

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

MAXELL, LTD.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

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

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

DEFENDANT APPLE INC.'S FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS
PURSUANT TO PATENT LOCAL RULES 3-3 AND 3-4

Apple v. Maxell

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the Court’s Docket Control Order entered July 9, 2019 (D.I. 46) and Patent Local Rules 3-3 and 3-4, Defendant Apple Inc. (“Apple”) provided its preliminary invalidity contentions to Maxell, Ltd. (“Maxell”) for the asserted claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,748,317 (“the ’317 patent”); 6,580,999 (“the ’999 patent”); 8,339,493 (“the ’493 patent”); 7,116,438 (“the ’438 patent”); 6,408,193 (“the ’193 patent”); 10,084,991 (“the ’991 patent”); 6,928,306 (“the ’306 patent”); 6,329,794 (“the ’794 patent”); 10,212,586 (“the ’586 patent”); 6,430,498 (“the ’498 patent”) (collectively, the “Asserted Patents”) on August 14, 2019. Pursuant to the Court’s February 24, 2020 Order Granting Apple’s Motion for Leave to Amend Invalidity Contentions (D.I. 201), Apple provides these supplemental invalidity contentions (“First Supplemental Invalidity Contentions”), which are subject to Apple’s Preliminary Election Of Prior Art, served on November 18, 2019.

Based on Maxell’s First Supplemental Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions (“Supplemental Infringement Contentions”) served on October 15, 2019, Maxell is asserting claims 1-3, 5-15, 17, and 18 of the ’317 patent; claims 1-6 of the ’999 patent; claims 1, 3-6, 10, and 11 of the ’493 patent; claims 1-7 of the ’438 patent; claims 1, 6, and 7 of the ’193 patent; claims 1-5 and 8-12 of the ’991 patent; claims 2, 5, 6, and 12-15 of the ’306 patent; claims 1-3 and 5-14 of the ’794 patent; claims 1-2, 6-7, 9-10, 13-14, and 16-18 of the ’586 patent; and claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, and 13 of the ’498 patent (collectively, “the Asserted Claims”), which are subject to Maxell’s Preliminary Election of Asserted Claims, served on November 6, 2019. Apple addresses the invalidity of the Asserted Claims in these First Supplemental Invalidity Contentions, and concludes with a description of its document production and identification of additional reservations and explanations.

These First Supplemental Invalidity Contentions are based on the claim constructions or

interpretations likely to be advanced by Maxell (as reflected in Maxell’s Complaint and Infringement Contentions), and are not necessarily based on what Apple contends are the proper constructions. By applying Maxell’s apparent constructions and/or interpretations, Apple does not concede in any way that those constructions are correct, and instead expressly reserves the right to oppose those constructions. Apple expressly reserves the right to amend these First Supplemental Invalidity Contentions after the Court has construed all relevant claim terms under P.R. 3-6. Furthermore, some of Apple’s contentions herein are based on infringement allegations made by Maxell. Apple does not concede in any way that those infringement allegations are correct, but rather asserts the fundamental principle that whatever infringes a claim if later in time must anticipate if earlier in time. These First Supplemental Invalidity Contentions use the acronym “PHOSITA” to refer to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the alleged invention pertains around the respective priority dates alleged by Maxell.

Apple hereby incorporates by reference all Invalidity Contentions against any of the Asserted Patents or their related patents from prior cases, including, but not limited to, the Invalidity Contentions served by the defendants in *Hitachi Maxell, Ltd. v. Huawei Device USA, Inc.*, Case No. 5:16-CV-00178-RWS (E.D. Tex.); *Hitachi Maxell, Ltd. v. ZTE Corp.*, Case No. 5:16-CV-00179-RWS (E.D. Tex.); *Maxell, Ltd. v. ASUSTEK Computer Inc.*, Case No. 2:17-cv-7528-R-MRW (C.D. Cal.); and *Maxell, Ltd. v. ASUSTEK Computer Inc.*, Case No. 3:18-cv-01788-VD (N.D. Cal.). Maxell is already in possession of these Invalidity Contentions and associated claim charts. Apple further incorporates by reference all prior art cited during prosecution of the Asserted Patents, and all *inter partes* review (IPR) petitions filed against the Asserted Patents and the prior art cited in these IPR petitions, including, but not limited to, IPR2018-00235, IPR2019-00071, IPR2018-00236, IPR2018-00904, IPR2018-00241, IPR2018-00237, and IPR2019-00640.

II. '317, '999, AND '498 PATENTS

The '498 patent was filed with the United States Patent and Trademark Office on July 11, 2000. The '999 patent was filed with the United States Patent and Trademark Office on June 18, 2002 as a continuation of Application No. 09/613,634 (filed on July 11, 2000; issued as the '498 patent). The '317 patent was filed with the United States Patent and Trademark Office on May 5, 2000 as a continuation of Application No. 10/173,423 (filed on June 18, 2001; issued as the '999 patent), which in turn was filed as a continuation of Application No. 09/613,634 (filed on July 11, 2000). In its Infringement Contentions, Maxell claims a priority date of July 12, 1999 for the '317, '999, and '498 patents. Apple reserves the right to serve additional or modified invalidity contentions should Maxell be permitted to amend or modify its claimed priority date.

A. Prior Art

Apple identifies the following prior art now known to Apple to anticipate and/or render obvious one or more claims of the '317, '999, and '498 patents under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a), (b), (e), (g), and/or 103.

1. Prior Art Patents and Publications

The following patents and publications are prior art for the Asserted Claims of the '317, '999, and '498 patents under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a), (b), (e), and/or (g). Invalidity claim charts for these references are attached as Exhibits A1 through A21.

1. Japanese Patent Publication No. JPH08-285613 to Akiyama et al. ("Akiyama"), published on November 1, 1996.
2. Japanese Patent Publication No. JPH10-197277 to Maruyama et al. ("Maruyama"), published on July 31, 1998.
3. U.S. Patent No. 5,781,150 to Norris ("Norris"), filed on October 13, 1995 and issued on July 14, 1998.
4. Cyberguide: A Mobile Context-Aware Tour Guide by Abowd et al. ("Abowd"), published on September 29, 1998.

5. PCT Application US98/17237 (WO 99/09374) to Knockeart, et al. (“Knockeart”), published on February 25, 1999.
6. U.S. Patent No. 6,067,502 to Hayashida et al. (“Hayashida”), filed on August 21, 1997 and issued on May 23, 2000.
7. U.S. Patent No. 5,815,411 to Ellenby, et al. (“Ellenby”), filed on September 10, 1993 and issued on September 29, 1998.
8. Japanese Patent Publication No. JPH09-311625 to Ikeda (“Ikeda”), published on December 2, 1997.
9. Japanese Patent No. JPH05-264711 (“Yokoyama” or the “’711 Patent”), published on October 12, 1993.
10. U.S. Patent No. 5,589,835 to Gildea et al. (“Gildea”), filed on December 20, 1994 and issued on December 31, 1996.
11. U.S. Patent No. 6,525,768 to Obradovich (“Obradovich”), filed on October 21, 1999 based on Provisional Application No. 60/105,050 (“the ’050 Application”) filed on October 21, 1998, and issued on February 25, 2003.¹
12. U.S. Patent No. 5,592,382 to Colley (“Colley”), issued on January 7, 1997.
13. USRE42,927 to Want et al. (“Want”) reissued from U.S. Patent No. 6,122,520, filed on February 13, 1998 and issued on September 19, 2000.

Apple’s investigation into prior art patent and publication references remains ongoing and Apple reserves the right to identify and rely on additional patent or publication references that describe or are otherwise related to the prior art systems identified below based on information

¹ The ’050 Application is substantively identical to Obradovich, including the same written description of the invention and figures illustrating the same. Where, as here, “the specification of the provisional” satisfies 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 for the “invention claimed in the non-provisional application,” the non-provisional patent qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as of the date of the filing date of its provisional application. *Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.*, 800 F.3d 1375, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2015); *see also New Railhead Mfg., L.L.C. v. Vermeer Mfg. Co.*, 298 F.3d 1290, 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (“[F]or the non-provisional utility application to be afforded the priority date of the provisional application, ... the written description of the provisional must adequately support the claims of the non-provisional application.”). Additionally, because the disclosures are substantively identical, all disclosures from Obradovich cited in these Invalidation Contentions are also contained in the ’050 Application. Accordingly, Obradovich qualifies as prior art to the ’317, ’498, and ’999 patents under at least 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as of the ’050 Application’s filing date of October 21, 1998.

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.