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

### AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:22-cv-263-JRG

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

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Defendant.

### SAMSUNG'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS UNDER P.R. 3-6(b)

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

| I.   | INT   | INTRODUCTION1   |   |  |
|------|---|---|---|--|
| II.  | THE GOOD CAUSE FACTORS FAVOR LEAVE TO AMEND |   |   |  |
|      | А.  | Samsung Diligently Moved To Amend After FMD Was Added | 2 |  |
|      | В.  | The Amendment Is Important                            | 3 |  |
|      | C.  | AGIS Would Not Be Prejudiced                          | 4 |  |
|      | D.  | A Continuance Is Unnecessary                          | 5 |  |
| III. | CON   | USION   |   |  |
|      |   |   |   |  |

Case 2:22-cv-00263-JRG-RSP Document 134 Filed 09/28/23 Page 3 of 11 PageID #: 12732

#### **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Page

### **CASES**

**DOCKET A L A R M** Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

### **TABLE OF EXHIBITS**

| Ex. Number   | Document   |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Defendants' Exhibits Filed With Defendants' Opening Brief (Dkt. 122)             |  |  |  |  |
| A  | AGIS's 2022 ITC Complaint against Google, Samsung, and 11 Other              |  |  |  |
|  | Respondents  |  |  |  |
| В  | Initial Determination on AGIS's June 15, 2023 Motion to Terminate ITC        |  |  |  |
|  | Investigation  |  |  |  |
| С  | Samsung's Invalidity Contention claim chart for U.S. Patent No. 9,467,838    |  |  |  |
|  | ("'838 Patent") asserting U.S. Patent No. 7,353,034                          |  |  |  |
| D  | Samsung's Invalidity Contention claim chart for the '838 Patent asserting    |  |  |  |
|  | U.S. Patent No. 7,630,724  |  |  |  |
| Е  | U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0223518 ("Haney")                           |  |  |  |
| F  | U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0199612 ("Beyer '612")                      |  |  |  |
| G  | U.S. Patent No. 7,031,728 ("Beyer '728")                                     |  |  |  |
| Н  | Respondents' Invalidity Contentions claim chart for Haney, served in ITC     |  |  |  |
|  | Inv. No. 337-TA-1347 on May 18, 2023   |  |  |  |
| Ι  | Respondents' Invalidity Contentions claim chart for Beyer '612 served in     |  |  |  |
|  | ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1347 on May 18, 2023                                     |  |  |  |
| J  | Respondents' Invalidity Contentions claim chart for the Beyer '728 prior art |  |  |  |
|  | reference, served in ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1347 on May 18, 2023                |  |  |  |
| К  | February 2, 2023 procedural schedule in ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1347             |  |  |  |
| L  | Samsung's proposed supplemental invalidity contentions claim chart for       |  |  |  |
|  | Haney with respect to U.S. Patent No. 8,213,970 (the "'970 Patent")          |  |  |  |
| М  | Samsung's proposed supplemental invalidity contentions claim chart for       |  |  |  |
|  | Beyer '612 with respect to the '970 Patent                                   |  |  |  |
| Ν  | Samsung's proposed supplemental invalidity contentions claim chart for       |  |  |  |
|  | Beyer '728 with respect to the '970 Patent                                   |  |  |  |
| 0  | Samsung's proposed supplement to the Invalidity Contentions Cover            |  |  |  |
|  | Pleading, originally served on February 23, 2023                             |  |  |  |
| Р  | Redline comparison of Samsung's proposed supplement to the Invalidity        |  |  |  |
|  | Contentions Cover Pleading against the Cover Pleading originally served      |  |  |  |
|  | on February 23, 2023   |  |  |  |
| Plaintiff's Additional Exhibits Filed With Plaintiff's Response Brief (Dkt. 130) |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0223518                                     |  |  |  |
| 2  | U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0199612                                     |  |  |  |
| 3  | U.S. Patent No. 9,820,123  |  |  |  |
| 4  | Defendants' Invalidity Contentions in Case No. 2:19-cv-00359-JRG             |  |  |  |
| 5  | Samsung's Response to Verified Complaint served in ITC Inv. No. 337-         |  |  |  |
| 6  | TA-1347  |  |  |  |
| 6  | Respondents' Notice of Prior Art, served in ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1347         |  |  |  |
| 7  | Defendants' Initial Invalidity Contentions and Subject Matter Eligibility    |  |  |  |
| Defen 1 ( 1 4 1  | Contentions in Case No. 2:22-cv-00263-JRG-RSP                                |  |  |  |
|  | ditional Exhibits Filed With Defendants' Reply Brief                         |  |  |  |
| Q  | Complainants' Claim Construction Brief in ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1347           |  |  |  |

**A L A R M** Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

DOCKET

### I. INTRODUCTION

AGIS cannot have it both ways by amending its infringement contentions to accuse an entirely different product, Find My Device ("FMD"), while preventing Samsung from responding by raising additional invalidity arguments. In contending otherwise, AGIS does not confront the arguments in Samsung's Motion, all of which demonstrate that leave should be granted, instead creating a sideshow about Samsung's awareness of the three supplemental references from prior cases. But AGIS fails to acknowledge the key distinction between those prior cases and this one—FMD was accused in those cases, while it was not accused in this case until August 24. AGIS simply ignores that the three supplemental references are directly responsive to its late addition of FMD, as they contain disclosures mirroring AGIS's allegations against FMD with respect to add these references only two weeks after they became relevant here with the addition of FMD.

AGIS also fails to identify any specific prejudice it would suffer from the amendment, and instead vaguely refers to additional discovery (without identifying any specific discovery needed) and claim construction (without identifying any proposed supplemental terms). AGIS also sidesteps that it already served rebuttal contentions as to these three references in the recent ITC Action involving FMD. And AGIS ignores that the recent four-month continuance allows sufficient time to redress any alleged prejudice from needed discovery or claim construction.

Finally, AGIS's Opposition is belied by AGIS's own recent motion to add allegations against FMD one year into the case, when, under the prior case schedule, claim construction was nearly complete and fact discovery was three months from closing. AGIS's motion came after it repeatedly represented to Samsung and the Court that it would not accuse FMD and after having litigated claims against FMD in other cases since 2017. By contrast, Samsung was diligent in moving to add the supplemental references within two weeks of FMD's addition to the case. The

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

## DOCKET A L A R M



# 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.