

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION

MULTIMEDIA TECHNOLOGIES PTE.  
LTD.,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

LG ELECTRONICS INC. and LG  
ELECTRONICS USA, INC.,

*Defendant.*

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case No. 2:22-cv-00494-JRG-RSP

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Before the Court is Defendants LG Electronics Inc. and LG Electronics USA, Inc.’s Motion to Dismiss Complaint for Failure to State a Claim. (**Dkt. No. 24.**) For the reasons that follow, the motion should be **GRANTED-IN-PART** and **DENIED-IN-PART**.

**I. APPLICABLE LAW**

A party may move to dismiss an action when the complaint fails “to state a claim upon which relief can be granted . . . .” FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(6). A complaint states a sufficient claim if it gives the defendant “fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (ellipsis in original) (citations omitted).

When considering a Rule 12 motion to dismiss, a court accepts “all well-pleaded facts as true and view[s] those facts in the light most favorable to the plaintiff.” *Bowlby v. City of Aberdeen, Miss.*, 681 F.3d 215, 219 (5th Cir. 2012) (citation omitted). The court may consider “the complaint, any documents attached to the complaint, and any documents attached to the motion to dismiss that are central to the claim and referenced by the complaint.” *Lone Star Fund V (U.S.), L.P. v. Barclays Bank PLC*, 594 F.3d 383, 387 (5th Cir. 2010) (citation omitted). The court must then

decide whether those facts “state a claim that is plausible on its face.” *Bowlby*, 681 F.3d at 219. “A claim has facial plausibility when the pleaded factual content allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Id.* (quoting *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009)).

This evaluation will “be a context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense.” *Ashcroft*, 556 U.S. at 679. “This standard ‘simply calls for enough facts to raise a reasonable expectation that discovery will reveal evidence of’ the necessary claims or elements.” *In re S. Scrap Material Co., LLC*, 541 F.3d 584, 587 (5th Cir. 2008) (quoting *Bell Atl.*, 550 U.S. at 556).

## II. ANALYSIS

LG argues that Multimedia has failed to state a claim as to direct, indirect, or willful infringement. (Mot. at 2-3.) LG contends that Multimedia merely parrots the same legal conclusion for all assertions of direct infringement, provides no factual basis for indirect infringement, and provides no support for willful infringement. (Mot. at 4.)

### A. DIRECT INFRINGEMENT

LG argues that Multimedia’s complaint fails as to direct infringement on three grounds: 1) Multimedia did not provide an effective element-by-element pleading; 2) Multimedia only pleaded certain accused devices were capable of infringing method claims and not that LG performed any infringing method; and 3) the complaint asserts infringement of products older than the patents. (Mot. at 6-23.)

LG contends that Multimedia’s complaint omits several limitations as to all patents, merely parrots the claim language as to others, and in others still provides factual assertions too vague to support the assertions in its complaint. (Mot. at 6-18.) In its motion and an accompanying exhibits,

LG identifies a variety of limitations or portions of limitations it alleges Multimedia's complaint does not discuss. (*Id.* at 6-11.) Citing cases outside of this district, LG contends "courts routinely dismiss claims that fail to address all limitations of an asserted claim as being inadequately pled." (*Id.* at 6.) LC further cites *Chapterhouse, LLC v. Shopify, Inc.*, No. 2:18-cv-00300-JRG, 2018 WL 6981828, at \*2 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 11, 2018) that a "mere conclusory statement" cannot support a claim of infringement without accompanying factual allegations. (*Id.* at 12, 17.)

LG further complains of Multimedia's allegations regarding method claims. (*Id.* at 18-21.) LG contends an assertion that "LG has directly infringed the [Asserted] Patent, and continues to do so, by providing a device capable of performing or that allows a user to perform the method of Claim 1" is deficient. (*Id.* at 19.) LG contends that because method claims are not infringed by the sale of capable products, only by practicing the method, Multimedia's assertions are deficient. (*Id.*) LG likewise argues Multimedia's assertion of LG's "making, having made, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing systems and methods..." is insufficient as Multimedia offers no factual support for its contention that LG is "using" and that, at minimum, the Court should dismiss allegations that making and sale infringe the method claims. (*Id.* at 20-21.)

LG complains of the allegations that "since 2014, the LG webOS operating system . . . has been installed on LG Smart TVs" and the assertion that all versions of the LG webOS infringe. (*Id.* at 21.) LG contends because several of the asserted patents did not issue until after 2015, such allegations should be dismissed. (*Id.* at 22.)

In response, Multimedia argues that LG misconstrues the law. (Opp. at 7-8.) Multimedia cites *Blitzsafe Tex. LLC v. Volkswagen Grp of Am., Inc.*, No. 2:15-cv-1274-JRG-RSP, 2016 WL 4778699, at \*4 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 16, 2016) that "asking the plaintiff to provide an element-by-element analysis of the accused device in the complaint does not advance the goals of the Federal

Rules of Civil Procedure. (*Id.* at 7.) Multimedia further distinguishes *Chapterhouse*, arguing there the complaint provided only a single conclusory statement that referred to a screenshot without explanation, whereas Multimedia has done significantly more here. (*Id.* at 7-8.) Multimedia argues it “identified the category of devices and technology that make up the Accused products” and “for each count it alleges, Multimedia identifies the ways by which those Accused Products infringe the relevant patent.” (*Id.* at 8.)

Multimedia further responds that its allegations of use are sufficient for the method claims. (*Id.* at 9.) Multimedia contends that LG uses its own Smart TVs for testing, marketing, and other purposes. (*Id.*) Multimedia also cites *Akamai v. Limelight Network*, 797 F.3d 1020 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (*en banc*), arguing that LG is also liable for direct infringement where all steps of a claimed method are attributed to LG. (*Id.*)

Further, Multimedia contends LG’s argument regarding old product versions goes to damages and is best resolved during the course of discovery and is not a matter of sufficiency to be decided here. (*Id.* at 9-10.)

Multimedia also argues that its infringement contentions moot LG’s argument that it should provide element-by-element allegations in its complaint. (*Id.* at 10-12.) LG replies to this argument contending that Multimedia is limited to its complaint for this issue and cannot point to external documents to meet its pleading burden. (Reply at 5-7.)

The Court finds that Multimedia has provided sufficiently definite allegations of infringement. The rules do not require an element-by-element analysis in the complaint. *See Blitzsafe Tex. LLC v. Volkswagen Grp of Am., Inc.*, No. 2:15-cv-1274-JRG-RSP, 2016 WL 4778699, at \*4 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 16, 2016). With this background, LG’s complaints largely fall away. Multimedia has identified the products it alleges infringe, the processes by which

Multimedia believes they infringe, and some tying of those processes to the language of the claims. This satisfies the requirement of “a short and plain statement of the claim showing the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2).<sup>1</sup>

Likewise, the Court finds Multimedia’s allegations of “use” of the method claims is sufficient. In light of the discussion Multimedia includes as to what processes infringe, Multimedia’s allegation of “use” is sufficiently clear to support its complaint.

Further, the Court finds that LG is correct that products in use prior to the issuance of the patents cannot infringe. As such, it is appropriate for this Court to dismiss claims as to such products.<sup>2</sup>

## **B. INDIRECT AND WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT**

LG contends, in addition to failing to plead direct infringement, Multimedia fails to sufficiently plead the knowledge and intent requirements of indirect and willful infringement. (Mot. at 23-29.)

LG contends Multimedia’s allegations of knowledge based on LG’s patent prosecution practices and LG’s patent monitoring practices is deficient. (*Id.* at 24.) LG contends such mere speculation is not an allegation that LG has knowledge of the asserted patents that might support Multimedia’s indirect and willfulness claims. (*Id.* at 24-25.) LG further contends that Multimedia’s single conclusory allegations of knowledge of infringement is also insufficient. (*Id.* at 25.)

---

<sup>1</sup> This should be clear in light of the no longer binding Form 18 in the Appendix of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Form 18 is a sample complaint for patent infringement consisting of only a few paragraphs and showing how simply a claim can be stated. *Estech Sys., Inc. v. Target Corp.*, No. 220CV00123JRGRSP, 2020 WL 6534094, at \*3 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 27, 2020), report and recommendation adopted, No. 220CV00123JRGRSP, 2021 WL 966017 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 12, 2021)

<sup>2</sup> This ruling is limited in that infringement is impossible prior to issuance. It should not be construed as a finding that the products do not practice the patent, that information regarding the products prior to the issuance of the patents is or is not discoverable, or that the products can constitute prior art. Such issues are separate.

# 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.