

PUBLIC VERSION

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

MAXELL, LTD.,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

APPLE INC.,

*Defendants.*

Civil Action No. 5:19-cv-00036

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

PUBLIC VERSION

---

**MAXELL, LTD.'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF NO INVALIDITY  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103 OF CLAIMS 7, 16, AND 17 OF  
U.S. PATENT NO. 10,212,586**

PUBLIC VERSION

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	LEGAL STANDARD.....	1
	A. Summary Judgment .....	1
	B. Invalidity.....	2
III.	STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS .....	3
IV.	STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES FOR THE COURT TO DECIDE .....	4
V.	ARGUMENT .....	4
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	8

PUBLIC VERSION

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Balivi Chem. Corp. v. JMC Ventilation Refrigeration LLC</i> , No. 1:07-cv-353, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 65695 (D. Idaho, June 29, 2010) .....	2, 3
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986) .....	1
<i>Eason v. Thaler</i> , 73 F.3d 1322 (5th Cir. 1996) .....	1
<i>Eli Lilly and Co. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 251 F.3d 955 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	2
<i>Forsyth v. Barr</i> , 19 F.3d 1527 (5th Cir. 1994) .....	1
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966) .....	2
<i>Ivera Med. Corp. v. Hospira, Inc.</i> , 801 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	2
<i>Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.</i> , 475 U.S. 574 (1986) .....	1
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Limited Partnership</i> , 131 S. Ct. 2238 (2011) .....	2
<i>Ragas v. Tenn. Gas Pipeline Co.</i> , 136 F.3d 455 (5th Cir. 1998) .....	1
<i>Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc. v. Arthrex, Inc.</i> , 355 F. App'x 384 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	2
<i>ThinkOptics, Inc. v. Nintendo of Am., Inc.</i> , No. 6:11-cv- 455, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91036 (E.D. Tex. July 3, 2014) .....	1, 2
<b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 102 .....	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	<i>passim</i>

..

35 U.S.C. § 282.....2

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c) .....1

**Other Authorities**

U.S. Patent No. 10,212,586..... *passim*

U.S. Patent No. 6,871,063 (Schiffer)..... *passim*

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0041746 (Kirkup) ..... *passim*

...

## PUBLIC VERSION

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Maxell moves for summary judgment of no invalidity of the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 10,212,586 (Ex. 1,<sup>1</sup> “the ’586 Patent”) because Apple’s only prior art reference relied on fails to disclose the “memory” limitations in the asserted claims. Under these circumstances, Apple cannot meet its steep burden of proving invalidity at trial, and summary judgment of no invalidity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 is warranted.

**II. LEGAL STANDARD****A. Summary Judgment**

Summary judgment shall be rendered when there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c); *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 323-25 (1986); *Ragas v. Tenn. Gas Pipeline Co.*, 136 F.3d 455, 458 (5th Cir. 1998). If the moving party has made an initial showing that there is no evidence to support the nonmoving party’s case, the party opposing the motion must assert competent summary judgment evidence of the existence of a genuine fact issue. *Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 586 (1986); *ThinkOptics, Inc. v. Nintendo of Am., Inc.*, No. 6:11-cv-455, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91036, at \*5 (E.D. Tex. July 3, 2014). Mere conclusory allegations, unsubstantiated assertions, improbable inferences, and unsupported speculation are not competent summary judgment evidence. *See Eason v. Thaler*, 73 F.3d 1322, 1325 (5th Cir. 1996); *Forsyth v. Barr*, 19 F.3d 1527, 1533 (5th Cir. 1994). Summary judgment must be granted if the nonmoving party fails to make a showing sufficient to establish the existence of an element essential to its case and on which it will bear the burden of proof at trial. *Celotex*, 477 U.S. at 322-23.

---

<sup>1</sup> References to “Ex.” throughout this brief refer to the Declaration of Michael L. Lindinger filed concurrently herewith.

# 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.