UNDER	
2	THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS ARE INSUFFICIENT TO SUSTAIN	
3	ITS CLAIM	32
4	I. Undisputed Facts.....	32
5	A. Caltech's April 2014 Infringement Contentions	32
6	B. Dr. Wicker's January 28, 2015 Infringement Report.....	33
7	II. ARGUMENT	33
8	MOTION NO. 6: NON-INFRINGEMENT BY DISH AND dishNET	
9	PRODUCTS	36
10	CONCLUSIONS	37

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
1	
2	
3	
4	<i>Am. Calcar, Inc. v. Am. Honda Motor Co.</i> , No. 06CV2433 DMS 33
5	
6	<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (<i>en banc</i>)..... 26, 27
7	
8	<i>Atlas IP, LLC v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> , No. 13-CIV-23309-ALTONAGA/O’Sullivan, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 158787 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 6, 2014) 12
9	
10	<i>Digital Reg of Tex. v. Adobe Sys., Inc.</i> , No. C 12-1971 CW, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 115565 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 19, 2014)..... 12
11	
12	<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Applera Corp.</i> , 599 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 22
13	
14	<i>Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014) passim
15	
16	<i>Evans Cooling Sys., Inc. v. Gen. Motors Corp.</i> , 125F.3d 1448 (Fed. Cir. 1997) 30
17	
18	<i>Highmark, Inc. v. Allcare Health Mgmt. Sys., Inc.</i> , 701 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 36, 37
19	
20	<i>Hill-Rom Services, Inc. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 22, 23
21	
22	<i>Hyatt v. Boone</i> , 146 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 1998)..... 27, 28
23	
24	<i>In re Innovatio IP Ventures Patent Litig.</i> , No. 11 C 9308, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 144061 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 3, 2013) 12
25	
26	<i>In re Rambus Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 42 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 21
27	
28	<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) 17, 20
	<i>LaserDynamics, Inc. v. Quanta Computer, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 51 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 1, 12
	<i>Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.</i> , 580 F.3d 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 1
	<i>Malta v. Schulmerich Carillons, Inc.</i> , 952 F.2d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1991)..... 33, 35

1	<i>Mirror Worlds, LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> ,	12
	784 F. Supp. 2d 703 (E.D. Tex. 2011)	
2	<i>Network Commerce, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> ,	32, 33
3	422 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	
4	<i>Omega Eng'g, Inc., v. Raytek Corp.</i> ,	21
5	334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	
6	<i>Pannu v. Iolab Corp.</i> ,	32
	155 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	
7	<i>Perricon v. Medicis Pharmaceutical Corp.</i> ,	16
8	432 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	
9	<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> ,	20, 24
	415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	
10	<i>Pro-Mold and Tool Co., Inc. v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc.</i> ,	30, 31
11	75 F.3d 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	
12	<i>Regents of University of Minnesota v. AGA Medical Corp.</i> ,	18
	717 F.3d 929 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	
13	<i>Sofamor Danek Group, Inc. v. DePuy-Motech, Inc.</i> ,	24
14	74 F.3d 1216 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	
15	<i>Taurus IP, LLC v. DaimlerChrysler Corp.</i> ,	18
	726 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	
16	<i>TechSearch L.L.C. v. Intel Corp.</i> ,	36
17	286 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	
18	<i>Teva Pharmaceuticals USE, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> ,	20
	135 S. Ct. 831 (January 20, 2015)	
19	<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> ,	12
20	632 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	
21	<i>VirnetX, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> ,	1, 2, 9, 10
22	767 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

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.