

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

CYWEE GROUP LTD.,

Plaintiff

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.
AND SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
AMERICA, INC.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

NO. 2:17-CV-00140-WCB-RSP

**DEFENDANTS SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. AND
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.'S
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF NO INFRINGEMENT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED	2
III. STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS	3
A. The Asserted Patents.....	3
B. The Accused Products.....	3
C. Claim Construction	4
D. Undisputed Facts for Issues 1, 2, and 3	5
E. Undisputed Facts for Issue 4.....	5
F. Undisputed Facts for Issue 5.....	7
G. Undisputed Facts for Issue 6.....	8
H. Undisputed Facts for Issue 7.....	9
I. Undisputed Facts for Issue 8.....	10
J. Undisputed Facts for Issue 9.....	11
IV. LEGAL STANDARD.....	11
V. ARGUMENT	13
A. The Patents-in-Suit are limited to a particular type of “enhanced” sensor fusion, and do not cover all types of sensor fusion.....	13
B. Issue 1: CyWee cannot establish direct infringement of method Claims 14–17 and 19 of the ’438 Patent and method Claims 10 and 12 of the ’978 Patent without evidence that Samsung or anyone else performs the claimed methods	14
1. CyWee has failed to establish that Samsung directly infringes the asserted method claims	14
2. CyWee has failed to establish that anyone else directly infringes the asserted method claims	15
C. Issue 2: CyWee cannot establish direct infringement of apparatus Claims 1 and 3–5 of the ’438 Patent without evidence that any Accused Product, as made, used, sold, offered for sale, or imported by Samsung, meets all of the claim limitations without modification	16
1. CyWee has failed to establish that Samsung directly infringes the asserted apparatus claims.....	16
2. CyWee has failed to establish that anyone else directly infringes the asserted apparatus claims	19

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
D. Issue 3: There is no indirect infringement by Samsung as to all asserted claims for which CyWee has not provided evidence of underlying direct infringement.....	20
E. Issue 4: Estimated accelerations that are calculated using current measured accelerations do not constitute “predicted” accelerations, as required by all asserted claims of the ’438 Patent.....	20
F. Issue 5: CyWee does not establish that the Accused Products “compar[e] the second quaternion in relation to the measured angular velocities . . . of the current state at current time t with the measured axial accelerations . . . and predicted axial accelerations” as required by Claims 14–17 and 19 of the ’438 Patent, where CyWee’s experts only identify a comparison with one set, not two sets, of accelerations.....	22
G. Issue 6: CyWee does not establish that the Accused Products “calculate a resulting deviation comprising resultant angles in said spatial reference frame” or “calculat[e] and convert[] the updated state of the six axis motion sensor module to said resulting deviation comprising said resultant angles” as required by all asserted claims of the ’438 Patent, where CyWee’s experts only state that one of ordinary skill in the art would have known how to do so, not that the Accused Products actually do so.....	24
H. Issue 7: Calculating alleged predicted accelerations based on a quaternion, which represents a device orientation, does not constitute predicting axial accelerations based on angular velocities as required by all asserted claims of the ’438 Patent, and comparing quaternions is not comparing the first signal set with the second signal set as required by Claim 1 of the ’438 Patent.....	25
I. Issue 8: Estimated magnetisms that are calculated using current measured magnetisms do not constitute “predicted” magnetisms, as required by all asserted claims of the ’978 Patent.....	28
J. Issue 9: CyWee does not establish the Accused Products use “the orientation output and the rotation output to generate a transformed output” required by all asserted claims of the ’978 Patent, where CyWee has not identified any source code implemented on the Accused Products, as made, used, sold, offered for sale, or imported by Samsung, that meets that limitation.....	29
VI. CONCLUSION.....	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>ACCO Brands, Inc. v. ABA Locks Mfrs. Co.</i> , 501 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	18
<i>Allvoice Developments US, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 612 F. App'x 1009 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	15, 16, 19
<i>Amdocs (Israel) Ltd. v. Openet Telecom, Inc.</i> , No. 1:10-CV-910-LMB-JFA, 2018 WL 2426581 (E.D. Va. Apr. 12, 2018)	17
<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> , 477 U.S. 242 (1986).....	12
<i>Ball Aerosol & Specialty Container, Inc. v. Ltd. Brands, Inc.</i> , 555 F.3d 984 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	12, 17
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986).....	11
<i>E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3Com Corp.</i> , 473 F.3d 1213 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	20
<i>Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	12
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Secure Computing Corp.</i> , 626 F.3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	12
<i>Forest Labs., Inc. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 239 F.3d 1305 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	12
<i>Fujitsu Ltd. v. Netgear Inc.</i> , 620 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	12, 18, 20
<i>Genband US LLC v. Metaswitch Networks Ltd.</i> , No. 2:14-CV-33-JRG, 2016 WL 5480908 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 29, 2016)	15
<i>Limelight Networks, Inc. v. Akamai Techs., Inc.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2111 (2014).....	12, 20
<i>Nazomi Commc'ns, Inc. v. Nokia Corp.</i> , 739 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	19
<i>Netword, LLC v. Centraal Corp.</i> , 242 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	<i>passim</i>

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	15, 16
<i>Ricoh Co. v. Quanta Comput. Inc.</i> , 550 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	12, 15
<i>Salazar v. HTC Corp.</i> , No. 2:16-CV-01096, 2018 WL 4252391 (E.D. Tex. May 3, 2018).....	18, 24
<i>Telemac Cellular Corp. v. Topp Telecom, Inc.</i> 247 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	18, 19
 Rules	
Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a)	11

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.