

Exhibit 1

1 DARIN W. SNYDER (S.B. #136003)
dsnyder@omm.com
2 LUANN L. SIMMONS (S.B. #203526)
lsimmons@omm.com
3 DAVID S. ALMELING (S.B. #235449)
dalmeling@omm.com
4 MARK LIANG (S.B. #278487)
mliang@omm.com
5 BILL TRAC (S.B. #281437)
btrac@omm.com
6 AMY K. LIANG (S.B. #291910)
aliang@omm.com
7 SORIN G. ZAHARIA (S.B. #312655)
szaharia@omm.com
8 **O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP**
Two Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor
9 San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 984-8700

STACY YAE (S.B. #315663)
syae@omm.com
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope St., 18th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: (213) 430-6000

11 *Attorneys for Defendants Google LLC and Waze*
12 *Mobile Ltd.*

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
14 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
15 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**

17 AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC,
18 Plaintiff,

19 v.

20 GOOGLE LLC,
21 Defendant.

22

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC,
23 Plaintiff,

24 v.

25 WAZE MOBILE LTD.,
26 Defendant.
27

Case No. 5:22-cv-04826-BLF
(Consolidated case)

**DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF
MOTION AND MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Date: September 7, 2023
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Judge: Hon. Beth Labson Freeman
Courtroom: 3, Fifth Floor

Complaint Filed: November 4, 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED BY THE COURT.....	2
III. STATEMENT OF FACTS	2
A. AGIS’s Asserted Patents And Claims.....	2
B. Accused Google Software Applications	5
1. Find My Device (“FMD”).....	5
2. Google Maps Mobile (“GMM”)	6
C. The Accused Waze Products.....	8
1. The Waze Application (“Waze App”)	8
2. Waze Carpool.....	10
D. Waze Had No Pre-Suit Knowledge Of The Asserted Patents.....	10
E. The Asserted Patents’ Priority Chain.....	10
IV. LEGAL STANDARD	12
V. GOOGLE DOES NOT INFRINGE THE ASSERTED PATENTS	12
A. FMD And GMM Do Not Infringe Any Asserted Claim Because They Do Not Meet The “group” Limitations	12
1. FMD	13
2. GMM.....	13
B. FMD and GMM Do Not Infringe The ’251, ’838, Or ’123 Patents Or ’829 Patent, Claims 41, 60 Because They Do Not Meet “sending data” Limitations	15
1. FMD	15
2. GMM.....	16
C. GMM Does Not Infringe The ’829 Patent Because GMM Does Not Meet The “remote control” Limitations	17
VI. WAZE DOES NOT INFRINGE THE ’829 OR ’123 PATENT.....	17
A. The Accused Waze Products Do Not Meet The “group” Limitations	17
B. AGIS’s Infringement Theories Address Only The “joining” Aspect Of The “group” Limitations And Have No Merit	19
1. Opening The Waze App Or Waze Carpool Does Not Satisfy The “request to join a group” Limitations.....	20
2. A Request To Download The Waze App Or Waze Carpool Is Not A “request to join a group” Or A “message relate[d] to joining a group”	20

DEFENDANTS’ NOTICE OF MOTION AND

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
3. Sharing A Location With Friends Or Contacts In The Waze App Or Waze Carpool Does Not “join a group”	21
4. Because There Is No “group” In Waze Carpool, Riders/Drivers Cannot Be Invited To Join A “group”	22
VII. THE ASSERTED PATENTS ARE ANTICIPATED BY THE ’724 PATENT	22
A. The ’410 Application Fails To Incorporate The ’724 Patent	24
B. The ’410 Application Does Not Support The Asserted Claims’ Limitation Of Receiving Georeferenced Maps From A Server	25
C. The ’724 Patent Antedates And Anticipates The Asserted Claims.....	29
VIII. WAZE CANNOT BE A WILLFUL INFRINGER.....	29
IX. CONCLUSION	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Page

CASES

Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.,
598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 28

Bayer Healthcare LLC v. Baxalta Inc.,
989 F.3d 964 (Fed. Cir. 2021)..... 29

Celotex Corp. v. Catrett,
477 U.S. 317 (1986)..... 12

Exigent Tech., Inc. v. Atrana Sols., Inc.,
442 F.3d 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 20, 22

Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.,
136 S. Ct. 1923 (2016)..... 29, 30

Hollmer v. Harari,
681 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 23, 26

In re De Seversky,
474 F.2d 671 (C.C.P.A. 1973) 25

In re Hogan,
559 F.2d 595 (C.C.P.A. 1977) 23

In re Lund,
376 F.2d 982 (C.C.P.A. 1967) 25

Ledergerber Med. Innovations, LLC v. W.L. Gore & Assocs., Inc.,
736 F. Supp. 2d 1172 (N.D. Ill. 2010) 25

Lockwood v. Am. Airlines, Inc.,
107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997)..... 28

Northrop Grumman Info. Tech., Inc. v. United States,
535 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 24

Power Integrations, Inc. v. ON Semiconductor Corp.,
No. 5:16-cv-06371-BLF (N.D. Cal. Aug. 7, 2019)..... 30

Tech. Licensing Corp. v. Videotek, Inc.,
545 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 23

WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.,
829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 30

Zenon Env't, Inc. v. U.S. Filter Corp.,
506 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 23, 24, 29

RULES

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a)..... 12



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.