

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS

AMERICA, LLC,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 12-cv-02824-JPM-tmp

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA

INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 12-cv-02825-JPM-tmp

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

DEFENDANTS SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC AND
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA INC.'S OPPOSITION TO B.E.
TECHNOLOGY'S MOTION TO STRIKE AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. NATURE AND STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS2

III. PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO STRIKE SHOULD BE DENIED3

 A. Motions to Strike Are Heavily Disfavored and Rarely Granted..... 3

 B. The *Twombly/Iqbal* Standard Does Not Apply to Affirmative Defenses 4

 C. Each of Samsung’s Affirmative Defenses Has Been Adequately Plead..... 8

 1. Failure to State a Claim 8

 2. Non-infringement 9

 3. Invalidity 10

 4. Prosecution History Estoppel 11

 5. Waiver, Estoppel, Laches and Equitable Estoppel..... 12

 6. Doctrine of Unclean Hands 12

 7. Adequate Remedy at Law and Additional Affirmative Defenses 13

IV. CONCLUSION.....13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Aptix Corp. v. Quickturn Design Systems, Inc.</i> , 269 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	12
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009)	1, 7
<i>Avocent Redmond Corp. v. United States</i> , 85 Fed. Cl. 724 (Ct. Fed. Cl. 2009).....	9
<i>Barry Fiala, Inc. v. Arthur Blank & Co., Inc.</i> , No. 2:02-cv-2282, 2003 WL 22309442 (W.D. Tenn., Feb. 19, 2003).....	3
<i>Bayer Cropscience AG v. Dow Agrosciences LLC</i> , No. 10-CV-1045, 2011 WL 6934557 (D. Del. Dec. 30, 2011).....	6
<i>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007)	1, 7
<i>Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. United States</i> , 201 F.2d 819 (6th Cir. 1953).....	4
<i>Damron v. ATM Central LLC</i> , No. 1:10-cv-01210-JDB-egb, 2010 WL 6512345 (W.D. Tenn. Oct. 29, 2010)	4, 7, 13
<i>Duramed Pharms., Inc. v. Watson Labs., Inc.</i> , 308-CV-00116-LRH-RAM, 2008 WL 5232908 (D. Nev. Dec. 12, 2008)	10, 13
<i>Elan Pharma Int'l Ltd. v. Lupin Ltd.</i> , CIV. A. 09-1008 JAG, 2010 WL 1372316 (D.N.J. Mar. 31, 2010).....	5, 7, 10
<i>Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.</i> , 493 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	11
<i>First Nat'l Ins. Co. of Am. v. Camps Servs.</i> , No. 08-cv-12805, 2009 WL 22861 (E.D. Mich. Jan. 5, 2009).....	6
<i>Graphic Packaging Int'l, Inc. v. C.W. Zumbiel Co.</i> , No. 1:10-cv-3008, 2011 WL 5829674 (N.D. Ga. Aug. 1, 2011)	10
<i>Keene Corp. v. United States</i> , 508 U.S. 200 (1993)	5
<i>Kilgore-Wilson v. Home Depot USA</i> , No. 2:11-cv-02601 JTF-cgc, 2012 WL 4062663 (W.D. Tenn. Sept. 14, 2012).....	4, 5, 7

..

Mark IV Industries Corp. v. Transcore, L.P.,
 C.A. No. 09-418, 2009 WL 4828661 (D. Del. Dec. 2, 2009) 8

McLemore v. Regions Bank,
 Nos. 3:08-cv-0021 & 3:08-cv-1003, 2010 WL 1010092 (M.D. Tenn. Mar. 18, 2010) 5

Microsoft Corp. v. Phoenix Sol’ns, Inc.,
 741 F. Supp. 2d 1156 (C.D. Cal. 2010)..... 7

Montgomery v. Wyeth,
 580 F.3d 455 (6th Cir. 2009)..... 5

MTA Metro-North R.R. v. Buchanan Marine, L.P.,
 No. 3:05cv881 (PCD), 2006 WL 3544936 (D. Conn. Dec. 8, 2006)..... 8

Paducah River Painting, Inc. v. McNational, Inc.,
 5:11-cv-00135-R, 2011 WL 5525938 (W.D. Ky. Nov. 14, 2011) 10

Penn Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. Norma Espinosa 2007-1 Ins. Trust,
 C.A. No. 09-300-LPS, 2011 WL 710970 (D. Del. Feb. 22, 2011) 6

Pfizer Inc. v. Apotex Inc.,
 726 F. Supp. 2d 921 (N.D. Ill. 2010) 7, 10

Rosada v. John Wieland Homes & Neighborhoods, Inc.,
 No. 3:09-cv-653-J-20MCR, 2010 WL 1249841 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 25, 2010)..... 8

Senju Pharms. v. Apotex, Inc.,
 --- F. Supp. 2d ---, 2013 WL 444928 (D. Del. Feb. 6, 2013)..... 6

Symbol Techs., Inc. v. Aruba Networks, Inc.,
 609 F. Supp. 2d 353 (D. Del. 2009) 12

Teirstein v. AGA Medical Corp.,
 No. 6:08cv14, 2009 WL 704138 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 16, 2009) 10, 11

Wedgetail Ltd. v. Huddleston Deluxe, Inc.,
 576 F.3d 1032 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 9

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 1..... 12

35 U.S.C. § 101..... 12

35 U.S.C. § 102..... 12

35 U.S.C. § 103..... 12

...

35 U.S.C. § 112..... 12
35 U.S.C. § 116..... 12
35 U.S.C. § 119..... 12
35 U.S.C. § 120..... 12

Rules

Fed. R. Civ. P. § 12..... 3
Fed. R. Civ. P. § 15..... 3
Fed. R. Civ. P. § 8..... 12

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.