

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

UNILOC 2017 LLC,

Plaintiffs,

v.

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

Defendants.

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

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**SAMSUNG'S *DAUBERT* MOTION TO EXCLUDE
CERTAIN OPINIONS AND TESTIMONY OF UNILOC'S DAMAGES EXPERT
WALTER BRATIC**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND..... 1

 A. Uniloc Contends That Samsung Sold Mobile Devices With Lock Screens That Infringe The '654 Patent, But Lock Screens Were Already Known In The Art. ... 1

 B. Although Mr. Bratic Could Not Say What Incremental Benefit Was Conferred By The '654 Patent, He Claims Damages of ██████████ Through Q2 2020. 3

 C. Mr. Bratic Ignores A Mountain Of Real-World Evidence. 4

III. ARGUMENT 5

 A. Mr. Bratic And Dr. Easttom Fail To Reliably Apportion Damages To Account For Only The Value Attributable To The '654 Patent. 6

 1. Dr. Easttom's Chart Is Pulled From Thin Air..... 7

 2. Mr. Bratic And Dr. Easttom Do Not Isolate And Separate The Value Of The Allegedly Infringing Features From The Value Of The Non-Infringing Features And Components..... 8

 B. Mr. Bratic's Use Of Samsung Surveys Is Arbitrary And Unreliable. 10

 1. Mr. Bratic Assumes, With No Basis, That The Samsung Survey He Relies On Implicates The '654 Patent. 10

 2. Mr. Bratic Improperly Equates The Percentage Of Responses To A Product Positioning Survey With The Percentage Of Revenue..... 11

 3. Mr. Bratic Cherry Picks One Samsung Survey. 12

 C. Mr. Bratic Improperly Relies On An ██████████ For His 50/50 Economic Benefit Split. 13

 D. Mr. Bratic Relies On Other Non-Comparable Agreements..... 14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>BMC Software, Inc. v. ServiceNow, Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 379620 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 1, 2016)	9
<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc.</i> , 509 U.S. 579 (1993).....	5, 7, 10
<i>E.E.O.C. v. Freeman</i> , 778 F.3d 463 (4th Cir. 2015)	12
<i>Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	6
<i>Gen. Elec. Co. v. Joiner</i> , 522 U.S. 136 (1997).....	7
<i>Intelligent Verification Sys., LLC. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 2015 WL 1518099 (E.D. Va. Mar. 31, 2015).....	10
<i>Konrick v. Exxon Mobil Corp.</i> , 2016 WL 439361 (E.D. La. Feb. 4, 2016)	12
<i>Micro Chem., Inc. v. Lextron, Inc.</i> , 317 F.3d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	5
<i>Paz v. Brush Engineered Materials, Inc.</i> , 555 F.3d 383 (5th Cir. 2009)	7
<i>Rembrandt Soc. Media, LP v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 22 F. Supp. 3d 585 (E.D. Va. 2013)	11
<i>ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.</i> , 594 F.3d 860 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	6
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.</i> , 2019 WL 2267212 (E.D. Tex. April 17, 2019).....	6, 10

I. INTRODUCTION

The opinions of Uniloc 2017 LLC’s (“Uniloc”) damages expert, Walter Bratic, should be excluded because they are perfunctory, unreliable and biased. First, Mr. Bratic violated the golden rule of patent damages – apportionment – by failing to identify and separate the value of the allegedly infringing features of Samsung’s accused products from the other features and components that Uniloc’s own technical expert, Dr. Chuck Easttom, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] In fact, Mr. Bratic did no apportionment at all, relying instead on Dr. Easttom’s “Apportionment Factor,” which Dr. Easttom pulled from thin air without any supporting analysis, research, testing, data, or peer-reviewed publications. Second, Mr. Bratic cherry-picked one Samsung survey, ignored at least 18 others, and employed no discernible methodology in selecting and using survey data. Third, he [REDACTED] relates to the technology of the ’654 patent. Fourth, Mr. Bratic improperly equated the percentage of consumer responses in the survey to the percentage of a feature’s contribution to Samsung’s overall profits for the accused products. He did no analysis to justify this one-to-one correlation for a single accused product, much less all 100+ accused products sold since 2012. Fifth, Mr. Bratic improperly relied on an inadmissible, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to support his claim that, in a hypothetical negotiation, Samsung would have agreed to equally split the benefits from the licensed patent. Sixth, he improperly relies on admittedly non-comparable license agreements so he and Uniloc could prejudice the jury with high dollar figures. His damages opinions are beyond flawed and should be excluded.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. **Uniloc Contends That Samsung Sold Mobile Devices With Lock Screens That Infringe The ’654 Patent, But Lock Screens Were Already Known In The Art.**

According to U.S. Patent No. 6,836,654 (the “’654 patent”), preventing unauthorized usage

of a mobile phone between the time the phone is lost and the time the owner blocks the phone via the network was an “object of the invention.” (Ex. 1, ’654 patent at 1:40-41.)¹ The ’654 patent purports to achieve this object of preventing unauthorized usage as follows: First, “a device [i.e., a phone] in accordance with the invention (1) verifies a user identification module [e.g., a SIM card] mounted inside the mobile radiotelephony device is linked to the mobile radiotelephony device,” much like the prior art. (*Id.* at 1:39-43.) Then, the device “(2) detects a period of inactivity of the mobile radiotelephony device during a normal operation of the mobile radiotelephony device, wherein the normal operation includes a processing of all outgoing calls, and (3) prevents the normal operation of the mobile radiotelephony device in response to the verification of the user identification module and in response to the detection of the period of inactivity of the mobile radiotelephony device.” (*Id.* at 1:43-51.) Once normal operation is prevented, a “deblocking code” must “be supplied to return to the normal operation mode.” (*Id.* at 2:11-12.)

Uniloc’s technical expert, Dr. Easttom, admitted that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] (Ex. 3, Easttom Dep. at 9:1-9, 10:23-12:13.) Mr. Bratic did not discuss any of these points with Dr. Easttom and did not know the incremental benefit provided by the ’654 patent:

[REDACTED]

¹ All exhibits are attached to the Declaration of Valerie Ho.

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.