

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

The CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF
TECHNOLOGY,

Plaintiff,

v.

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

Defendants.

Case No. 2:21-CV-0446-JRG

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**DEFENDANTS SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.'S AND SAMSUNG
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.'S ANSWER**

Defendants Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (“SEC”) and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (“SEA”) (collectively, “Samsung”) hereby submit their Answer to Plaintiff The California Institute of Technology’s (“Caltech” or “Plaintiff”) Complaint. Samsung denies all allegations in Caltech’s Complaint unless expressly admitted in the following paragraphs. Any admissions herein are for purposes of this matter only. Samsung also reserves the right to take further positions and raise additional defenses and counterclaims that may become apparent as a result of additional information discovered subsequent to filing the Answer.

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT*

1. Samsung admits that Plaintiff purports to set forth an action for patent infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7,116,710 (the “’710 patent”), U.S. Patent No. 7,421,032 (the “’032 patent”), U.S. Patent No. 7,716,552 (the “’552 patent”), U.S. Patent No. 7,916,781 (the “’781 patent”), and U.S. Patent No. 8,284,833 (the “’833 patent”) (collectively, “the Asserted Patents”) against Samsung arising under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq. Samsung denies committing any acts of infringement at any time. Samsung denies any remaining allegations in Paragraph 1 of the Complaint.

2. Samsung admits that certain public documents reflect a jury found Apple and Broadcom infringed certain claims of the ’710, ’032, and ’781 patents and awarded Caltech more than \$1 billion in damages, but the litigation documents are heavily redacted and the Federal Circuit vacated the judgment of infringement for the ’781 patent and the damages award in its entirety and then remanded for a new trial. *California Inst. of Tech. v. Broadcom Ltd.*, 25 F.4th 976, 980 (Fed. Cir. 2022). Samsung denies committing any acts of infringement at any time.

* Samsung restates the heading used in Plaintiff’s Complaint, but the use of Plaintiff’s headings should not be construed as an admission by Samsung. For example, as set forth below, Samsung denies any alleged patent infringement.

Samsung admits that Caltech seeks a reasonable royalty from Samsung, but Samsung denies that any is owed. Samsung denies any remaining allegations in Paragraph 2 of the Complaint.

THE PARTIES

3. Samsung lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 3 of the Complaint and, on that basis, denies them.

4. Samsung lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 4 of the Complaint and, on that basis, denies them.

5. Samsung admits that SEC is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Republic of Korea with a principal place of business at 129 Samsung-ro, Maetan-3dong, Yeongtong-gu Suwon-si, Gyeonggi-do, 16677, Korea. Samsung denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 5 of the Complaint.

6. Samsung admits that SEA is a wholly owned subsidiary of SEC. Samsung admits that SEA is incorporated under the laws of New York with a principal place of business at 85 Challenger Road, Ridgefield Park, New Jersey 07660. Samsung admits that SEA has offices at 6625 Excellence Way, Plano, Texas 75023. Samsung further admits that SEA may be served with process through its registered agent with the Texas Secretary of State, CT Corporation System, 1999 Bryan Street, Suite 900, Dallas, Texas 75201. Samsung denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 6 of the Complaint.

7. Samsung admits that SEA is involved in sales and distribution of certain Samsung consumer electronics products in the United States. Samsung denies that it has committed any acts of infringement as alleged by Caltech and denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 7 of the Complaint.

8. Samsung admits that SEA merged with Samsung Telecommunications America LLC (“STA”) in January 2015. Samsung admits that STA was involved in the sales and

distribution of certain Samsung-branded mobile electronic products in the United States. Samsung denies that STA or any other Samsung entity infringed any of the Asserted Patents. Samsung denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 8 of the Complaint.

9. Samsung denies that SEA or STA has committed any acts of infringement as alleged by Caltech. Samsung further denies that any alleged acts of infringement at issue in this case occurred before the merger of STA and SEA, which occurred more than six years before the Complaint was filed. The remaining allegations in Paragraph 9 of the Complaint express legal conclusions and thus no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Samsung denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 9 of the Complaint.

10. Samsung denies the allegations in Paragraph 10 of the Complaint.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

11. Samsung admits that the Complaint purports to set forth an action under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code.

12. As pled, Samsung does not deny that the Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a). Samsung denies the Court has subject matter jurisdiction in this case, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 12 of the Complaint.

13. For the purposes of this action only, Samsung does not challenge personal jurisdiction in the Eastern District of Texas. Samsung denies that it has committed any acts of infringement as alleged by Caltech. The remaining allegations in Paragraph 13 of the Complaint express legal conclusions and thus no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Samsung denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 13 of the Complaint.

14. Samsung admits that SEA has offices in the Eastern District of Texas, including at 6625 Excellence Way, Plano, Texas 75023. The remaining allegations in Paragraph 14 of the

Complaint express legal conclusions and thus no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Samsung denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 14 of the Complaint.

15. Samsung admits that the website cited in Paragraph 15 Footnote 1 of the Complaint, when accessed on April 5, 2022, stated that SEA's "Mobile hub in Plano centralizes innovation and enhances cross-functional collaboration for all teams dedicated to their largest mobile product line: smartphones" and its "[d]ivisions includ[e] Networks, Mobile Marketing, Computing and Wearables, and Product Management." Samsung further admits that the April 6, 2018 website cited in Paragraph 15 Footnote 2 of the Complaint, when accessed on April 5, 2022, stated that as of the date of that article, "Samsung Electronics America's North Texas offices will now be located in a newly redeveloped 216,000 square foot building" and "more than 1,000 regional employees from two current locations in Richardson and Plano will be relocated to the new location." Samsung denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 15 of the Complaint.

16. Samsung denies the allegations in Paragraph 16 of the Complaint.

17. Samsung denies the allegations in Paragraph 17 of the Complaint.

18. For the purposes of this action only, Samsung does not contest that the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)-(c) and 28 U.S.C. § 1400 are satisfied, as pled. Samsung denies that venue is proper and denies that this District is the most convenient venue under 28 U.S.C. § 1404.

19. Samsung admits that SEC is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Republic of Korea. Samsung further admits that SEA has offices at 6625 Excellence Way, Plano, Texas 75023. The remaining allegations in Paragraph 19 of the Complaint express legal conclusions and thus no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Samsung denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 19 of the Complaint.

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.