

**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.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

C.A. NO. 2:21-cv-00040-JRG

LEAD CONSOLIDATED CASE

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

Defendants.

C.A. NO. 2:21-cv-00041-JRG

**RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS HUAWEI DEVICE CO., LTD AND HUAWEI DEVICE
USA, INC.'S PARTIAL MOTION TO DISMISS**

Plaintiff Gesture Technology Partners, LLC (“GTP”) files this Response to Defendants Huawei Device Co., Ltd. and Huawei Device USA, Inc. (collectively, “Defendants”) Motion to Dismiss GTP’s Complaint (the “Motion” or “Mot.”), Dkt. No. 28. For the following reasons, the Motion should be denied in its entirety.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Motion fails for one primary reason: Defendants inappropriately seek to parse GTP’s claims by dividing the case into a pre-filing phase and a post-filing phase. Defendants have inadequate legal support for their proposed division at the pleading stage and arrive at their position only by ignoring the Court’s prior decisions and the entirety of the Complaint’s allegations. The Motion should therefore be denied.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

Rule 12(b)(6) – Motions to Dismiss. In the Fifth Circuit, a “motion to dismiss under rule 12(b)(6) ‘is viewed with disfavor and is rarely granted.’” *Collins v. Morgan Stanley Dean Witter*, 224 F.3d 496, 498 (5th Cir. 2000) (quoting *Kaiser Aluminum & Chem. Sales v. Avondale Shipyards*, 677 F.2d 1045, 1050 (5th Cir. 1982)). “Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) authorizes a court to dismiss a complaint if the complaint ‘fail[s] to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.’” *Script Sec. Sols. L.L.C. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 170 F. Supp. 3d 928, 935 (E.D. Tex. 2016) (Bryson, J.) (quoting FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(6)). “The question resolved on a motion to dismiss for a failure to state a claim is not whether the plaintiff will ultimately prevail, ‘but whether [the] complaint was sufficient to cross the federal court’s threshold.’” *Id.* (quoting *Skinner v. Switzer*, 562 U.S. 521, 530 (2011)). The “plaintiff is generally required to provide ‘only a plausible “short and plain” statement of the plaintiff’s claim . . .’” *Id.* at 936 (quoting *Skinner*, 562 U.S. at 530; Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2)) (alteration in original).

The plausibility standard is satisfied when the complaint pleads “enough facts to raise a reasonable expectation that discovery will reveal evidence” in support of the alleged claims. *Id.* Thus, particularly when the relevant information is beyond the plaintiff’s access, the courts should generally permit discovery to proceed unless the complaint recites no more than sheer speculation about the plaintiff’s entitlement to relief. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 679 (2009) (“Determining whether a complaint states a plausible claim for relief will . . . be a context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense.”).

Rule 15(a) – Leave to Amend. When deciding motions to dismiss, Federal Rule 15(a) instructs the courts to “freely give leave [to amend] when justice so requires,” within the discretion of the Court. FED. R. CIV. P. 15(a)(2); *Wapp Tech Ltd. P’ship v. Micro Focus Int’l, PLC*, 406 F. Supp. 3d 585, 593 (E.D. Tex. 2019) (Mazzant, J.). This Court has interpreted Federal Rule 15(a) to “evinced[] a bias in favor of granting leave to amend.” *Wapp Tech Ltd. P’ship*, 406 F. Supp. 3d at 593 (quoting *Jones v. Robinson Prop Grp., L.P.*, 427 F.3d 987, 994 (5th Cir. 2005)). Indeed, “district courts must entertain a presumption in favor of granting parties leave to amend.” *Dueling v. Devon Energy Corp.*, 623 Fed. Appx. 127, 129 (5th Cir. 2015) (quoting *Mayeaux v. La. Health Serv. & Indem. Co.*, 376 F.3d 420, 425 (5th Cir. 2004)) (internal citation omitted) (holding the district court abused its discretion in denying plaintiffs’ request for leave to amend).

Induced Infringement. “Whoever actively induces infringement of a patent shall be liable as an infringer.” 35 U.S.C. § 271(b). “[I]nducement can be found where there is [e]vidence of active steps taken to encourage direct infringement.” *Barry v. Medtronic, Inc.*, 914 F.3d 1310, 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (citations omitted). Inducement also has a knowledge requirement— “liability for inducing infringement attaches only if the defendant knew of the patent and that ‘the

induced acts constitute patent infringement.” *Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, 135 S. Ct. 1920, 1926 (2015) (quoting *Global–Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.*, 563 U.S. 754, 766 (2011)). Knowledge of the patent can be shown directly or through evidence of willful blindness on the part of the alleged infringer. *See Motiva Patents, LLC v. Sony Corp.*, 408 F. Supp. 3d 819, 828 (E.D. Tex. 2019) (Gilstrap, C.J.) (collecting relevant Supreme Court and Federal Circuit cases). In order to prove knowledge by evidence of willful blindness, the patentee must show that (1) the defendant “subjectively believes that there is a high probability that a fact exists and (2) the defendant must have taken deliberate actions to avoid learning of that fact.” *Global–Tech*, 563 U.S. at 769 (citations omitted).

Enhanced Damages. “In a case of infringement, courts ‘may increase the damages up to three times the amount found or assessed.’” *Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.*, 136 S. Ct. 1923, 1928 (2016) (quoting 35 U.S.C. § 284). “[A] case presenting ‘subjective bad faith’ alone could ‘sufficiently . . . warrant [an enhanced] fee award,’” *Halo*, 136 S. Ct. at 1933 (quoting *Octane Fitness, LLC v. ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.*, 572 U.S. 545, 555 (2014)), as long as the patent infringer’s conduct was “willful, wanton, malicious, bad-faith, deliberate, consciously wrongful, flagrant, or—indeed—characteristic of a pirate.” *Halo*, 136 S. Ct. at 1932. This Court has found that “a well-pled claim for willful blindness is sufficient to state a claim for willful infringement.” *See Motiva Patents*, 408 F. Supp. 3d at 836–38 (explaining that this determination is “squarely consistent” with the Supreme Court’s holdings in *Global-Tech* and *Halo* and to hold otherwise would present a “legal quagmire”).

III. ARGUMENT

A. GTP Has Plausibly Pled Induced Infringement.

Defendants’ argument that the Complaint fails to plead pre-suit knowledge sufficiently (*see* Dkt. No. 28, Mot. at 5-6) lacks merit because the Court has repeatedly held that “pre-suit” and

“post-suit” indirect infringement claims should not be evaluated separately at the pleading stage. For example, in *Lochner Techs., LLC v. AT Labs Inc.*, No. 2:11-CV-242, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 92924, at *9-10 (E.D. Tex. Jul. 5, 2012) (Gilstrap, J.), the Court declined to dismiss the plaintiff’s indirect infringement claims, even though plaintiff did not allege pre-suit knowledge of the asserted patents. The Court rejected the defendants’ argument that there was a “pleading deficiency at least with respect to any allegedly infringing activities that pre-date the filing of the Original Complaint” and denied defendants’ motion to dismiss on that basis. *Id.*; see also *Cellular Comms. Equip. LLC v. HTC Corp.*, No. 6:13-CV-507, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 179461, at *26-27 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 27, 2015) (Davis, J.) (denying motion to dismiss indirect infringement claims based on failure to allege pre-suit knowledge); *Inmotion Imagery Techs. v. Brain Damage Films*, No. 2:11-CV-414-JRG, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 112630, at *3-4 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 10, 2012) (Gilstrap, J.) (same). The Court’s subsequent jurisprudence confirms that there is no reason “to depart from the reasoning of these cases.” *Alacritech Inc. v. Centurylink, Inc.*, No. 2:16-CV-00693-RWS-RSP, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 155687, at *8-9 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 4, 2017) (Payne, J.) (denying motion to dismiss pre-suit indirect infringement claims because plaintiff alleged knowledge of the asserted patents as of service of the complaint). As in those cases, the instant Complaint alleges for each Asserted Patent that “Huawei had knowledge of [the Asserted Patents] at least as of the filing of this Complaint. Compl. at ¶¶ 41, 56, 71, 85.

Furthermore, by alleging that Defendants had knowledge “at least as of the filing of this Complaint,” GTP has described pre-suit knowledge by Defendants; “[t]he implication is that [Defendant] induced infringement before the complaint was filed. Viewing the facts in the light most favorable to [Plaintiff], the complaint describes pre-suit conduct.” *Estech Sys., Inc. v. Target Corp.*, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 209893, at *17 (Aug. 27, 2020) (Payne, J.) (denying motion to

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.