

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

UNILOC 2017 LLC,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

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

*Defendants.*

Civil Action No. 2:18-cv-508-JRG

████████████████████  
████████████████████

████████████████████

**SAMSUNG'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. ISSUES PRESENTED..... 1

III. STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS ..... 2

A. The '654 Patent .....2

B. The Accused Products.....4

C. Uniloc’s Original Infringement Theory .....6

D. The Court’s Markman Order Undermined Uniloc’s Infringement Theory.....7

E. Dr. Easttom’s Expert Report and Uniloc’s New Infringement Theory .....8

IV. LEGAL STANDARDS ..... 9

A. Summary Judgment .....9

B. Direct Infringement .....10

C. Indirect Infringement .....11

V. ARGUMENT ..... 12

A. The Accused Products Do Not Have a “Linked User Identification Module” as Required By All Asserted Claims .....12

1. The Accused Products Do Not Have a “Linked User Identification Module” Under the Court’s Claim Construction .....13

2. The Accused Products Do Not Have a “Linked User Identification Module” Even Under Uniloc’s New Claim Construction of “Normal Operation” .....14

B. The Accused Products’ Lock Screen Does Not Prevent “Normal Operation,” as Required By All of the Asserted Claims .....16

C. The Accused Products Do Not Have a “Timing Means” as Required By Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 .....18

D. Uniloc Has Failed to Present Any Evidence of Infringement for the Majority of the Accused Products .....20

E. Uniloc Has Failed to Show Any Evidence of Direct Infringement by Samsung .....21

1. Samsung Cannot Directly Infringe Apparatus Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 17, and 18.....21

2. Samsung Cannot Infringe the Method Claims.....23

3. There is Insufficient Evidence to Raise a Triable Issue of Fact That Samsung Has “Used” the Accused Products in the United States.....25

F. Uniloc Has Failed to Demonstrate Indirect Infringement by Samsung .....27

- 1. Summary Judgment of No Indirect Infringement Should be Entered Because Uniloc Cannot Demonstrate Direct Infringement .....27
- 2. Uniloc Has Not Adduced Any Evidence of Knowledge by Samsung of Infringement by Third Parties .....28
- 3. Uniloc Has Adduced No Evidence of Acts By Samsung Intended to Induce Infringement.....29
- 4. Summary Judgment of No Contributory Infringement Should Be Entered Because Uniloc Has Not Adduced Any Evidence of No Substantial Non-Infringing Use of the Accused Products .....30

VI. CONCLUSION ..... 30

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

<b>Cases</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
<i>ACCO Brands, Inc. v. ABA Locks Mfr. Co.</i> , 501 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	11, 26
<i>C.R. Bard, Inc. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc.</i> , 911 F.2d 670 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	9
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986).....	9, 10
<i>Centillion Data Sys., LLC v. Qwest Commun. Int’l</i> , 631 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	22, 23
<i>Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 1920 (2015).....	11, 12, 28
<i>Cordis Corp. v. Boston Sci. Corp.</i> , 561 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	15
<i>Dodots Licensing Solutions LLC v. Lenovo Holding Co.</i> , 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 213202 (D. Del. Dec. 19, 2018).....	24
<i>DSU Med. Corp. v. JMS Co.</i> , 471 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	28
<i>Ecolab, Inc. v. FMC Corp.</i> , 569 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	28
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 251 F.3d 955 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	10
<i>EMG Tech., LLC v. Vanguard Grp., Inc.</i> , 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 191718 (E.D. Tex. June 24, 2014).....	10
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Secure Computing Corp.</i> , 626 F.3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	10, 23
<i>Fujitsu Ltd. v. Netgear Inc.</i> , 620 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	12, 30
<i>Johnston v. IVAC Corp.</i> , 885 F.2d 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	10
<i>Joy Techs., Inc. v. Flakt, Inc.</i> , 6 F.3d 770 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	10, 11, 23, 24, 27

<i>Koninklijke Philips N.V. v. Zoll Med. Corp.</i> , 656 F. App'x. 504 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	28
<i>Meyer Intellectual Props. Ltd. v. Bodum, Inc.</i> , 690 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	10, 23, 26
<i>Mirror Worlds, LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 784 F. Supp. 2d 703 (E.D. Tex. 2011).....	11, 26, 27
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	11, 24
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int'l, Inc.</i> , 843 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	11
<i>Ricoh Co. v. Quanta Computer Inc.</i> , 550 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	11, 24
<i>Toshiba Corp. v. Imation Corp.</i> , 681 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	30
<i>TQP Dev., LLC v. Intuit Inc.</i> , 2014 WL 2810016 (E.D. Tex. June 20, 2014).....	10
<i>Warner-Jenkinson Co. v. Hilton Davis Chem. Co.</i> , 520 U.S. 17 (1997).....	10

# 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.