



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

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT, LLC	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	CASE NO. 2:17-cv-514-JRG
	§	(Lead Case)
v.	§	
	§	
HTC CORPORATION, et al.	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
	§	
Defendant.	§	

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT, LLC	§	CASE NO. 2:17-CV-515-JRG
	§	(Member Case)
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
	§	
LG ELECTRONICS INC.	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

**DEFENDANT LG ELECTRONICS INC.'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF
NON-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
IV. LEGAL STANDARD.....	6
A. Summary Judgment	6
B. Direct Infringement.....	6
C. Indirect Infringement	7
V. ARGUMENT	8
A. LGEKR Has Not Directly Infringed the Patents-in-Suit Because LGEKR Has Not Committed Any Acts of Infringement Within the United States Under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a)	8
1. LGEKR Does Not Make Any Patented Invention Within the United States	8
2. LGEKR Does Not Use Any Patented Invention Within the United States	8
3. LGEKR Does Not Sell Any Patented Invention Within the United States	9
4. LGEKR Does Not Offer to Sell Any Patented Invention Within the United States	12
5. LGEKR Does Not Import Any Accused Devices Into the United States	13
B. LGEKR Has Not Indirectly Infringed the Patents-in-Suit.....	13
1. LGEKR Did Not Have the Requisite Knowledge to Induce Infringement.....	16
2. LGEKR Does Not Encourage End Users of Accused Devices to Use the Accused Applications	18
3. Android OS Updates Are Not a Basis for Indirect Infringement.....	19
4. LGEKR Has Not Contributorily Infringed the Patents-in-Suit.....	20
VI. CONCLUSION.....	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<u>Cases</u>	
<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> , 477 U.S. 242 (1986).....	6
<i>Bristol-Meyers Squibb Co. v. Matrix Labs. Ltd.</i> , No. 12CIV5846 (PAE), 2015 WL 2257705 (S.D.N.Y. May 13, 2015)	11, 12
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986).....	6
<i>Chalumeau Power Sys. LLC v. Alcatel–Lucent</i> , No. 11-1175-RGA, 2012 WL 6968938 (D. Del. July 18, 2012)	17
<i>Cleveland Clinic Found. v. True Health Diagnostics LLC</i> , 859 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	20
<i>Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 1920 (2015).....	7, 16, 17, 21
<i>Crawford v. Formosa Plastics Corp., La.</i> , 234 F.3d 899 (5th Cir. 2000)	6
<i>Cybiotronics, Ltd. v. Golden Source Elecs. Ltd.</i> , 130 F. Supp. 2d 1152 (C.D. Cal. 2001)	14, 15
<i>DermaFocus LLC v. Ulthera, Inc.</i> , 201 F. Supp. 3d 465 (D. Del. 2016).....	17
<i>Diesel Props. S.R.L. v. Greystone Bus, Credit II LLC</i> , No. 07 Civ. 9580(HB), 2009 WL 89115 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 14, 2009).....	17
<i>DSU Med. Corp. v. JMS Co.</i> , 471 F.3d 1293 (Fed Cir. 2006) (en banc).....	7, 16
<i>Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.</i> , 563 U.S. 754 (2011).....	7
<i>Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.</i> , 831 F. 3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	10
<i>IRIS Corp. v. Japan Airlines Corp.</i> , 769 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	8



Manville Sales Corp. v. Paramount Sys., Inc.,
917 F.2d 544 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....16

MEMC Elec. Materials, Inc. v. Mitsubishi Materials Silicon Corp.,
420 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....7, 11

Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.,
545 U.S. 913 (2005).....16

Microsoft Corp. v. AT&T Corp.,
550 U.S. 437 (2007).....6

NTP, Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd.,
418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....8, 9

Ricoh Co. v. Quanta Computer Inc.,
550 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....7

Rotec Indus., Inc. v. Mitsubishi Corp.,
215 F.3d 1246 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....12

Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Contractors USA, Inc.,
617 F.3d 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....12, 13

Vita-Mix Corp. v. Basic Holding, Inc.,
581 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....19

Water Techs. Corp. v. Calco, Ltd.,
850 F.2d 660 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....7

Wing Shing Prods. (BVI), Ltd. v. Simatelex Manufactory Co.,
479 F. Supp. 2d 388 (S.D.N.Y. 2007).....10, 15

Ziptronix, Inc. v. Omnivision Techs., Inc.,
71 F. Supp. 3d 1090 (N.D. Cal. 2014).....13

Statutes and Rules

U.S.C.

§ 271.....8

§ 271(a) *passim*

§ 271(b).....1, 2, 7

§ 271(c).....1, 20

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)6



Other Authorities

Black's Law Dictionary 884 (10th ed. 2014).....11

Webster's Third New International Dictionary 2523 (1993)8

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.