

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

REMBRANDT WIRELESS TECHNOLOGIES,
LP,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.;
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.;
and SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS
AMERICA, LLC,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:13-cv-00213-JRG-RSP

**SAMSUNG DEFENDANTS' REPLY TO RULE 50(b) RENEWED MOTION FOR
JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW AND/OR RULE 59(a) MOTION FOR NEW
TRIAL ON LIABILITY ISSUES**

Annex Exhibit 1017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| I. REMBRANDT’S STATEMENT OF LEGAL STANDARDS IS MISLEADING | 1 |
| II. REMBRANDT FAILS TO CITE EVIDENCE TO REBUT SAMSUNG’S <i>PRIMA FACIE</i> OBVIOUSNESS CASE | 1 |
| A. There Is No Evidence Rebutting the Prior Art’s Disclosure of “Different Types” of Modulation Methods | 1 |
| B. Rembrandt Mischaracterizes the Evidence on Motivation to Combine and Relies on Attorney Argument | 2 |
| C. Samsung Properly Established the Prior Art’s Disclosure of the “Reversion” Limitation Recited in Claims 2 and 59 of the ‘580 Patent | 5 |
| D. There Is No Evidence Rebutting the Prior Art’s Disclosure of the Address Placement Limitation of Claim 21 of the ‘228 Patent | 6 |
| E. Rembrandt’s Evidence of Secondary Considerations Is Insufficient to Overcome Samsung’s <i>Prima Facie</i> Case | 7 |
| III. REMBRANDT FURTHER HIGHLIGHTS THE ERRONEOUS CONSTRUCTION OF “DIFFERENT TYPES” OF MODULATION METHODS | 8 |
| IV. REMBRANDT’S POST-HOC JUSTIFICATION FOR ITS “ <i>AD HOMINEM</i> ” ATTACKS IS INADEQUATE | 9 |
| V. REMBRANDT’S WITHDRAWAL OF CLAIMS ON THE EVE OF TRIAL WARRANTS JMOL OF NON-INFRINGEMENT AS TO THOSE CLAIMS | 10 |
| VI. CONCLUSION | 10 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| CASES | Page(s) |
|---|----------------|
| <i>ABT Sys. v. Emerson Elec. Co.</i> , – F.3d at –, 2015 WL 4924160 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 19, 2015) | 1, 5, 7, 8 |
| <i>Agrizap, Inc. v. Woodstream Corp.</i> , 520 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... | 1 |
| <i>Alcon Research Ltd. v. Barr Laboratories, Inc.</i> , 745 F.3d 1180 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... | 10 |
| <i>Ayyst Techs., Inc. v. Emtrak, Inc.</i> , 544 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... | 1, 5 |
| <i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... | 3 |
| <i>Ecolab, Inc. v. FMC Corp.</i> , 569 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... | 1, 5 |
| <i>Harari v. Lee</i> , 656 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... | 8 |
| <i>In re Mouttet</i> , 686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... | 4 |
| <i>In re Nomiya</i> , 509 F.2d 566 (CCPA 1975)..... | 6 |
| <i>In re Paulsen</i> , 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994)..... | 9 |
| <i>Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. Compuserve Inc.</i> , 256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... | 8 |
| <i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... | 4 |
| <i>MobileMedia Ideas LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , 780 F.3d 1159 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... | 1 |
| <i>New Trend Foods, LLC v. Kato Suchi Rest.</i> , No. M-06-330, 2008 WL 901568 (S.D. Tex. Mar. 31, 2008) | 10 |
| <i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... | 7, 8 |

Seachange Int'l, Inc. v. C-COR, Inc.,
 413 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 9

Soverain Software LLC v. Newegg Inc.,
 705 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2013),
 rev'g 836 F. Supp. 2d 462 (E.D. Tex. 2010) 1, 7, 8

Wyers v. Master Lock Co.,
 616 F.3d 1231 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 7

STATUTES

Fed. R. Civ. P.
 50(b) 10
 59(a)..... 1

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

| Abbreviation | Description |
|--------------|---|
| BI | Samsung Defendants' Rules 50(b) Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law and/or Rule 59(a) Motion for New Trial on Liability Issues, filed August 7, 2015, Dkt. 329 |
| CC Opp. | Defendants' Joint Claim Construction Response Brief, filed May 1, 2014, Dkt. 102 |
| CC Tr. | Transcript of <i>Markman</i> Hearing held May 30, 2014 before Magistrate Judge Payne, Dkt. 111 |
| DI | Docket Item |
| DX | Defendants' Trial Exhibit |
| RI | Rembrandt's Response in Opposition to Samsung Defendants' Rule 50(b) Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law and/or Rule 59(a) Motion for New Trial on Liability Issues, filed September 7, 2015, Dkt. 335 |

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.