

**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.

Case No. 6:21-cv-00454-ADA

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**PLAINTIFF’S PRELIMINARY DISCLOSURE OF ASSERTED CLAIMS AND
INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS TO SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO. LTD. AND
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.**

Scramoge Technology Limited (“Plaintiff” or “Scramoge”) submits the following Preliminary Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions to Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (“Defendants” or “Samsung”). This disclosure is based on the information available to Scramoge as of the date of this disclosure, and Scramoge reserves the right to amend this disclosure to the full extent consistent with the Court’s Rules and Orders.

I. Asserted Claims

Scramoge asserts that Samsung has infringed and continue to infringe at least the following claims of Scramoge’s patents (collectively, the “Asserted Claims”):

- a. **U.S. Patent No. 9,553,476 (“the ’476 Patent”):** Claims 1-15.
- b. **U.S. Patent No. 9,825,482 (“the ’482 Patent”):** Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 21.

- c. **U.S. Patent No. 9,997,962 (“the ’962 Patent”)**: Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 18, and 19.
- d. **U.S. Patent No. 9,843,215 (“the ’215 Patent”)**: Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22.
- e. **U.S. Patent No. 10,367,370 (“the ’370 Patent”)**: Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18.
- f. **U.S. Patent No. 10,424,941 (“the ’941 Patent”)**: Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7.

Scramoge reserves the right to seek leave of court to add, delete, substitute, or otherwise amend this list of asserted claims should further discovery, the Court’s claim construction, or other circumstances so merit.

II. Accused Products

Scramoge contends that the Asserted Claims are infringed by the various apparatuses used, made, sold, offered for sale, or imported into the United States by Samsung (the “Accused Products”). The Accused Products include at least the following, as well as products with reasonably similar functionality, and all Edge, Plus (+), Active, Lite, 4G, and 5G varieties of these products:

- **The Asserted Claims of the ’476, ’962, ’215, and ’370 Patents:** Galaxy S6, S6 Edge, S7, S7 Edge, S8, Note 8, S9, Note 9, S9+, S10e, S10, S10+, S10 5G, Note 10, Note 10+, Note 10+ 5G, S20, S20 5G, S20+, S20+ 5G, S20 Ultra LTE/5G, Note 20, Note 20 5G, Note 20 Ultra 5G, S21, S21+, S21 Ultra, Fold, Z Fold2 5G, Z Fold 3, Z Flip, and Z Flip 3.
- **The Asserted Claims of the ’482 Patent:** Galaxy S6, S6 Edge, S6 Edge +, Note 5, S7, S7 Edge, S8, S8+. Note 8, S9, S9+, and Note 9.
- **The Asserted Claims of the ’941 Patent:** Galaxy Watch, Galaxy Watch3, Galaxy Watch 4, Galaxy Watch Active, and Galaxy Watch Active2.

Scramoge reserves the right to amend this list of accused instrumentalities, as well as other information contained in this document and the exhibits hereto, to incorporate new information learned during the course of discovery, including, but not limited to, the inclusion of newly released products, versions, or any other equivalent devices ascertained through discovery. Further, to the extent any accused infringing products have gone through or will go through name changes, but were or will be used or sold with the same accused features, earlier corresponding products under different names also are accused.

III. Claim Charts

Claim charts identifying a location of every element of every asserted claim of the asserted Scramoge Patents within accused products are attached hereto as Exhibits A–F. Scramoge’s analysis of the Accused Products is based on limited publicly available information and based on Scramoge’s own investigation prior to any discovery in this action. In an effort to focus the issues, Scramoge identifies exemplary evidence for each claim limitation. The evidence cited for a particular limitation should be considered in light of the additional evidence cited for the other claim limitations. Scramoge reserves the right to rely on evidence cited for any particular limitation of an asserted claim for any other limitation asserted for that claim. Unless otherwise indicated, the information provided that corresponds to each claim element is considered to indicate that each claim element is found within each of the different variations of each respective Accused Products described above.

Scramoge reserves the right to amend these claim charts, as well as other information contained in this document and the exhibits hereto. Scramoge further reserves the right to amend these claim charts to incorporate new information learned during the course of discovery,

including, but not limited to, information that is not publicly available or readily discernible without discovery or undue burden.

IV. Literal Infringement / Doctrine of Equivalents

Scramoge contends that Samsung has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe the asserted claims by making, using, offering for sale, selling, and importing into the United States the Accused Products. Scramoge asserts that, under the proper construction of the asserted claims and their claim terms, the limitations of the asserted claims of the asserted Scramoge patents are literally present in the accused products, as set forth in the claim charts attached hereto as Exhibits A–F. Scramoge contends that any and all elements found not to be literally infringed are infringed under the doctrine of equivalents because the differences between the claimed inventions and the accused instrumentalities, if any, are insubstantial.

Scramoge’s contention is that each limitation is literally met, and necessarily also would be met under the doctrine of equivalents because there are no substantial differences between the Accused Products and the claims, in function, way, or result. If Samsung attempts to argue that there is no infringement literally and also no infringement under doctrine of equivalents and attempts to draw any distinction between the claimed functionality and the functionality in the Accused Products, then Scramoge reserves its right to rebut the alleged distinction as a matter of literal infringement and/or as to whether any such distinction is substantial under the doctrine of equivalents.

Scramoge reserves the right to amend its Infringement Contentions as to literal infringement or infringement under the doctrine of equivalents in light of new information learned during the course of discovery and the Court’s claim construction.

V. Priority Dates

The Asserted Claims are entitled to a priority date of at least the following:

- a. **U.S. Patent No. 9,553,476:** Each asserted claim of the '476 Patent is entitled to at least a priority date of March 23, 2012.
- b. **U.S. Patent No. 9,825,482:** Each asserted claim of the '482 Patent is entitled to at least a priority date of October 4, 2012.
- c. **U.S. Patent No. 9,997,962:** Each asserted claim of the '962 Patent is entitled to at least a priority date of June 27, 2013.
- d. **U.S. Patent No. 9,843,215:** Each asserted claim of the '215 Patent is entitled to at least a priority date of March 4, 2014.
- e. **U.S. Patent No. 10,367,370:** Each asserted claim of the '370 Patent is entitled to at least a priority date of March 4, 2014.
- f. **U.S. Patent No. 10,424,941:** Each asserted claim of the '941 Patent is entitled to at least a priority date of January 28, 2014.

VI. Identification of Instrumentalities Practicing the Claimed Inventions

At this time, Scramoge is not relying on any assertion that any of its own instrumentalities practice the claims of the Asserted Patents.

VII. Document Production Accompanying Disclosure

Scramoge submits the following Document Production Accompanying Disclosure, along with an identification of the categories to which each of the documents corresponds.

Scramoge is presently unaware of any documents sufficient to evidence any discussion with, disclosure to, or other manner of providing to a third party, or sale of or offer to sell, the inventions recited in the Asserted Claims of the asserted patents prior to the application date or

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.