

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

UNILOC USA, INC., *et al.*

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No. 2:16-cv-642-JRG

LEAD CASE

<u>SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,</u>	
<u>APPLE INC.,</u>	Case No. 2:16-cv-0638-JRG
<u>BLACKBERRY CORPORATION, ET AL.,</u>	Case No. 2:16-cv-0639-JRG
<u>KAKAO CORPORATION,</u>	Case No. 2:16-cv-0640-JRG
<u>LINE EURO-AMERICAS CORP., ET AL.,</u>	Case No. 2:16-cv-0641-JRG
<u>VIBER MEDIA S.A.R.L.,</u>	Case No. 2:16-cv-0643-JRG
<u>VOXERNET LLC,</u>	Case No. 2:16-cv-0644-JRG
<u>WHATSAPP, INC.,</u>	Case No. 2:16-cv-0645-JRG
<u>AOL INC.</u>	Case No. 2:16-cv-0722-JRG
<u>BEETALK PRIVATE LTD.</u>	Case No. 2:16-cv-0725-JRG
<u>FACEBOOK, INC.</u>	Case No. 2:16-cv-0728-JRG
<u>GREEN TOMATO LIMITED</u>	Case No. 2:16-cv-0731-JRG
<u>SONY INTERACTIVE ENTERTAINMENT</u>	Case No. 2:16-cv-0732-JRG
<u>TANGOME, INC. D/B/A TANGO</u>	Case No. 2:16-cv-0733-JRG

DEFENDANTS' PRELIMINARY INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS

Pursuant to Local Patent Rule 3-3 and the Court's Docket Control Order ("DCO"), the undersigned Defendants in the above-captioned cases (collectively, "Defendants") set forth their Invalidity Contentions concerning U.S. Patent Nos. 7,535,890 ("the '890 patent"), 8,199,747 ("the '747 patent"), 8,243,723 ("the '723 patent"), 8,724,622 ("the '622 patent") and 8,995,433 ("the '433 patent") (collectively, the "Asserted Patents").¹

These Invalidity Contentions are served pursuant to the Court's DCO. Defendants also

¹ These Preliminary Invalidity Contentions should not be construed as a waiver to any defense, objection, or motion related to personal jurisdiction or venue, and each Defendant maintains any and all objections, defenses, and motions relating to jurisdiction and venue that have been previously raised. For example, Kakao Corp. maintains that the Court lacks personal jurisdiction over it and has filed a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. Sony Interactive Entertainment LLC maintains that the Court lacks personal jurisdiction over it and that venue is improper in this case, and instead avers that it has been improperly named in this suit. VoxelNet LL, Apple Inc., Facebook, Inc. and WhatsApp, Inc., also maintain that venue is not proper in the cases against them.

serve herewith the document production accompanying these disclosures. These contentions set forth Defendants' preliminary Invalidity Contentions with respect to the claims currently asserted by Plaintiffs Uniloc USA, Inc. and Uniloc Luxembourg S.A. (collectively, "Plaintiff" or "Uniloc").

I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

The Asserted Claims² of the Asserted Patents are neither novel nor non-obvious in view of the state of the prior art and the understanding of those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the alleged inventions. The Asserted Claims instead attempt to lay claim over the use of "instant voice messaging systems," "generating an instant voice message," systems and methods for "transmitting [] selected recipients and [] instant voice message[s] [] over [various] networks," an "instant messaging application," and other features and functionality, which were well-known in the field prior to the alleged inventions of the Asserted Patents.

The Asserted Claims are also invalid because they fail to claim patent-eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and *Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int'l*, 134 S. Ct. 2347, 2354 (2014) and its progeny, as set forth herein. The Asserted Claims are also invalid for lack of written description and lack of enablement under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as explained herein.

II. INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS

The following contentions are based on Defendants' current understanding of the Asserted Claims as applied in Plaintiff's Infringement Contentions, without the benefit of claim construction and only limited discovery. Accordingly, these Invalidity Contentions may reflect various potential and alternative positions regarding claim construction and scope. To the extent these contentions reflect or suggest a particular interpretation or reading of any claim element,

² As used herein, the term "Asserted Claims" encompasses all claims that Plaintiff asserts against each individual Defendant in these consolidated cases.

Defendants do not adopt, advocate, or acquiesce to such an interpretation or reading. Nor do these Invalidity Contentions constitute any admission by Defendants that any accused products or services, including any current or past versions of those products or services, are covered by any Asserted Claim. Defendants do not take any position herein regarding the proper scope or construction of the Asserted Claims.

Any assertion herein that a particular limitation is disclosed by a prior art reference or references may be based in part on Plaintiff's apparent interpretation, as identified in Plaintiff's Infringement Contentions and/or Complaints in these actions, and is not intended to be, and is not, an admission by Defendants that any such construction is supportable or correct. To the extent the following contentions reflect constructions of claim limitations consistent with or implicit in Plaintiff's Infringement Contentions, no inference is intended, nor should any be drawn, that Defendants agree with or concedes those claim constructions. Defendants expressly do not do so, and reserves its right to contest them.

To the extent that prior art cited for a particular limitation discloses functionality that is the same or similar in some respects to the alleged functionality in the accused products and/or services as set forth in Plaintiff's Infringement Contentions, Defendants do not concede that those limitations are in fact met by those accused functionalities.

Defendants further reserve the right to seek to supplement and amend these disclosures and associated document production based on further investigation, analysis, and discovery, Defendants' consultation with experts and others, and contentions or court rulings on relevant issues such as claim construction and priority dates. For example, since discovery is in the early stages, deposing the alleged inventors may reveal information that affects the disclosures and contentions herein. Also, Defendants have not completed discovery from third parties who have

information concerning the prior art cited herein and possible additional art. Defendants also reserve the right to seek leave to amend these Invalidity Contentions and/or to modify their selection of prior art references in the event that Plaintiff serves supplemental or modified infringement contentions.

Because Defendants are continuing their search for and analysis of relevant prior art, Defendants reserve the right to seek to revise, amend, and/or supplement the information provided herein, including identifying, charting, and/or relying upon additional prior art references, relevant disclosures, and bases for Invalidity Contentions. Additional prior art, disclosures, and invalidity defects, whether or not cited in this disclosure and whether known or not known to Defendants, may become relevant as investigation, analysis, and discovery continue. Defendants are currently unaware of the extent, if any, to which Plaintiff will contend that limitations of the Asserted Claims are not disclosed in the prior art identified by Defendants. To the extent that such an issue arises, Defendants reserve the right to identify and rely upon other references or portions of references regarding the allegedly missing limitation(s).

Additionally, because discovery has only recently commenced, Defendants reserve the right to present additional prior art references and/or disclosures under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a), (b), (e), (f), and/or (g), and/or § 103, located during the course of such discovery or further investigation, and to assert invalidity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(c), (d), or (f), to the extent that such discovery or investigation yields information forming the basis for such invalidity.

A. Identity of Each Item of Prior Art—P.R. 3-3 (a)

Pursuant to P.R. 3-3 (a), and subject to Defendants' reservation of rights, Defendants identify each item of prior art that anticipates or renders obvious one or more of the Asserted Claims in the attached Prior Art Index submitted herewith. *See Appendix A, infra.* To the

extent that the references listed in **Appendix A** are not identified as items of prior art that anticipate or render obvious an Asserted Claim, Defendants intend to rely on these references as background and as evidence of the state of the art at the time of Plaintiff's alleged invention.

Additionally, the prior art references cited by Defendants include references that are related patent applications and issued patents that contain substantially the same subject matter (e.g., published U.S. patent applications, and issued U.S. patents, foreign applications or issued patents). Any citation to or quotation from any of these patent applications or patents, therefore, should be understood as encompassing any parallel citation to the same subject matter in other related or corresponding applications or patents. For example, where a claim chart cites a published patent application that ultimately issued as a patent with substantially the same written description, Defendants may rely upon the published patent application and/or the issued patent as prior art.

Defendants also reserve the right to later rely upon all references or portions of references provided in **Appendix A** to supplement or amend their disclosures contained herein. Also, to the extent not expressly mentioned herein, Defendants incorporate by reference (1) any and all prior art contained or identified in documents produced thus far by Plaintiff in this or any other proceeding, and (2) any and all additional materials regarding or bearing upon invalidity in Plaintiff's possession or control that have not been produced to date, to the extent that any exist.

Each disclosed item of prior art describing a product, system, or other implementation made in the United States is evidence of a prior invention by another under 35 U.S.C. § 102(g), as evidenced by the named inventors, authors, organizations, and publishers involved with each such reference. Defendants further intend to rely on admissions of the named inventors concerning the prior art, including statements found in the Asserted Patents, their prosecution

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.