

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

FUNDAMENTAL INNOVATION)	
SYSTEMS INTERNATIONAL, LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 3:17-CV-01827-N
)	
v.)	
)	
ZTE CORPORATION, <i>et al.</i> ,)	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
)	
Defendants.)	

**DEFENDANT ZTE CORPORATION’S ANSWER
TO PLAINTIFF’S AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Defendant ZTE Corporation (“ZTE Corp.”) responds to Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint as follows. This Answer is solely on behalf of ZTE Corp. and is not on behalf of Defendant ZTE (USA) Inc. or Defendant ZTE (TX), Inc.

PARTIES

1. ZTE Corp. lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in paragraph 1 of the Amended Complaint and therefore denies the same.
2. ZTE Corp. lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in paragraph 2 of the Amended Complaint and therefore denies the same.
3. ZTE Corp. admits that ZTE Corp. is organized and existing under the laws of China with its principal place of business at No. 55, Hitech Road South, Shenzhen, China 518057. Except as expressly admitted, ZTE Corp. denies the allegations in paragraph 3 of the Amended Complaint.

4. ZTE Corp. admits that ZTE (USA) Inc. is a New Jersey corporation. ZTE Corp. admits that ZTE (USA) Inc. sells consumer electronics. Except as expressly admitted, ZTE Corp. denies the allegations in paragraph 4 of the Amended Complaint.

5. ZTE Corp. admits that ZTE (TX) is a Texas corporation. Except as expressly admitted, ZTE Corp. denies the allegations in paragraph 5 of the Amended Complaint.

6. The allegations in paragraph 6 of the Amended Complaint express legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ZTE Corp. admits that it identifies with the trade name “ZTE.” ZTE Corp. specifically denies that ZTE Corp. has committed acts of infringement under any theory of infringement in this judicial district or elsewhere in the United States. Except as expressly admitted, ZTE Corp. denies the allegations in paragraph 6 of the Amended Complaint.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. The allegations in paragraph 7 of the Amended Complaint express legal conclusions to which no response is required.

8. The allegations in paragraph 8 of the Amended Complaint express legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ZTE Corp. admits that ZTE (USA) conducts business in Texas and maintains a facility and employees within Texas. ZTE Corp. specifically denies that ZTE (USA) has committed acts of infringement under any theory of infringement in this judicial district or elsewhere in the United States. Except as expressly admitted, ZTE Corp. denies the allegations in paragraph 8 of the Amended Complaint.

9. The allegations in paragraph 9 of the Amended Complaint express legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ZTE Corp. denies the allegations in paragraph 9 of the Amended Complaint.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

10. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 10 of the Amended Complaint.

11. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 11 of the Amended Complaint.

12. ZTE Corp. lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in paragraph 12 of the Amended Complaint and therefore denies the same.

13. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 13 of the Amended Complaint.

14. The allegations in paragraph 14 of the Amended Complaint express legal conclusions and claim language, there has been no claim construction order in this action, and thus, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 14 of the Amended Complaint.

15. The allegations in paragraph 15 of the Amended Complaint express legal conclusions and claim language, there has been no claim construction order in this action, and thus, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 15 of the Amended Complaint.

16. The allegations in paragraph 16 of the Amended Complaint express legal conclusions and claim language, there has been no claim construction order in this action, and thus, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 16 of the Amended Complaint.

17. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 17 of the Amended Complaint.

18. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 18 of the Amended Complaint.

19. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 19 of the Amended Complaint.

20. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 20 of the Amended Complaint.

21. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 21 of the Amended Complaint.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF
([Alleged] Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8,232,766)

22. ZTE Corp. incorporates by reference each of its responses set forth in paragraphs 1 to 21 as if fully set forth herein.

23. ZTE Corp. admits that Exhibit A to the Amended Complaint appears to be a copy of U.S. Patent No. 8,232,766 (“the ’766 patent”). ZTE Corp. admits that the face of Exhibit A shows the title “Multifunctional Charger System and Method.” ZTE Corp. admits that the face of Exhibit A states that the ’766 patent issued on July 31, 2012. Except as expressly admitted, ZTE Corp. denies the allegations in paragraph 23 of the Amended Complaint.

24. ZTE Corp. admits that the face of Exhibit A indicates that the ’766 patent names Daniel M. Fischer, Dan G. Radut, Michael F. Habicher, Quang A. Luong, and Jonathan T. Malton as inventors. Except as expressly admitted, ZTE Corp. denies the allegations in paragraph 24 of the Amended Complaint.

25. ZTE Corp. lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in paragraph 25 of the Amended Complaint and therefore denies the same.

26. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 26 of the Amended Complaint.

27. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 27 of the Amended Complaint.

28. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 28 of the Amended Complaint.

29. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 29 of the Amended Complaint.

30. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 30 of the Amended Complaint.

31. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 31 of the Amended Complaint.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF
([Alleged] Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7,834,586)

32. ZTE Corp. incorporates by reference each of its responses set forth in paragraphs 1 to 31 as if fully set forth herein.

33. ZTE Corp. admits that Exhibit B to the Amended Complaint appears to be a copy of U.S. Patent No. 7,834,586 (“the ’586 patent”). ZTE Corp. admits that the face of Exhibit B shows the title “Multifunctional Charger System and Method.” ZTE Corp. admits that the face of Exhibit B states that the ’586 patent issued on November 16, 2010. Except as expressly admitted, ZTE Corp. denies the allegations in paragraph 33 of the Amended Complaint.

34. ZTE Corp. admits that the face of Exhibit B indicates that the ’586 patent names Daniel M. Fischer, Dan G. Radut, Michael F. Habicher, Quang A. Luong, and Jonathan T. Malton as inventors. Except as expressly admitted, ZTE Corp. denies the allegations in paragraph 34 of the Amended Complaint.

35. ZTE Corp. lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in paragraph 35 of the Amended Complaint and therefore denies the same.

36. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 36 of the Amended Complaint.

37. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 37 of the Amended Complaint.

38. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 38 of the Amended Complaint.

39. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 39 of the Amended Complaint.

40. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 40 of the Amended Complaint.

41. ZTE Corp. denies every allegation in paragraph 41 of the Amended Complaint.

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.