

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION**

WESTERNGECO L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 4:13 cv 02725
)	
PETROLEUM GEO-SERVICES, INC., and)	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
PGS GEOPHYSICAL AS,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**GEO'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
AGAINST WESTERN'S ATTEMPTED DOUBLE RECOVERY**

Of Counsel:

Morgan Chu
Benjamin Hattenbach
Ellisen Turner
Arka Chatterjee
Dominik Slusarczyk
IRELL & MANELLA LLP
1800 Avenue of the Stars
Suite 900
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel.: 310-277-1010
Fax: 310-203-7199

David Beck
Attorney-in-Charge
State Bar No. 00000070
Federal Bar No. 919
dbeck@beckredde.com

Michael E. Richardson
State Bar No. 24002838
Federal Bar No. 23630
mrichardson@beckredde.com
BECK REDDEN LLP
1221 McKinney
Suite 4500
Houston, TX 77010
Tel.: 713-951-3700
Fax: 713-951-3720

*Attorneys for Defendants
Petroleum Geo-Services, Inc. and PGS
Geophysical AS*

Dated: July 15, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. Factual Background.....	3
A. The <i>ION</i> suit.....	3
B. The present litigation.	6
2. Legal Standard.	7
3. Argument.	8
A. Exhaustion – <i>ION</i> 's bond assures that it will satisfy the <i>ION</i> judgment and exhausts Western's patent claims against Geo.	8
1. A damages judgment exhausts patent rights.	8
2. The <i>ION</i> judgment provided full compensation.	11
3. Western may not collaterally attack the sufficiency of the <i>ION</i> judgment.....	13
B. Double recovery – any damages award based on digiFINs included in the <i>ION</i> judgment would be an impermissible double recovery.	15
C. Issue preclusion prevents Western from re-litigating digiFIN damages.....	17
1. The <i>ION</i> litigation presented the identical issue.	17
2. Western's full compensation was thoroughly litigated.	18
3. Full compensation was necessary to the <i>ION</i> judgment.	20
4. Judge Ellison's evidentiary rulings do not limit the scope of the <i>ION</i> judgment or its preclusive effect.	21
D. Judicial estoppel precludes Western from seeking patent damages from any downstream digiFIN purchasers.....	22
E. Claim preclusion bars Western's infringement claims.....	24
1. The <i>ION</i> judgment was a final judgment on the merits, rendered by a court of competent jurisdiction.	25
2. Western raises the same cause of action in both suits.	25
3. Defensive claim preclusion does not require actual privity where the non-movant has already averred its existence.	26
4. Conclusion.	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<u>Cases</u>	
<i>Aero Products Int'l, Inc. v. Intex Recreation Corp.</i> , 466 F.3d 1000 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	15, 16, 17
<i>Amstar Corp. v. Envirotech Corp.</i> , 823 F.2d 1538 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....	10
<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> , 477 U.S. 242 (1986).....	7
<i>Arlington Industries, Inc. v. Bridgeport Fittings, Inc.</i> , 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19339 (M.D. Pa. Mar. 3, 2010).....	16
<i>Birdsell v. Shaliol</i> , 112 U.S. 485 (1884).....	14
<i>Brain Life, LLC v. Elekta Inc.</i> , 746 F.3d 1045 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	25
<i>Catalina Lighting, Inc. v. Lamps Plus, Inc.</i> , 295 F.3d 1277 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	16
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986).....	7
<i>Commissioner v. Sunnen</i> , 333 U.S. 591 (1948).....	24
<i>Dixon v. Warden Louisiana State Penitentiary</i> , 20 F.3d 468 (5th Cir. 1994)	12
<i>General Motors Corp. v. Devex Corp.</i> , 461 U.S. 648 (1983).....	13
<i>Glenayre Elecs., Inc. v. Jackson</i> , 443 F.3d 851 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	passim
<i>Hidden Oaks Ltd. v. City of Austin</i> , 138 F.3d 1036 (5th Cir. 1998)	18
<i>In re Coastal Plains, Inc.</i> , 179 F.3d 197 (5th Cir. 1999)	23
<i>In re Freeman</i> , 30 F.3d 1459 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	17
<i>In re Howe</i> , 913 F.2d 1138 (5th Cir. 1992)	25

In re Nintendo of America, Inc.,
 --- F.3d ---, Dkt. No. 2014-132, 2014 WL 2889911 (Fed. Cir. Jun 25,
 2014) 9

Junker v. Eddings,
 396 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 16

Koh v. Microtek Int'l, Inc.,
 250 F. Supp. 2d 627 (E.D. Va. 2003) 10

LG Electronics, Inc. v. Asustek Computers,
 126 F. Supp. 2d 414 (E.D. Va. 2000) 9

Mars, Inc. v. Nippon Conlux Kabushiki Kaisha,
 58 F.3d 616 (Fed. Cir. 1995)..... 25

Minco, Inc. v. Combustion Eng'g, Inc.,
 95 F.3d 1109 (Fed. Cir. 1996)..... 12

Minnesota Min. & Mfg. Co. v. Chemque, Inc.,
 303 F.3d 1294 (2002)..... 22, 23

Nilsen v. City of Moss Point,
 701 F.2d 556 (5th Cir. 1983) 25

Odetics, Inc. v. Storage Tech. Corp.,
 14 F. Supp.2d 785 (E.D. Va. 1998) 10, 11, 13

Prager v. El Paso Nat'l Bank,
 417 F.2d 1111 (5th Cir. 1969) 22

Quanta Computer, Inc. v. LG Electronics, Inc.,
 553 U.S. 617 (2008)..... 8

Recoveredge, L.P. v. Pentecost,
 44 F.3d 1284 (5th Cir. 1995) 17

Rodriguez v. Corvel Corp.,
 CIV.A.SA-99-CA1339HG, 2001 WL 674172 (W.D. Tex. Feb. 26, 2001)..... 13

Secure Access, LLC v. Nintendo of America Inc.,
 2014 WL 986169 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 7, 2014) 9

Sherman, Clay & Co. v. Searchlight Horn Co.,
 225 F. 497 (9th Cir. 1915) 14

Shifferaw v. Emson USA,
 2010 WL 1064380 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 18, 2010) 9

SSIH Equip., S.A. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n,
 718 F.2d 365 (Fed. Cir. 1983)..... 22

Stickle v. Heublein, Inc.,
 716 F.2d 1550 (Fed. Cir. 1983)..... 10, 15

<i>Strickland v. Washington</i> , 466 U.S. 668 (1984).....	12
<i>Transclean Corp. v. Jiffy Lube Intern., Inc.</i> , 474 F.3d 1298 (2007).....	26
<i>Union Tool Co. v. Wilson</i> , 259 U.S. 107 (1922).....	14
<i>United States v. Shanbaum</i> , 10 F.3d 305 (5th Cir. 1994)	17
<i>United States v. Univis Lens Co.</i> , 316 U.S. 241 (1942).....	8
<i>Vulcan Engineering Co., Inc. v. Fata Aluminium, Inc.</i> , 278 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	7
<i>Wagner Sign Serv. v. Midwest News Reel Theatres</i> , 119 F.2d 929 (7th Cir. 1941)	10
<i>Weeks v. Angelone</i> , 528 U.S. 225 (2000).....	12
<u>Other Authorities</u>	
18 CHARLES ALAN WRIGHT & ARTHUR R. MILLER, FEDERAL PRACTICE & PROCEDURE § 4416 (2d ed.).....	17
18 CHARLES ALAN WRIGHT & ARTHUR R. MILLER, FEDERAL PRACTICE & PROCEDURE § 4420 (2d ed.).....	17
18 CHARLES ALAN WRIGHT & ARTHUR R. MILLER, FEDERAL PRACTICE & PROCEDURE § 4433 (2d ed.).....	22
18 CHARLES ALAN WRIGHT & ARTHUR R. MILLER, FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE § 4406 (2d ed. 2002).....	24
18A CHARLES ALAN WRIGHT & ARTHUR R. MILLER, FEDERAL PRACTICE & PROCEDURE § 4435 (2d ed.).....	25
18A CHARLES ALAN WRIGHT & ARTHUR R. MILLER, FEDERAL PRACTICE & PROCEDURE § 4464 (2d ed.).....	22
RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF JUDGMENTS § 24 (1981)	25
<u>Rules</u>	
Fed. R. Civ. P. 56.....	7
Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 51(d)(1)	18

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.