

**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

**DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND
INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS**

It is undisputed that the MERL and MDScope prior art systems were described and charted in Defendants' original invalidity contentions, and the supplementations at issue here are based on materials newly-obtained from third-party subpoenas. Defendants were as diligent as could have been expected in discovering and disclosing the materials, and GTP cannot articulate any actual prejudice. Unable to challenge these facts, GTP misstates Defendants' position to argue that the supplementations are not "important" because they are "substantively cumulative." Opp. at 2. The materials are not "cumulative" additional prior art, but rather are additional evidence to help explain and clarify how MERL and MDScope invalidate the Asserted Patents. Defendants have endeavored to proceed as the letter and spirit of the Court's local rules require, undertaking diligent and sincere efforts to ensure "timely discovery" and providing GTP more than "adequate notice and information with which to litigate" *Personalized Media Commc'ns, LLC v. Apple, Inc.*, No. 2:15-cv-01366-JRG, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16909, at *10–11 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 29, 2021). Defendants request that the Court grant their motion for leave to amend.

I. DEFENDANTS HAVE DEMONSTRATED DILIGENCE

Defendants were *diligent in discovering* the new materials, serving third-party subpoenas on the creators of MERL and MDScope just a month after serving Defendants' original invalidity contentions. Mot. at 2. GTP claims Defendants served the subpoenas "towards the end of the discovery period," Opp. at 3, but the calendar refutes that claim. Defendants served the subpoenas *11 weeks before* the close of fact discovery.¹ Further, unlike patents and technical publications, information on physical systems like MERL and MDScope is difficult to obtain because there is no centralized database cataloging such systems. *See Maxell Ltd. v. Apple, Inc.*, No. 5:19-cv-00036-RWS, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 257203, at *6–7 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 24, 2020). There were thus

¹ This is only 4 weeks into the 15 week period separating the original invalidity contentions (week of July 4) and the close of fact discovery (week of October 11).

“practical limitations” to Defendants’ diligent efforts to discover the full set of available materials on these two systems. *See CEATS, Inc. v. Cont’l Airlines, Inc.*, No. 6:10-cv-00120, Dkt. 633 at 4 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 5, 2011). This Court is familiar with the challenges defendants face when discovering relevant art held and controlled by third-parties. *Seven Networks, LLC v. Google LLC*, No. 2:17-cv-004442-JRG, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 112210 (E.D. Tex. Jul. 6, 2018).

Defendants were also **diligent in disclosing** the new materials. GTP fails to mention that Defendants disclosed the new materials to GTP just **nine days** (MDScope) and **one day** (MERL) after obtaining the materials. Mot. at 3. The “relative speed” with which Defendants passed along the third-party production to GTP demonstrates diligence. *Seven*, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 112210, at *8. Rather than pursuing serial motions for leave to amend (*i.e.*, one for MERL and one for MDScope), Defendants prepared a single proposed supplementation and provided it to GTP on September 10, 2021, **less than two weeks** after obtaining the materials in full. *Id. See Maxell*, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 257203, at *7–8 (finding disclosure within “three weeks” to be diligent).²

GTP’s argument that Defendants were not diligent in pursuing discovery, or in disclosing the newly-obtained materials, rests on the misguided notion that if Defendants had been **even more diligent** they might have discovered and disclosed the materials a few days earlier. But perfection is neither possible nor required. Defendants have exhibited ample good faith and diligence.

II. THE NEWLY OBTAINED MATERIALS ARE IMPORTANT

The newly-obtained MERL and MDScope materials do not “only” provide background and support for Defendants’ existing contentions on those prior art systems. Opp. at 4. Rather,

² While diligence in filing their motion is not strictly a factor, Defendants note that GTP waited a full week to state its opposition to the supplementation, during which time Defendants followed up with GTP twice for a response. Mot. at 6 (Certificate of Conference). Defendants prepared and filed their motion within roughly a week. GTP’s claim that “Defendants waited to try to amend until three days before” the September 20 claim construction hearing is misleading.

the materials will help explain and clarify for the jury just how MERL and MDScope invalidate the Asserted Patents. Mot. at 3. “Clarity to the trier of fact is important.” *Maxell*, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 257203, at *10. For example, the MERL video clip will give the jury “a plain and understandable explanation of [Defendants’] invalidity defense.” *Id.* at *9. Both MERL and MDScope are prior art systems created over twenty years ago. Prototypes do not exist. The video clip will bring the MERL system to life and provide powerful evidence for the trier of fact.³

Moreover, both Dr. William Freeman (one of the inventors of MERL) and Dr. Vladimir Pavlovic (one of the inventors of MDScope) will provide deposition testimony before the close of fact discovery. The MERL video clip relates directly to Dr. Freeman’s work, and two of the MDScope publications were authored by Dr. Pavlovic. While Drs. Freeman and Pavlovic will certainly testify about other publications that were included in Defendants’ original invalidity contentions, their testimony regarding the newly-obtained materials is no less important, as the video clip and these two publications provide unique perspectives on the MERL and MDScope systems. The other three MDScope publications⁴ also offer unique contributions to Defendants’ already-disclosed theories: “Prototype Speech Recognition Interface for VMD” describes speech recognition technology, which can be used in contradistinction to gesture recognition technology;

³ GTP suggests that, rather than seek leave pursuant to the Court’s local rules, Defendants should simply seek to have the new materials admitted into evidence at trial. Opp. at 4. But if GTP will not object to their admission, its opposition to Defendants’ supplementation serves no purpose but to consume Court and party resources; and if GTP will (as expected) object to their admission, its suggestion that Defendants should try to do so without seeking leave is non-serious. Defendants timely “crystallized” their invalidity theories with respect to MERL and MDScope in their original invalidity contentions, and seek to supplement with newly-obtained materials that further support and evidence those theories, thereby ensuring that GTP is “sufficiently notified” as to the materials and their importance. *Personalized Media*, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16909, at *10–12.

⁴ Defendants have determined that the sixth publication, “Dynamic Bayesian Networks for Information Fusion with Applications to Human-Computer Interfaces,” is included in their original invalidity contentions and thus, while maintaining it in their contentions, withdraw that publication from their requested supplementation. Exhibit A (video clip); Exhibit B (publications).

“Molecular Dynamics Studies of the Protein Bacteriorhodopsin” and “Simplified Expression of Message-Driven Programs and Quantification of Their Impact on Performance” describe biological structures and computations abilities, respectively, for the molecular modeling system that was the subject of Dr. Pavlovic’s gesture detection system.

In sum, the supplemental video clip and publications (1) will bring clarity to the trier of fact, (2) will be the subject of live testimony for two key fact witnesses; and (3) will offer unique contributions to Defendants’ invalidity theories. The supplemental materials are important.

III. DEFENDANTS’ SUPPLEMENTATION DOES NOT PREJUDICE GTP

The newly-obtained materials can be both “important” and not prejudicial. *Cf. Uniloc 2017 LLC v. Google LLC*, No. 2:18-cv-00550-JRG-RSP, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25675, at *8–11 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 16, 2020). Despite the materials’ importance, GTP’s prejudice claims are notably weak.

First, the new materials do not alter Defendants’ invalidity theories with respect to MERL and MDScope, which were timely described and charted in their original invalidity contentions. GTP’s opposition ignores the crucial fact that the video clip and publications ***do not add a single new theory*** to Defendants’ original invalidity contentions. GTP’s reliance on *Innovation Display* is thus grossly inapt. *Opp.* at 4-5. There, defendant sought to add four prior art references that would result in “five new claim charts.” *Innovative Display Techs. LLC v. Acer Inc.*, No. 2:13-cv-00522-JRG-RSP, Dkt. 63 at 4–5 (E.D. Tex. May 20, 2014). The new prior art affected 22 claims across four asserted patents and required plaintiff “to develop its case anew.” *Id.*, Dkt. 65 at 6–7 (E.D. Tex. Jun. 3, 2014). Here, in contrast, the video clip and publications will not affect “the scope and combination of the specific prior arts disclosed in [Defendants’] invalidity contentions.” *Innovative Display Techs. LLC v. Acer Inc.*, No. 2:13-cv-00522-JRG, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 83196, at *7 (E.D. Tex. Jun. 19, 2014). Plaintiff also misreads *Maxell*. *Opp.* at 5. There, the defendant sought to add a wholly new item of prior art (*i.e.*, the Casio Camera). *Maxell*, 2020 U.S.

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.