

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION**

SCRAMOGE TECHNOLOGY LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,  
AND SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS  
AMERICA, INC.,

Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Civil Action No. 6:21-cv-00454-ADA

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

**SAMSUNG'S PRELIMINARY INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Defendants Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (collectively, “Samsung”) hereby make the following Preliminary disclosure of Invalidity Contentions (“Preliminary Invalidity Contentions”) to Plaintiff Scramoge Technology Ltd. (“Scramoge”).

These contentions address only the claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 9,553,476 (“the ’476 Patent”), 9,825,482 (“the ’482 Patent”), 9,843,215 (“the ’215 Patent”), 9,997,962 (“the ’962 Patent”), 10,367,370 (“the ’370 Patent”), and 10,424,941 (“the ’941 Patent”), (collectively, the “Asserted Patents”) asserted in Scramoge’s Preliminary Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions (“Infringement Contentions”) served on September 7, 2021.

Scramoge has asserted the following claims (collectively, the “asserted claims”) against Samsung:

- **The ’476 Patent:** Claims 1-15
- **The ’482 Patent:** Claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, 13, 15-19, and 21
- **The ’215 Patent:** Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-13, and 17-22.
- **The ’962 Patent:** Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 18, and 19.
- **The ’370 Patent:** Claims 1-4, 7-9, and 12-18
- **The ’941 Patent:** Claims 1-4, 6, and 7.

With respect to each asserted claim and based on its investigation to date, Samsung hereby: (a) identifies each item of prior art that anticipates and/or renders obvious each asserted claim; (b) specifies whether each such item of prior art anticipates each asserted claim and/or renders it obvious, and, if it renders it obvious, explains why the prior art renders the asserted claim obvious and identifies any combinations of prior art showing obviousness; (c) submits a

chart identifying where specifically in each item of prior art each limitation of each asserted claim is found; and (d) identifies the grounds of invalidity based on 35 U.S.C. § 112.<sup>1</sup>

In addition, pursuant to the Standing Order Governing Patent Proceedings, and based on its investigation to date, Samsung has produced or is producing documents concurrently with these Preliminary Invalidity Contentions.

## II. RESERVATIONS

Samsung reserves the right to amend these Preliminary Invalidity Contentions. The information and documents that Samsung produces are based on information available to date and are subject to further revision. Samsung expressly reserves the right to amend these disclosures and the accompanying document production should Scramoge provide any additional information that it failed to provide in its Infringement Contentions.

Further, because discovery (including discovery from third parties) has not yet begun, Samsung reserves the right to revise, amend, and/or supplement the information provided herein, including identifying and relying on additional references, should Samsung's further search and analysis yield additional information or references, consistent with the Standing Order Governing Patent Cases and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Samsung reserves the right to rely on additional prior art; further analysis of prior art; application of prior art to new or different claims; depositions and discovery from prior art sources and authors; analysis of prior art products; combinations of references; expert opinion and/or testimony; evidence supporting invalidity of any asserted claim; and any additional relevant information that may result from its further

---

<sup>1</sup> According to the Preliminary Infringement Contentions, Plaintiff contends that the claims of the '476 and '482 patents are entitled to a priority date before March 16, 2013 (*see* Preliminary Infringement Contentions at 5) and that the claims of the '962, '215, '370, and '941 patents are entitled to a priority date after March 16, 2013 (*see id.*). As discussed further herein, Samsung does not agree that the claims are entitled to the priority dates set forth in the Preliminary Infringement Contentions. But unless otherwise specified, the invalidity grounds discussed in these Preliminary Invalidity Contentions are applicable under both pre-AIA and post-AIA law.

investigation and discovery. Additionally, Samsung reserves the right to rely on additional information, testimony, and/or analysis concerning operation of prior art systems. Moreover, Samsung reserves the right to revise its ultimate contentions concerning the invalidity of the asserted claims, which may change depending upon the Court's construction of the asserted claims, any findings as to the priority or invention date of the asserted claims, and/or positions that Scramoge or its expert witness(es) may take concerning claim construction, infringement, and/or invalidity issues.

Prior art not included in this disclosure, whether known or unknown to Samsung, may become relevant. In particular, Samsung is currently unaware of the extent, if any, to which Scramoge will contend that limitations of the asserted claims are not disclosed in the prior art identified by Samsung, or will contend that any of the identified references do not qualify as prior art. The identification of any patent or patent publication shall be deemed to include any counterpart patent or application filed, published, or issued anywhere in the world.

The information and documents that Samsung produces are based on Samsung's present understanding of Scramoge's infringement theories as advanced by Scramoge in its Infringement Contentions. Scramoge's Infringement Contentions are deficient in numerous respects. For example, Scramoge has failed to specifically identify where each element of each Asserted Claim is found within each accused instrumentality, and does not identify a specific mapping from components of the accused instrumentalities to the elements of the asserted claims. Scramoge has also failed to present any contentions for infringement under the doctrine of equivalents. Scramoge has not provided detailed infringement contentions that identify each specific claim limitation allegedly infringed under the doctrine of equivalents and its alleged equivalent element in the accused instrumentalities, or the basis for purported insubstantial differences between each

such limitation and its alleged equivalent. If Scramoge attempts or is permitted to cure such deficiencies, doing so may lead to further grounds for invalidity, and thus Samsung specifically reserves the right to modify, amend, or supplement its contentions. If Scramoge is granted leave to amend its contentions, or other additional information regarding Scramoge's infringement theories becomes available, Samsung anticipates that it will provide corresponding invalidity contentions which establish that, under Scramoge's interpretation of the claim scope as set forth in its Infringement Contentions, the asserted patents read on the prior art.

Further, Scramoge has not produced prior art known to it, including regarding any known prior art products. As discovery in this action provides Samsung with additional information, Samsung may serve subpoenas on third parties believed to have knowledge, documentation, and/or corroborating evidence relating to invalidity and/or prior art. It is therefore likely that Samsung will discover additional prior art pertinent to the invalidity of the asserted claims and Samsung reserves the right to supplement these contentions after becoming aware of additional prior art or information. Samsung further reserves the right to introduce and use such supplemental materials at trial.

Samsung's claim charts in Exhibits A-F cite particular teachings and disclosures of the prior art as applied to features of the asserted claims. However, persons having ordinary skill in the art may view an item of prior art generally in the context of other publications, literature, products, and understanding. Accordingly, the cited portions are only exemplary, and Samsung reserves the right to rely on uncited portions of the prior art references and on other publications and expert testimony as aids in understanding and interpreting the cited portions, as providing context thereto, and as additional evidence that a claim limitation is known or disclosed. Citations to figures are inclusive of all discussion of those figures. Samsung further reserves the right to

# 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.