

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

GESTURE TECHNOLOGY
PARTNERS, LLC,

Plaintiff

v.

HUAWEI DEVICE CO., LTD.,
HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CASE NO. 2:21-cv-00040-JRG
(Lead Case)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

GESTURE TECHNOLOGY
PARTNERS, LLC,

Plaintiff

v.

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

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CASE NO. 2:21-cv-00041-JRG
(Member Case)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**SAMSUNG DEFENDANTS' DAUBERT MOTION TO PRECLUDE
THE OPINIONS AND TESTIMONY OF PLAINTIFF'S DAMAGES EXPERT
DAVID KENNEDY**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE KENNEDY REPORT	2
A. Understanding of Samsung Features	2
B. Reliance on the Groehn Report & Apportionment	3
III. LEGAL STANDARD.....	5
IV. ARGUMENT	6
A. The Kennedy Report Depended on the Unreliable and Irrelevant Groehn Report.....	6
B. The Kennedy Report Adopted a Hypothetical Negotiation Not Tied to the Facts of the Case	7
1. The Kennedy Report Used an Incorrect Hypothetical Negotiation Date	8
2. The Kennedy Report Applied an “After-The-Fact Assessment” of Samsung’s “Anticipated” Profit.....	9
3. The Kennedy Report Arbitrarily Assigns GTP a [REDACTED] Bargaining Share	10
C. The Kennedy Report Failed to Apportion for Non-Infringing Uses of the Accused Products.....	12
D. The Kennedy Report Ignored the Patent Rights Claimed in the Patents	14
1. The Kennedy Report Ignored the Distinction Between Apparatus and Method Claims	14
2. The Kennedy Report Contradicts the Court’s Construction of “Gesture”	15
V. CONCLUSION.....	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Aqua Shield v. Inter Pool Cover Team</i> , 774 F.3d 766 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	7, 9
<i>Bio-Rad Labs., Inc. v. 10X Genomics Inc.</i> , 967 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	12
<i>Biscotti Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , No. 2:13-CV-01015-JRG-RSP, 2017 WL 2536962 (E.D. Tex. May 18, 2017).....	12
<i>BMC Software, Inc. v. Servicenow, Inc.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-903-JRG, 2016 WL 367251 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 29, 2016).....	1, 15
<i>Bourjaily v. United States</i> , 483 U.S. 171 (1987).....	5
<i>Cassidian Commc 'ns, Inc. v. Microdata GIS, Inc.</i> , No. 2:12-cv-00162-JRG, 2013 WL 11322510 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 3, 2013).....	8
<i>CloudofChange, LLC v. NCR Corp.</i> , No. 6:19-cv-00513-ADA (W.D. Tex. Nov. 9, 2021), Dkt. No. 205.....	15
<i>Commonwealth Sci. & Indus. Rsch. Org. v. Cisco Sys., Inc. (CSIRO)</i> , 809 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	5, 14
<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc.</i> , 509 U.S. 579 (1993).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Exmark Mfg. Co. v. Briggs & Stratton Power Prods. Grp., LLC</i> , 879 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	1, 5, 13
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Sys., Inc.</i> , 879 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	5, 11, 13, 14
<i>Garretson v. Clark</i> , 111 U.S. 120 (1884).....	6
<i>Hanson v. Alpine Valley Ski Area, Inc.</i> , 718 F.2d 1075 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	9
<i>Infernal Tech. LLC v. Activision Blizzard Inc.</i> , No. 3:18-cv-01397-M, 2021 WL 4391250 (N.D. Tex. Sept. 16, 2021).....	1

<i>LaserDynamics, Inc. v. Quanta Comput., Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 51 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	6, 7, 8
<i>Lucent Techs. Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.</i> , 580 F.3d 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	10
<i>M2M Sols. LLC v. Motorola Sols., Inc.</i> , No. 12-cv-33-RGA, 2016 WL 767900 (D. Del. Feb. 25, 2016).....	6
<i>Mentor Graphics Corp. v. EVE-USA, Inc.</i> , 870 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (per curiam).....	13
<i>Packet Intelligence LLC v. NetScout Sys., Inc.</i> , 965 F.3d 1299, 1314-15 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	14, 15
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	14
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int’l, Inc.</i> , 904 F.3d 965 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	7, 13, 14
<i>ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.</i> , 594 F.3d 860 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (per curiam).....	14
<i>Riles v. Shell Expl. & Prod. Co.</i> , 298 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	9, 10
<i>RSA Protective Techs., LLC v. Delta Sci. Corp.</i> , 2:19-cv-06024-JAK (PLAx), 2021 WL 4978462 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2021).....	8
<i>Sinclair Refining Co. v. Jenkins Petroleum</i> , 289 U.S. 689 (1933).....	9
<i>Summit 6 LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.</i> , 802 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	13
<i>Tech Pharm. Servs., LLC v. Alixa Rx LLC</i> , No. 4:15-CV-766, 2017 WL 3318247 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 3, 2017).....	6
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 632 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	1, 12
<i>Virnetx, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 767 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	11, 12, 14
<i>Whitserve, LLC v. Comput. Packages, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 10 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	5



Wordtech Sys., Inc. v. Integrated Networks Sols., Inc.,
609 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....7, 10

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 284.....14

Other Authorities

Federal Rule of Evidence 702.....1

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.