

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

UNILOC 2017 LLC,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Case No. 2:18-CV-00514
	§	Jury Trial Demanded
AT&T SERVICES, INC. and AT&T	§	
MOBILITY LLC,	§	
	§	
Defendants,	§	
	§	
ERICSSON INC.,	§	
	§	
Intervenor Defendant.	§	
	§	

INTERVENOR ERICSSON INC.’S ANSWER IN INTERVENTION

Intervenor Ericsson Inc. (“Ericsson”), by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby submits the following Answer in Intervention to the November 17, 2018 Complaint (DE 1) (“Complaint”) of Plaintiff Uniloc 2017 LLC (“Uniloc”):

SCOPE OF ERICSSON’S ANSWER IN INTERVENTION

Ericsson’s intervention in this case is limited to defending claims arising from AT&T Services, Inc. and AT&T Mobility LLC’s (collectively, “AT&T”) use of Ericsson products. To the extent a response is required to allegations outside of this scope, Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and therefore denies them. Ericsson’s use of headings in this Answer in Intervention is for convenience only and are not admissions as to any of Uniloc’s allegations in the Complaint.

ANSWER IN INTERVENTION

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Ericsson admits that Uniloc purports to allege in the Complaint that AT&T has infringed U.S. Patents Nos. 6,901,272 (the “272 patent), 6,519,005 (the “005 patent) and 7,016,676 (the “676 patent) (collectively, the “Patents-in-Suit”). Ericsson admits that Exhibits A-C of the Complaint appear to be accurate reproductions of the Patents-in-Suit.

2. Ericsson admits that Uniloc purports to allege in the Complaint that AT&T has infringed the Patents-in-Suit by importing, making, offering for sale, selling and operating certain applications and devices. Ericsson admits that Uniloc purports to seek damages and other relief in the Complaint. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in the remainder of this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

THE PARTIES

3. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

4. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

5. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

6. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

7. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. This Paragraph states a legal conclusion to which no response is necessary. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, Ericsson denies that AT&T has infringed the '676 patent through AT&T's use of Ericsson products. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

9. Ericsson denies that AT&T has infringed the '676 patent through AT&T's use of Ericsson products. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

10. Ericsson denies that AT&T has infringed the '676 patent through AT&T's use of Ericsson products. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

COUNT I: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,901,272

11. Ericsson incorporates by reference each response contained in paragraphs 1 through 10 of this Answer in Intervention as though fully set forth herein.

12. Ericsson admits that Exhibit A of the Complaint appears to be an accurate reproduction of the '272 patent. Ericsson admits to the allegations made in the remainder of this Paragraph.

13. This Paragraph states a legal conclusion to which no response is necessary. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, denied.

14. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

15. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

16. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

17. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

18. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

19. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

20. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

21. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

22. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

23. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

24. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

25. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

26. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

27. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

28. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

29. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

30. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies them.

COUNT II: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,519,005

31. Ericsson incorporates by reference each response contained in paragraphs 1 through 10 of this Answer in Intervention as though fully set forth herein.

32. Ericsson admits that Exhibit B of the Complaint appears to be an accurate reproduction of the '005 patent. Ericsson admits to the allegations made in the remainder of this Paragraph.

33. This Paragraph states a legal conclusion to which no response is necessary. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, denied.

34. Ericsson is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph and therefore denies 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.