

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

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

HTC CORPORATION,

Defendant.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case No. 2:17-CV-0514-JRG  
(LEAD CASE)

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

████████████████████

---

**PLAINTIFF AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC'S REPLY TO  
DAUBERT MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE OPINIONS OF  
W. CHRISTOPHER BAKEWELL RELATING TO DAMAGES (DKT. 128)**

AGIS's motion to exclude the opinions of HTC's damages expert W. Christopher Bakewell is not a matter of AGIS disputing "the facts and some of the data points" relied on by Mr. Bakewell, nor does AGIS's motion go to the weight rather than the admissibility of Mr. Bakewell's opinions. Dkt. 128 at 1. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] HTC's

opposition to this motion cites to no authority whatsoever to show that such clear language, evidencing the intent of the parties, can be summarily disregarded, let alone by an expert for one of the very parties to that agreement. Dkt. 128 at 5. For this reason alone, [REDACTED] and Mr. Bakewell's opinions based on it should be excluded from the case.

Instead of focusing on this, HTC devotes much of its attention to arguing a point not in dispute, *i.e.* that a settlement agreement can be relied upon as a comparable license for the

reasonable royalty analysis. Dkt. 128 at 1-4. AGIS already acknowledged in its opening brief that a settlement agreement may be relied upon as a comparable license, but only where the expert “account[s] for the ‘technological and economic differences’” Dkt. 128 at 4; *see Wordtech Sys. v. Integrated Networks Sol’ns, Inc.*, 609 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2010); *see also Res-Q-Net.com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.* 594 F.3d 860, 872 (Fed. Cir. 2010). [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] his expert opinions based on them are unreliable and should be excluded.

**I. HTC HAS FAILED TO SHOW THAT [REDACTED]**  
[REDACTED]

AGIS’s motion focused on specific ways Mr. Bakewell failed to establish that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

HTC responds to AGIS’s argument that Mr. Bakewell has [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Yet nowhere in

Mr. Bakewell's report does he appear to have considered [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Even

accepting as true HTC's position that the accused products in those cases were virtually the same products accused by AGIS, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] <sup>1</sup> [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] As to this

point, HTC also tries to distinguish *Realtime Data v. Echostar Corp.*, No. 6:17-CV-00084-JDL,

---

<sup>1</sup> [REDACTED]

<sup>2</sup> Exhibits A-D refer to Exhibits to the Declaration of Alfred Fabricant.

2018 WL 1959319 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 5, 2018) (E.D. Tex.) cited by AGIS, arguing that the lump-sum settlement license in that case was excluded due to a lack of *technical* comparability. Dkt. 128 at 9. While lack of technical comparability was indeed the second factor noted in the Court’s decision, the first factor expressly addressed by the Court in granting the motion to exclude the agreement in question was that, “the final agreement reached lacks any reference to the court’s prior order or the royalty base (if any at all) used to arrive at the lump-sum payment.” *Id.* at 8. The same result should be obtained here.

With respect to the litigation context in which each of the agreements was negotiated,

[REDACTED]

# 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.