


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

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC, §
§ Case No. 2:17-CV-0513-JRG
§ (LEAD CASE)
Plaintiff, §
§
v. § **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**
§
HUAWEI DEVICE USA INC. ET AL., §
§ 
§
Defendants. §

APPLE, INC., § Case No. 2:17-CV-0516-JRG
§ (CONSOLIDATED CASE)
Defendant. §
§ **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**PLAINTIFF AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC'S RESPONSE
IN OPPOSITION TO APPLE INC.'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
THAT U.S. PATENT NO. 7,630,724 IS NOT INCORPORATED INTO
U.S. PATENT APPLICATION NO. 14/027,410 (DKT. 226)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page(s)</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF ISSUES	1
III. RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS	2
IV. COUNTER-STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS	2
V. LEGAL STANDARD.....	3
VI. ARGUMENT	3
VII. CONCLUSION.....	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Advanced Display Sys, Inc. v. Kent State Univ.</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	3
<i>Allure Energy, Inc. v. Nest Labs, Inc.</i> , No. 9:13-cv-102, Dkt. 281 at 2 (E.D. Tex. May 18, 2015).....	5
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.</i> , No. 5:12-cv-00630-LHK, 2014 WL 252045 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2014).....	6
<i>Callaway Golf Co. v. Acushnet Co.</i> , 576 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	4
<i>Cruson v. Jackson Nat’l Life Ins. Co.</i> , No. 4:16-cv-00912, 2018 WL 3752853 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 8, 2018).....	5
<i>Harari v. Hollmer</i> , 602 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	3
<i>Hollmer v. Harari</i> , 681 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	4
<i>Husky Injection Molding Sys. Ltd. v. Athena Automation Ltd.</i> , 838 F.3d 1236 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	4
<i>Lockwood v. Am. Airlines, Inc.</i> , 107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	3
<i>Northrop Grumman Info. Tech. Inc., v. U.S.</i> , 78 Fed. Cl. 45 (Fed. Cl. 2007)	4
<i>NuStar Energy L.P. v. Diamond Offshore Co.</i> , 402 S.W.3d 461 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2013, no pet.).....	5
<i>Personalized Media Commc’ns, LLC v. Zynga, Inc.</i> , No. 2:12-cv-00068, Dkt. 232 at 2 (E.D. Tex. November 8, 2013).....	5
<i>Tier Reit Inc. v. Uvest Fin. Servs. Grp. Inc.</i> , No. 3:15-cv-03831, 2016 WL 4039163 (N.D. Tex. July 28, 2016).....	5
<i>Zenon Envtl., Inc. v. U.S. Filter Corp.</i> , 506 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	3, 5

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 112.....3
35 U.S.C. § 120.....3

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 1.57(b).....3
37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a).....6
Local Rule CV-56(a).....2
Local Rule CV-56(d).....2

Plaintiff AGIS Software Development LLC (“AGIS”) hereby submits its Response in Opposition to Defendant Apple Inc.’s (“Apple”) Motion for Summary Judgment that U.S. Patent No. 7,630,724 Is Not Incorporated Into U.S. Patent Application No. 14/027,410 (Dkt. 226). AGIS respectfully submits that each of Apple’s arguments lacks merit and Apple’s motion should be denied.

I. INTRODUCTION

U.S. Patent Application No. 14/027,410 (the “’410 application”) properly incorporates by reference U.S. Patent No. 7,630,724 (the “’724 patent”). Apple alleges that the ’410 application does not incorporate the ’724 patent because (1) the grammar and syntax of the incorporation statement shows only U.S. Patent No. 7,031,728 (the “’728 patent”) was incorporated by reference; (2) there is ambiguity in the incorporation statement which defeats a finding of incorporation; and (3) AGIS’s expert’s opinion is unnecessary to determine whether there is incorporation. Apple’s arguments are without merit because the ’410 application specifically references the ’724 patent using the necessary language for incorporation by reference, there is no ambiguity in the incorporation statement, and AGIS’s expert, Joseph McAlexander’s expert opinion was provided in response to Apple’s expert, Paul Clark’s opinion. In addition, Mr. McAlexander’s opinion provides the reasonable person of ordinary skill in the art standard under which incorporation by reference is assessed. Therefore, the Court should deny Apple’s summary judgment motion.

II. RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF ISSUES

Apple has failed to show that the ’410 application does not incorporate the ’724 patent by reference because Apple does not show that the incorporation statement in the ’410 application does not expressly and unambiguously incorporate the ’724 patent.

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.