

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Case No. 2:12-cv-02824 JPM tmp
v.)	
)	JURY DEMAND
SAMSUNG)	
TELECOMMUNICATIONS)	
AMERICA, LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	
<hr/>		
B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Case No. 2:12-cv-02825 JPM tmp
v.)	
)	JURY DEMAND
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS)	
AMERICA, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	
<hr/>		

**PLAINTIFF B.E. TECHNOLOGY L.L.C.’S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

Dated: August 12, 2013

Richard M. Carter (TN B.P.R. #7285)
Adam C. Simpson (TN B.P.R. #24705)
MARTIN, TATE, MORROW & MARSTON, P.C.
6410 Poplar Avenue, Suite 1000
Memphis, TN 38119-4839
Telephone: (901) 522-9000

Robert E. Freitas (CA Bar No. 80948)
Craig R. Kaufman (CA Bar No. 159458)
Daniel J. Weinberg (CA Bar No. 227159)

Qudus B. Olaniran (CA Bar No. 267838)
FREITAS TSENG & KAUFMAN LLP
100 Marine Parkway, Suite 200
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 593-6300

Attorneys for Plaintiff
B.E. Technology, L.L.C.

Plaintiff B.E. Technology, L.L.C. (“B.E.”) respectfully responds to defendants Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC’s (“STA”) and Samsung Electronics America, Inc.’s (“SEA”) (together “the defendants”) motion for extension of time. The defendants seek additional time to meet their Local Patent Rules (“LPR”) 3.3 and 3.4 obligations pending the Court’s resolution of the defendants’ motion to compel supplemental infringement contentions and stay certain discovery obligations. *See* SEA D.E. 50.¹ There is no basis for the requested extension of time.

The defendants seek modification of the recently agreed upon deadline for providing non-infringement contentions and accompanying document production. *See* SEA D.E. 51. The defendants made their request five days after the parties submitted the agreed upon schedule to the Court. *See* SEA D.E. 56. The defendants agreed to the case schedule knowing full well that B.E. contends its infringement contentions are sufficient under the LPR and do not require supplementation. *See* SEA D.E. 57-3. There is no basis for agreeing to a case schedule, which was adopted by the Court, *see* SEA D.E. 56, and immediately seeking modifications of that schedule.

The defendants request a twenty-eight (28) day extension of time to comply with the LPR after B.E. serves supplemental infringement contentions if their motion to compel is granted or a twenty-one (21) day extension if their motion to compel is denied. There is no basis for such a win-win. If the defendants’ motion is denied, they will have already had the time it takes the Court to decide the motion to compel plus the more than seven months since B.E. served its initial infringement contention to formulate their non-infringement contentions. An additional twenty-one day extension is excessive and undeserved. Presumably, by filing this motion for

¹ Where the documents filed in STA and SEA are identical, B.E. will refer to the document entry number on SEA’s docket.

extension of time, the defendants do not intend to satisfy their obligations under LPR 3.3 and 3.4 in accordance with the case schedule. *See* SEA D.E. 56. Regardless of the outcome of the defendants' motion to compel, the defendants apparently have maneuvered into a position to simply take an extension of time despite the requirements of the case schedule.

As discussed in detail in B.E.'s memorandum in opposition to the defendants' motion to compel, B.E.'s initial infringement contentions are adequate under the LPR. *See* SEA D.E. 57. B.E.'s initial infringement contentions provide "reasonable notice to the defendant why [B.E.] believes it has a reasonable chance of proving infringement and raise a reasonable inference that all accused products infringe." SEA D.E. 57-6. The defendants demonstrated at the initial case management conference a deep understanding of the asserted patent and their initial thinking on why their products do not infringe. The defendants know how their own products work and they have been in possession of B.E.'s contentions for more than seven months. The defendants do not require more information from B.E. or additional time to provide their initial non-infringement contentions. Moreover, as noted in B.E.'s opposition brief, the defendants do not cite to any authority supporting a stay of non-infringement contentions pending the resolution of a motion to compel supplemental infringement contentions. SEA D.E. 57 at 19-20. Thus, the defendants should be required to comply with their agreement to the current case schedule. *See* SEA D.E. 56.

The defendants' requested extension is not brief and is prejudicial to B.E. The defendants claim that the requested extension would "ensure that the Court has adequate time to consider the merits of Samsung's Motion to Compel without forcing Samsung to respond *twice* to over 10,000 pages" of B.E.'s initial infringement contentions. *See* SEA D.E. 51 at 2. (emphasis in original). The length of B.E.'s initial infringement contentions is not grounds for

granting an extension of time or delaying compliance with the case schedule. *Id.* The defendants have had B.E.'s contentions for more than seven months. There has been more than enough time to understand and prepare non-infringement contentions. B.E. will be prejudiced by delay because B.E. will have less time to analyze the defendants' non-infringement contentions, whenever those contentions are provided, before having to make substantive decisions with respect to upcoming deadlines in the case schedule, including, amending pleadings and identifying terms for construction. *See* SEA D.E. 56. Moreover, these deadlines may pass before or arrive shortly after the Court rules on the defendants' motion to compel. Contrary to the defendants' assertion, it is probable that granting the defendants' requested extension will result in the delay of other deadlines in the case schedule, which was adopted in all of the pending B.E. cases to keep them moving forward together. This case has already been delayed and the defendants' request will only add more delay. *See* STA D.E. 33; SEA D.E. 37 (stay pending order on motions to transfer).

For the foregoing reasons, B.E. respectfully requests that the Court deny the defendants' request for an extension of time for the defendants to comply with their obligations under the LPR 3.3 and 3.4 pending the resolution of the defendants' motion to compel.

Dated: August 12, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Daniel Weinberg

Robert E. Freitas (CA Bar No. 80948)
Craig R. Kaufman (CA Bar No. 159458)
Daniel J. Weinberg (CA Bar No. 227159)
Qudus B. Olaniran (CA Bar No. 267838)
FREITAS TSENG & KAUFMAN LLP
100 Marine Parkway, Suite 200
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 593-6300
Facsimile: (650) 593-6301
rfreitas@ftklaw.com
ckaufman@ftklaw.com

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.