



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

MAXELL, LTD.,

Plaintiff

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action NO. 5:19-cv-00036-RWS

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED



**APPLE INC.'S MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF
MAXELL'S OPENING EXPERT REPORTS THAT
EXCEED THE SCOPE OF MAXELL'S P.R. 3-1 INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS
AND NEW EXPERT THEORIES OFFERED AFTER EXPERT REPORTS**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MATERIAL FACTS	1
III. ARGUMENT	3
A. Maxell’s New Infringement Theories In Its Opening Expert Reports Should Be Struck	3
1. [REDACTED]	3
2. [REDACTED]	6
3. [REDACTED]	7
B. Maxell’s New Theories Offered in the Deposition of Dr. Tim Williams Should Be Precluded.....	9
1. Dr. Williams’s Opinion On ’586 Patent Claim 1 Is New.....	9
2. Dr. Williams’s Undisclosed Expert Opinion Should Be Excluded as Untimely and Prejudicial.....	12
3. Dr. Williams’s New Opinion is An Unreliable Claim Construction Opinion.....	12
C. Exclusion Is Necessary To Prevent Prejudice	13
IV. CONCLUSION.....	14



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases

Arterbury v. Odessa Separator, Inc.,
No. 5:16-CV-00183-RWS-RSP, 2019 WL 6700978 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 22, 2019) 8

Biscotti Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.,
No. 2:23-CV-01015-JRG-RSP, 2017 WL 2267283 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 22, 2019)..... 5, 7

Chrimar Sys., Inc. v. Alcatel-Lucent USA, Inc.,
No. 6:15-CV-163-JDL, 2016 WL 11673971 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 27, 2016)..... 9

Computer Acceleration Corp. v. Microsoft Corp.,
503 F. Supp. 2d 819 (2007) 3

Connectel, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.,
391 F. Supp. 2d 526 (E.D. Tex. 2005) 3

Cordis Corp. v. Boston Sci. Corp.,
561 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 13

Motorola, Inc. v. Analog Devices, Inc.,
No. 1:03-CV-131, 2004 WL 5633736 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 20, 2004)..... 1, 14

Opal Run LLC v. C&A Marketing, Inc.,
No. 2:16-CV-24-JRG-RSP, 2017 WL 3381344 (E.D. Tex. May 15, 2017)..... 7

Realtime Data, LLC v. Morgan Stanley,
554 F. App'x 923 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 8

Realtime Data, LLC v. Packeteer, Inc.,
No. 6:08-CV-144, 2009 WL 2590101 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 18, 2009)..... 3

ROY-G-BIV Corp. v. ABB, Ltd.,
63 F. Supp. 3d 690 (E.D. Tex. 2014)..... 3

Sycamore IP Holdings LLC v. AT&T Corp.,
No. 2:16-CV-588-WCB, 2017 WL 4517953 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 10, 2017)..... 8

Rules

Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a) 1

Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2)(B)(i)..... 1, 12

Apple v. Maxell



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(CONTINUED)

Page

Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(c)(1).....	1, 12
Fed. R. Evid. 702	13

I. INTRODUCTION

Local Patent Rule 3-1’s requirement “that a party state it[s] preliminary infringement contentions shortly after the initial case management conference is specifically designed to require parties to crystalize their theories of the case, and to prevent a ‘shifting sands’ approach to patent litigation.” *Motorola, Inc. v. Analog Devices, Inc.*, No. 1:03-CV-131, 2004 WL 5633736, at *1 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 20, 2004). Yet nearly a year after infringement contentions were due, Maxell served expert reports that raise new allegations and theories for the first time.

In addition, Rule 26 requires that expert reports contain “a complete statement of all opinions the witness will express and the basis and reasons for them.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2)(B)(i). When a party fails to provide the information required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a), “the party is not allowed to use that information or witness to supply evidence on a motion, at a hearing, or at a trial, unless the failure was substantially justified or is harmless.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(c)(1).

Maxell did not provide Apple with notice of these new theories, as required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and this District’s Patent Rules, and thus Apple respectfully requests that the Court grant this motion and strike these new theories.

II. MATERIAL FACTS

Maxell served three sets of infringement contentions. Maxell’s Original Infringement Contentions were served in June 2019, the P.R. 3-1 deadline. After Apple produced source code, Maxell served its First Supplemental Infringement Contentions in October 2019. However, rather than identify “what source code allegedly satisfies the software limitations” as required by P.R. 3-1(g), this Court found that Maxell cited “a large number of undifferentiated source code files and folders insufficiently tied to the accused functionalities without explanation.” D.I. 204 at 5. The Court thus ordered Maxell to supplement its contentions. D.I. 223 at 2–3. In March

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.