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

BLITZSAFE TEXAS, LLC,	§
	§
Plaintiff,	§
	§
V.	§
	§
HONDA MOTOR CO., LTD.; AMERICAN	§
HONDA MOTOR CO., INC.; HONDA OF	& & & &
AMERICA MFG., INC.; HONDA	§
MANUFACTURING OF ALABAMA, LLC;	§
AND HONDA MANUFACTURING OF	§
INDIANA, LLC,	§
	§
Defendants.	§

NO. 2:15-CV-01274 (LEAD CASE)

### **DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO EXCEED PAGE LIMITATIONS**

§

Defendants file this unopposed Motion requesting leave to exceed the page limitations for Defendants' responsive claim construction (Dkt. 101) by two pages, *i.e.*, from thirty to thirty-two pages. Good cause supports the extension. The primary reason for Defendants' request is because Plaintiff Blitzsafe Texas, LLC ("Blitzsafe") ignores the doctrine of collateral estoppel and is attempting to re-litigate five terms in this case that have previously been construed by another federal court. This requires Defendants to not only address the collateral estoppel issues, but also to re-argue the constructions for the same terms that have already been construed.

### I. GOOD CAUSE EXISTS TO INCREASE THE PAGE LIMITATIONS.

### A. Legal Standard.

Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, the page limitations governing dispositive motions pursuant to Local Rule CV-7(a) shall apply to claim construction briefing. P.R. 4-5(e). Accordingly, both opening and responsive claim construction briefing is limited to thirty pages.

1

Local Rule CV-7(a). This rule may be modified for good cause with the Court's consent. FED. R. CIV. P. 16(b). Indeed, "[t]he court is lenient in permitting litigants to file documents that exceed the page limits after a showing of good cause." *Clarke v. Dir., Tex. Dep't of Crim. Justice-Corr. Insts. Div.*, No. 4:08cv381, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 126607, at \*2 (E.D. Tex. Sep. 4, 2013).

### B. Blitzsafe Is Seeking to Re-litigate Several Claim Terms That Have Been Litigated Extensively in a Prior Litigation.

In March 2010, Marlowe Patent Holdings LLC filed a lawsuit against several companies in the District of New Jersey asserting infringement of the '786 patent, styled *Marlowe Patent Holdings LLC v. Dice Electronics LLC et al.*, No. 3:10-cv-01199-PGS-DEA (D.N.J.) (the "*Dice* Case"). District Judge Peter Sheridan presided over the case. Ira Marlowe is the owner of both Marlowe Patent Holdings and Blitzsafe, as well as being the sole named inventor of the '786 patent. While the *Dice* Case was pending, a second lawsuit was filed by Marlowe Patent Holdings against Ford Motor Company, styled *Marlowe Patent Holdings LLC v. Ford Motor Co.*, No. 3:11-cv-07044-PGS-DEA (D.N.J.) (filed Dec. 2, 2011) (the "*Ford* Case"). Judge Sheridan eventually consolidated the *Dice* Case and *Ford* Case for claim construction purposes.

Over the next two years, the parties extensively litigated the proper construction of the claim terms of the '786 patent. During this time, Marlowe Patent Holdings had the opportunity to submit three sets of briefs and participate in three separate hearings over the appropriate construction of the claims. Judge Sheridan ultimately issued a 41-page claim construction opinion and 3-page claim construction order on January 20, 2015. Dkts. 109, 110 in the *Ford* Case. In the opinion and order, Judge Sheridan construed fourteen disputed claim terms of the '786 patent. *Id.* Both the *Dice* Case and the *Ford* Case ended shortly thereafter, with the parties stipulating to a dismissal with prejudice. Dkt. 244 in the *Dice* Case, Dkt. 130 in the *Ford* Case.

2

Not long after the *Dice* and *Ford* Cases concluded, Marlowe Patent Holdings assigned the '786 patent to Blitzsafe on July 10, 2015. Ira Marlowe also assigned the '342 patent to Blitzsafe on the same day. Blitzsafe was formed as a Texas limited liability company just two days earlier, identifying Blitzsafe of America, Inc. as its sole manager and governing entity. Ira Marlowe is the owner of Blitzsafe of America, Inc. as well as the CEO of Blitzsafe Texas, LLC. The instant consolidated lawsuits followed.

Because Blitzsafe insists on re-litigating the meaning of claims terms already decided by Judge Sheridan, there are currently twelve groups of claim terms that are in dispute between the parties. However, Defendants believe that this Court should adopt all of Judge Sheridan's constructions from the *Dice* and *Ford* Cases, and reject Blitzsafe's attempts to re-litigate the construction of the following terms: "interface," "device presence signal," "pre-programmed," "external," and "portable." In addition to those five terms, the parties to the *Ford* Case agreed to the construction of "car stereo"—an agreed construction that Blitzsafe now seeks to change.

### C. Defendants Are Consolidating Their Arguments in One Brief.

In addition to the foregoing, five groupings of defendants (*i.e.*, Honda, Volkswagen, Toyota, Hyundai/Kia, and Nissan) have had their cases consolidated for pretrial purposes. *See* Dkt. 25. Had Defendants all filed separate briefs in separate cases, the overall page limits would have been 150 pages.

Additionally, Defendants raise indefiniteness arguments in the Claim Construction Response. Defendants bear the burden of proof on these invalidity arguments. *See, e.g.*, 35 U.S.C. § 282(a). Typically, the party with the burden of proof would be allowed to file reply briefs. Under the Patent Rules, however, the Defendants are not afforded a reply brief for these arguments. In this regard, Defendants have consolidated the arguments that would typically cover more pages in additional briefs in this one brief.

#### II. CONCLUSION.

Δ

For the reasons set forth above, Defendants respectfully request the Court to grant their motion to increase the page limit for Defendants' responsive claim construction brief from 30 pages to 32 pages.

Dated: May 27, 2016

DOCKE

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Joseph M. Beauchamp

Joseph M. Beauchamp Texas State Bar No. 24012266 Email: jmbeauchamp@jonesday.com H. Albert Liou Texas State Bar No. 24061608 Email: aliou@jonesday.com Erin C. Dickerman 24087358 Texas State Bar No. Email: edickerman@jonesday.com JONES DAY 717 Texas Street, Suite 3300 Houston, Texas 77002-2712 Telephone: (832) 239-3939 Facsimile: (832) 239-3600

Joseph Melnik California State Bar No. 255601 Email: jmelnik@jonesday.com JONES DAY 1755 Embarcadero Road Palo Alto, California 94303 Telephone: (650) 739-3939 Facsimile: (650) 739-3900

Randy Akin Texas State Bar No. 00954900 Email: gra@randyakin.com **G.R. (Randy) Akin, P.C.** 3400 W. Marshall Avenue, Suite 300 Longview, Texas 75604 Telephone: (903) 297-8929 Facsimile: (903) 297-9046

### ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO., INC.; HONDA OF AMERICA MFG., INC.; HONDA MANUFACTURING OF ALABAMA, LLC; AND HONDA MANUFACTURING OF INDIANA, LLC

# DOCKET A L A R M



# 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.