

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

REMBRANDT WIRELESS
TECHNOLOGIES, LP

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. 2:13-CV-213

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO. LTD.;
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
AMERICA, LLC; AND SAMSUNG
TELECOMMUNICATIONS
AMERICA, LLC.

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

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 A NEW TRIAL ON LIABILITY ISSUES

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. TECHNICAL BACKGROUND 1

III. LEGAL STANDARDS 4

IV. ARGUMENT..... 5

 A. Samsung Failed To Prove By Clear And Convincing Evidence That Rembrandt’s Patents Were Invalid As Obvious..... 5

 1. None Of The Prior Art, Including The Boer Patent And The Lucent Press Release, Discloses “Different Types” Of Modulation Methods..... 7

 2. Samsung Failed To Prove That It Would Be Obvious to Combine a Master/Slave Protocol With The Boer Patent. 9

 3. Samsung Did Not Establish That The Prior Art Teaches Reversion. 13

 4. Samsung Failed To Prove Claim 21 Of The ‘228 Patent Is Obvious. 15

 5. Samsung Failed to Make a *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness as to the Asserted Claims..... 17

 6. The Jury’s Verdict Is Consistent With The PTO’s Validity Decisions After Considering The Same Prior Art..... 18

 7. Secondary Considerations Support The Jury’s Conclusion Of Nonobviousness. 19

 8. There Were No Improper *Ad Hominem* Attacks, And A New Trial Is Not Warranted..... 20

 B. The Court Correctly Construed the Term “Of A Different Type.”..... 23

 C. Samsung Is Not Entitled to Judgment as a Matter of Law on Unasserted Claims 1, 19, 23, 29, 41, 52, and 58 of the ‘580 Patent or Unasserted Claims 1, 26, 28, 29, 50, and 51 of the ‘228 Patent..... 29

V. CONCLUSION..... 31

Table of Authorities

Cases

Alcon Research Ltd. v. Barr Labs., Inc.,
745 F.3d 1180 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 30

Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.,
2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 13616 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 4, 2015) 12

Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.,
477 U.S. 242 (1986)..... 4

Cassidian Comms., Inc. v. microDATA GIS, Inc.,
2:12-CV-162-JRG, Dkt. 201 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 8, 2014)..... 14

Circuit Check, Inc. v. QXQ Inc.,
2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 13620 (Fed. Cir. July 28, 2015)..... 16

Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.,
No. 2:07-CV-341, Dkt. 361 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 29, 2010)..... 23

Dresser–Rand Co. v. Virtual Automation Inc.,
361 F.3d 831 (5th Cir. 2004) 4

Edwards v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.,
512 F.2d 276 (5th Cir. 1975) 21

Eiland v. Westinghouse Elec. Corp.,
58 F.3d 176 (5th Cir. 1995) 5

Eli Lilly v. Zenith Goldline Pharms.,
471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 18

Finisar Corp. v. DirecTV Group, Inc.,
523 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 13

Flowers v. S. Reg’l Physician Servs.,
247 F.3d 229 (5th Cir. 2001) 24

Foradori v. Harris,
523 F.3d 477 (5th Cir. 2008) 25

Fractus, S.A. v. Samsung Elec. Co., Ltd.,
No. 6:09-CV-2030-LED, Dkt. 1113 (E.D. Tex. June 28, 2012)..... 6

Gautreaux v. Scurlock Marine, Inc.,
84 F.3d 776 (5th Cir. 1996) 21

Hall v. Freese,
735 F.2d 956 (5th Cir. 1984) 21

i4i Ltd. P’ship v. Microsoft Corp.,
598 F.3d 831 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 7

In re Geisler,
116 F.3d 1465 (Fed. Cir. 1997)..... 10

..

In re Gurley,
27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994)..... 11

In re Mouttet,
686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 11

Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.,
512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 14

InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGo Communs., Inc.,
751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 12, 14

IPPV Enterprises, LLC v. Echostar Comms., Corp.,
191 F. Supp. 2d 530 (D. Del. 2002)..... 15

Johnson v. Ford Motor Co.,
988 F.2d 573 (5th Cir. 1993) 21

Jones v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.,
870 F.2d 982 (5th Cir. 1989) 5

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398, 416 (2007)..... 10, 12

Lazare Kaplan Int’l, Inc. v. Photocscribe Techs., Inc.,
628 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 27

Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Limited P’ ship,
131 S. Ct. 2238 (2011)..... 5

Nobelpharma AB v. Implant Innovations, Inc.,
141 F.3d 1059 (Fed. Cir. 1998)..... 6

O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.,
521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 27

Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.,
806 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1986)..... 5

PACT XPP Tech., AG v. Xilinx, Inc.,
No. 2:07-CV-563-RSP, Dkt. 441 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 28, 2013)..... 6, 29

Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.,
480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 6

Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int’l, Inc.,
711 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 19

Reading & Bates Constr. Co. v. Baker Energy Resources Corp.,
748 F.2d 645 (Fed. Cir. 1984)..... 16

Reeves v. Sanderson Plumbing Prods., Inc.,
530 U.S. 133 (2000)..... 4, 11

Retractable Techs., Inc. v. Occupational & Med. Innovations, LTD,
No. 6:08-CV-120, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 82069 (E.D. Tex. Aug 11, 2010) 29

...

Riverwood Int’l Corp. v. R.A. Jones & Co.,
324 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 15

Sciele Pharma, Inc. v. Lupin Ltd.,
684 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 16

Sibley v. Lemaire,
184 F.3d 481 (5th Cir. 1999) 28

Soverain Software LLC v. Newegg Inc.,
836 F. Supp. 2d 462 (E.D. Tex. 2010)..... 6

Spectralytics, Inc. v. Cordis Corp.,
649 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 4, 8, 11

Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficoso N. Am. Corp.,
299 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2002)..... 28

The Proctor & Gamble Co. v. Team Tech. Inc.,
No. 12-CV-552, Dkt. 130 (S.D. Ohio, July 3, 2014)..... 19

TQP Dev., LLC v. 1-800-Flowers.Com, Inc.,
2:11-CV-248-JRG, Dkt. 464 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 17, 2015)..... 4

Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Drilling United States, Inc.,
699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 19

U.S. v. Adams,
383 U.S. 39 (1966)..... 13

U.S. v. Morin,
627 F.3d 985 (5th Cir. 2010) 21

Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.,
655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 12, 18

Wahpeton Canvas Co. v. Frontier, Inc.,
870 F.2d 1546 (Fed. Cir. 1989)..... 30

WesternGeco L.L.C. v. ION Geophysical Corp.,
953 F. Supp. 2d 731 (S.D. Tex. 2013)..... 28

Whitehead v. Food Max of Miss., Inc.,
163 F.3d 265 (5th Cir. 1998) 5, 23

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 282..... 5

Rules

FED. R. CIV. P. 50(b)..... 30

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.