

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

UNILOC 2017 LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

AT&T MOBILITY LLC, and AT&T  
SERVICES, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:18-cv-00514-JRG

Jury Trial Demanded

---

**PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO ERICSSON INC.'S  
MOTION TO INTERVENE AS A DEFENDANT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. BACKGROUND ..... 1

III. ARGUMENT ..... 3

    A. Ericsson Does Not Have a Right to Intervene Under Rule 24(a)(2)..... 3

        1. Ericsson Does Not Have a Significant Interest in This Lawsuit and Disposition of this  
        Action Will Not Impair its Ability to Protect its Interests ..... 4

        2. Ericsson Does Not Require Representation in this Action; Regardless, Ericsson has  
        Not Shown that AT&T Cannot Represent any Interest It Might Have in Defending AT&T’s  
        own Accused Network..... 5

    B. Permissive Intervention Under Rule 24(a)(2) is Inappropriate..... 7

IV. CONCLUSION..... 8

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Munchkin, Inc. v. Furminator, Inc.</i> , No. 4:08-cv-00367-ERW, 2008 WL 3200758 (E.D. Mo. Aug. 5, 2008) .....	8
<i>Nat'l Inst. for Strategic Tech. Acquisition &amp; Commercialization v. Nissan of N. Am.</i> , No. 11-cv-11039, 2012 WL 3679316 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 22, 2012).....	7
<i>New Orleans Pub. Serv., Inc. v. United Gas Pipe Line Co.</i> , 732 F.2d 452 (5th Cir. 1984) .....	4
<i>Select Retrieval, LLC v. Altrec, Inc.</i> , Case No. 3:11-cv-1104-AA, 2013 WL 12321319 (D. Or. Jan. 29, 2013).....	8
<i>Sierra Club v. Espy</i> , 18 F.3d 1202 (5th Cir. 1994) .....	5
<i>Team Worldwide Corp. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , No. 2:17-cv-00235-JRG, 2017 WL6059303 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 7, 2017).....	6
<i>Texas v. United States</i> , 805 F.3d 653 (5th Cir. 2015) .....	4
<i>Trenton Int'l, Ltd. v. Trenton Int'l, Inc.</i> , No. 2:05-cv-581-FtM, 2008 WL 11430009 (M.D. Fla. Aug. 7, 2008).....	8

## I. INTRODUCTION

Ericsson Inc.’s (“Ericsson”) reason for intervening is that it provides *some* of the base stations in AT&T’s infringing cellular network. This is not a sufficient reason to intervene as of right, nor a justification for permissive intervention. Intervention is particularly inappropriate where, as here:

- (1) Ericsson provides only a portion of the equipment recited in the claim (base stations) and not even all of the relevant base stations;
- (2) Ericsson is not indemnifying AT&T; and
- (3) Ericsson cannot even say whether it has documents relevant to the issues in this case (*see, e.g.*, Dkt. No. 20 at 10: “Ericsson also *likely* possesses documents related to the design and function of the Accused Ericsson Base Stations” (emphasis added)).

Ericsson asks to intervene based on two Internet printouts—that say nothing more than Ericsson provides some LAA enabled base stations to AT&T—and conclusory attorney argument. Ericsson cannot wedge its way into a lawsuit concerning AT&T’s infringing network without proving it has the right to do so or should be allowed to do so.

The Court should deny Ericsson’s motion because Ericsson: (1) has not averred that it has relevant documents or witnesses, (2) has not demonstrated an obligation to an active litigant (such as indemnification), and (3) has not proven that AT&T cannot defend (or does not understand) the functionality of its own network.

## II. BACKGROUND

In the Complaint, Plaintiff details AT&T’s infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7,016,676 (the “’676 patent”). Dkt. No. 1, ¶¶ 58-79. The operation of AT&T’s network that provides “shared network access to LTE-LAA and Wi-Fi capable devices over at least one common frequency band” is accused of infringing the method of claim 1 of the ’676 patent. *Id.* at ¶¶ 58-

60 (“AT&T’s Network, base stations, and network controllers perform an interface control method that provides for alternate use of the 5 GHz frequency band, which is used by a first (Wi-Fi) and second (LTE-LAA) interface standard.”).

Ericsson does not assert that it provides all of the equipment recited in claim 1. Moreover, while Ericsson repeatedly claims that AT&T is somehow ignorant of its own use of the infringing LAA functionality (and thus AT&T’s own network), this is empty attorney rhetoric and is belied by the evidence in the Complaint demonstrating that AT&T is well versed in the functioning of all of the relevant infringing equipment, as exemplified as follows:

## **AT&T Reaches Wireless Speeds of More than 750 Mbps with LTE Licensed Assisted Access (LTE-LAA) Field Trials**

*Initial LTE-LAA Rollout Planned by End of Year*

AT&T and Ericsson conduct one of the first-ever live LTE-LAA field trials, reaching initial wireless speeds of more than 750 megabits per second (Mbps) in downtown San Francisco.

LTE-LAA technology is expected to play a key role as we aim to reach theoretical peak speeds of up to 1 gigabit per second (Gbps) at some small cell sites by the end of the year. It’s also one of the technologies we’re using to enhance the network and boost speeds in our [5G Evolution](#) markets.

While 5G standards are still being finalized, we’re laying the foundation for tomorrow’s faster wireless speeds today with 5G Evolution and also with technologies like LTE-LAA. This is a major step on our [journey](#) to deliver state-of-the-art 5G speeds as early as late 2018.

LTE-LAA combines unlicensed spectrum with licensed spectrum through carrier aggregation to increase network capacity— providing faster speeds and a better customer experience. It is designed to exist in harmony with other unlicensed spectrum technologies such as Wi-Fi. This is done through a feature called “listen before talk”, which ensures fair coexistence between LTE-LAA and Wi-Fi.

# 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.