

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

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC,

Plaintiff,

vs.

HTC CORPORATION,

Defendant.

**CASE NO. 2:17-CV-514-JRG
(LEAD CASE)**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**DEFENDANT HTC CORPORATION'S
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF NO WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED BY THE COURT	1
III. STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS	1
A. AGIS’s Enhanced Damages Allegations	1
B. HTC Corp.’s Lack of Knowledge of the Patents	3
IV. LEGAL STANDARD.....	4
V. ARGUMENT.....	5
A. The Court Should Grant Summary Judgment of No Pre-Suit Willful Infringement Because There Is No Genuine Dispute that HTC Corp. Lacked Knowledge of the Asserted Patents Before the Filing of the Complaint.....	5
B. Summary Judgment of No Pre-Suit or Post-Suit Willful Infringement Is Warranted Because There Is No Genuine Dispute that HTC Corp. Has Not Committed Egregious Conduct.....	8
VI. CONCLUSION.....	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> , 477 U.S. 242 (1986).....	5
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986).....	5
<i>Deckers Outdoor Corp. v. J.C. Penney Co. Inc.</i> , 45 F. Supp. 3d 1181 (C.D. Cal. 2014)	7
<i>DermaFocus LLC v. Ulthera, Inc.</i> , 201 F. Supp. 3d 465 (D. Del. 2016).....	6
<i>Enfindergemeinschaft UroPep GbR v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , No. 2:15-CV-1202-WCB, 2017 WL 2190055 (E.D. Tex. May 18, 2017).....	6
<i>Ericsson Inc. v. TCL Commc'n Tech. Holdings, Ltd.</i> , No. 2:15-CV-00011-RSP, 2017 WL 5137401 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 4, 2017).....	6
<i>Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.</i> , 136 S. Ct. 1923 (2016).....	5, 6, 8, 9
<i>WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.</i> , 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	5
<i>Huawei Techs. Co. Ltd. v. T-Mobile US, Inc.</i> , No. 2:16-CV-00052-JRG-RSP, 2017 WL 1129951 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 21, 2017).....	6
<i>i4i Ltd. P'ship v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 598 F.3d 831 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	8
<i>Imonex Servs., Inc. v. W.H. Munzprufer Dietmar Trenner GMBH</i> , 408 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	7
<i>Little v. Liquid Air Corp.</i> , 37 F.3d 1069 (5th Cir. 1994)	5
<i>Personal Audio, LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , No. 9:09-CV-111, 2011 WL 13134849 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 26, 2011).....	8
<i>Puma SE v. Forever 21, Inc.</i> , No. CV-17-2523-PSG, 2017 WL 4771004 (C.D. Cal. June 29, 2017)	8
<i>Salazar v. HTC Corp.</i> , No. 2:16-CV-01096-JRG-RSP, 2018 WL 4242416 (E.D. Tex. May 1, 2018).....	6
<i>Tareco Props., Inc. v. Morriss</i> , No. 6:07-CV-181, 2008 WL 1836377 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 23, 2008).....	8, 9
<i>VirnetX Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 324 F. Supp. 3d 836 (E.D. Tex. 2017).....	5

VNUS Med. Techs., Inc. v. Diomed Holdings, Inc.,
527 F. Supp. 2d 1072 (N.D. Cal. 2007)8

WesternGeco L.L.C. v. ION Geophysical Corp.,
837 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2016), *overruled on other grounds by* 138 S. Ct.
2129 (2018).....8

ZitoVault, LLC v. Int’l Bus. Machs. Corp.,
No. 3:16-CV-0962-M, 2018 WL 2971131 (N.D. Tex. Mar. 29, 2018).....6

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 284.....1

35 U.S.C. § 287(a)7

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a)4

I. INTRODUCTION

AGIS alleges that HTC Corp. willfully infringes U.S. Pat. Nos. 8,213,970; 9,408,055; 9,445,251; and 9,467,838 (the “asserted patents”). But AGIS’s allegations have two crucial flaws. First, even though willful infringement requires knowledge of the patents, AGIS has failed to identify any evidence demonstrating that HTC Corp. had knowledge of the asserted patents prior to the filing of the Complaint. HTC Corp. therefore cannot be liable for pre-suit willful infringement. Second, AGIS has not alleged any facts or provided any evidence demonstrating any egregious conduct by HTC Corp. The total extent of AGIS’s egregiousness allegation is listing a series of synonyms for “egregious” in an interrogatory response without any supporting evidence. This is insufficient to create a triable issue of fact on willful infringement.

For these reasons, as set forth below, HTC Corp. respectfully requests that the Court grant summary judgement of no pre-suit willful infringement and summary judgment of no post-suit willful infringement.

II. STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED BY THE COURT

- Whether HTC Corp. can be found to have willfully infringed a patent prior to suit when it had no pre-suit knowledge of the asserted patents.
- Whether HTC Corp. can be found to willfully infringe a patent where there is no evidence of egregious conduct, just a plaintiff listing synonyms for “egregious” without any supporting evidence.

III. STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS

A. AGIS’s Enhanced Damages Allegations

AGIS alleges that HTC Corp. willfully infringed the asserted patents. (Complaint (Dkt. No. 1), ¶¶ 24, 37, 50, 63; *id.* at Prayer for Relief, § b.) AGIS seeks treble damages under

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.