

**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' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE
PORTIONS OF THE EXPERT REPORT AND PROFERRED TESTIMONY OF
DEFENDANTS' EXPERT WITNESS, DR. ROBERT STEVENSON**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ARGUMENT	1
A. Dr. Stevenson did not attempt to construe the claims himself, but applied the Court’s constructions, including the plain meaning where applicable	1
1. ’431 Patent, Claim 7: “means for controlling a function of said apparatus using said information”	3
2. ’431 Patent, Claim 1: “determining from said sensed light the movement of said finger”	4
3. ’924 Patent, Claim 1: “a first camera oriented to view a user of the handheld device”	6
4. ’079 Patent: “light source”	8
B. Dr. Stevenson was not required to provide a legal opinion by identifying the applicable subsection of 35 U.S.C. § 102 for prior art references he relied on for invalidity	10
C. Dr. Stevenson applied the correct legal standard when rendering his opinions regarding obviousness of the Asserted Method Claims	11
D. Dr. Stevenson’s obviousness opinions regarding the “handheld” and “portable” claim limitations should not be excluded	13
E. Dr. Stevenson will not provide anticipation opinions as to the MERL system with respect to Claims 1-4 and 6 of the ’431 Patent	15
III. CONCLUSION	15

[REDACTED]

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apator Miitors ApS v. KAMSTRUP A/S</i> , 887 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	11
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.</i> , No. 12-CV-00630-LHK, 2014 WL 660857 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 20, 2014).....	2, 7
<i>Carr v. Montgomery Cnty.</i> , No. H-13-2795, 2015 WL 5838862 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 7, 2015)	11
<i>CytoLogix Corp. v. Ventana Med. Sys., Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1168 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	2
<i>In re Dailey</i> , 357 F.2d 669 (C.C.P.A. 1966)	14, 15
<i>EMC Corp. v. Pure Storage, Inc.</i> , CV No. 13-1985-RGA, 2016 WL 775742 (D. Del. Feb. 25, 2016)	2, 3
<i>EmeraChem Holdings, LLC v. Volkswagen Grp. of Am., Inc.</i> , 859 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	10
<i>Gardner v. TEC Sys., Inc.</i> , 725 F.2d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	14, 15
<i>Kraft Foods, Inc. v. Int’l Trading Co.</i> , 203 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	5
<i>In re Larson</i> , 340 F.2d 965 (C.C.P.A. 1965)	14
<i>In re Lindberg</i> , 194 F.2d 732 (C.C.P.A. 1952)	14
<i>Medgraph, Inc. v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> , 843 F.3d 942 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	1
<i>Network-1 Techs., Inc. v. Alcatel-Lucent USA, Inc.</i> , No. 6:11-CV-492-RWS-KNM, 2017 WL 4020591 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 13, 2017), <i>objections overruled sub nom. Network-1 Techs., Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , No. 6:13-CV-00072-RWS, 2017 WL 10222211 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 7, 2017).....	1, 9



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>ParkerVision, Inc. v. Qualcomm Inc.</i> , 903 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	12
<i>Salazar v. HTC Corp.</i> , No. 2:16-cv-01096-JRG-RSP, Dkt. 247 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 27, 2018).....	3
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Infobridge Pte. Ltd.</i> , 929 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	10
<i>Skedco, Inc. v. Strategic Operations, Inc.</i> , 287 F. Supp. 3d 1100 (D. Or. 2018)	15
<i>SSL Servs., LLC v. Citrix Sys., Inc.</i> , 940 F. Supp. 2d 480 (E.D. Tex. 2013), <i>aff'd</i> , 769 F.3d 1073 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	2, 7, 9
 Statutes	
35 U.S.C.	
§ 102.....	1, 10
§ 102(a).....	10
§ 102(b).....	10
§ 103.....	10
 Other Authorities	
Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(a)(2)(C)	11
Fed. R. Evid. 702	11

I. INTRODUCTION

GTP misquotes and mischaracterizes Dr. Stevenson's opinions in an effort to exclude proper non-infringement analysis that applies the Court's constructions, or the plain and ordinary meaning where appropriate, to the specific technology at issue. Despite arguing Dr. Stevenson improperly opined as to matters of law for non-infringement, GTP argues he should have opined as to a legal question for invalidity, namely the subsection of 35 U.S.C. § 102 under which each prior art system qualifies as such. GTP also mischaracterizes Dr. Stevenson's invalidity opinions as incorrectly applying the law, yet GTP ignores the tables to Dr. Stevenson's report in which he provides his detailed opinions. Because GTP has failed to meet its burden of proof on any ground presented in its motion, GTP's motion should be denied in its entirety.

II. ARGUMENT

A. **Dr. Stevenson did not attempt to construe the claims himself, but applied the Court's constructions, including the plain meaning where applicable**

GTP attempts to distort Dr. Stevenson's proper opinions concerning non-infringement, a question of fact, into improper claim construction in an effort to exclude his analysis. *Medgraph, Inc. v. Medtronic, Inc.*, 843 F.3d 942, 949 (Fed. Cir. 2016) ("Infringement is a question of fact.") (citation omitted); *Network-1 Techs., Inc. v. Alcatel-Lucent USA, Inc.*, No. 6:11-CV-492-RWS-KNM, 2017 WL 4020591, at *5 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 13, 2017), *objections overruled sub nom. Network-1 Techs., Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*, No. 6:13-CV-00072-RWS, 2017 WL 10222211 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 7, 2017) ("Whether the accused products infringe under the Court's claim construction is for the jury to decide."). Dr. Stevenson explicitly states that he did not construe any term, but rather applied the Court's constructions or the plain meaning of terms the Court did not construe:

I have applied the Court's constructions and the constructions agreed upon by the parties as part of the analysis for my Report. For

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.