

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

OCEAN SEMICONDUCTOR LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

**HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC., HUAWEI
DEVICE CO., LTD., AND HISILICON
TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.,**

Defendants.

C.A. No. 4:20-cv-00991-ALM

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

**PLAINTIFF OCEAN SEMICONDUCTOR LLC'S OPPOSITION
TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION
TO DISMISS FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 271(g)**

Dated: April 19, 2021

DEVLIN LAW FIRM LLC
Timothy Devlin
tdevlin@devlinlawfirm.com
Henrik Parker (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
hparker@devlinlawfirm.com
Alex Chan
State Bar No. 24108051
achan@devlinlawfirm.com
1526 Gilpin Avenue
Wilmington, DE 19806
Telephone: (302) 449-9010
Facsimile: (302) 353-4251

*Attorneys for Plaintiff
Ocean Semiconductor LLP*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	LEGAL STANDARD.....	1
A.	The High Bar for a Motion to Dismiss	1
B.	The Broad Reach of Infringement Under 35 U.S.C. § 271(g).....	2
III.	ARGUMENT.....	3
A.	The Methods of the '402 Patent Involve the Making of Physical Products Such as Silicon Wafers, and Ocean's Pleadings Reflect that Fact	4
1.	The Intrinsic Record Amply Shows that Physical Products Are Being Manufactured ...	4
2.	Huawei's Argument Fails Because There Is No Legitimate Dispute that Each Claimed Limitation is Performed During the Manufacture of Physical Products.....	5
3.	Huawei's Arguments Are Not Supported by <i>Bayer</i> or <i>Momenta</i>	6
B.	The Methods of the '538 Patent Involve the Making of Physical Products Such as Silicon Wafers, and Ocean's Pleadings Reflect that Fact	7
1.	Huawei's Arguments Are Not Supported by <i>Bayer</i> or <i>Momenta</i>	9
2.	Huawei Omits Key Claim Elements that Unmistakably Cover the Manufacture of Physical Products	10
C.	The Methods of the '305 and '248 Patents Involve the Making of Physical Products Such as Silicon Wafers, and Ocean's Pleadings Reflect that Fact	10
D.	In All Events, Fact Issues Preclude Dismissal.....	13
E.	At Worst, Rather Than Dismissing the Complaint, Leave to Amend Should Be Granted	14
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	1
<i>Bayer AG v. Housey Pharm., Inc.</i> , 340 F.3d 1367, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	passim
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	1, 2
<i>Biotec Biologische Naturverpackungen GmbH & Co. v. Biocorp, Inc.</i> , 249 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	15
<i>Bio-Technology General Corp. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , 80 F.3d 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	4, 8, 14
<i>Bustos v. Martini Club, Inc.</i> , 599 F.3d 458 (5th Cir. 2010)	2
<i>Causey v. Sewell Cadillac-Chevrolet, Inc.</i> 394 F.3d 285 (5th Cir. 2004)	2
<i>Disc Disease Sols. Inc. v. VGH Sols., Inc.</i> 888 F.3 1256 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	3
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Am. Cyanamid Co.</i> , 82 F.3d 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	3, 4, 14
<i>Encoditech, LLC v. Citizen Watch Co. of Am.</i> C.A. No. 18-1335-XR, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 105833 (W.D. Tex. June 25, 2019).....	3
<i>Frye v. Anadarko Petro. Corp.</i> , 953 F.3d 285 (5 th Cir. 2019)	2
<i>Griggs v. Hinds Junior Coll.</i> , 563 F.2d 179 (5th Cir. 1977)	16
<i>Lone Star Motor Imp., Inc. v. Citroen Cars Corp.</i> , 288 F.2d 69 (5th Cir. 1961)	16
<i>Lormand v. US Unwired, Inc.</i> , 565 F.3d 228 (5 th Cir. 2009)	2
<i>Millennium Cryogenic Techs., Ltd. v. Weatherford Artificial Lift Sys.</i> , Civil Action No. H-12-0890-KPE, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 196638 (S.D. Tex. 2012)	15
<i>Momenta Pharms., Inc. v. Teva Pharms. USA Inc.</i> , 809 F.3d 610 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	9
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 653 F. Supp. 2d 1016 (C.D. Cal. 2009)	14, 15

Skinner v. Switzer
562 U.S. 521 (2011)..... 2

Zond, LLC v. Renesas Elecs. Corp.,
Civil Action No. 13-11625-NMG,
2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 114363 (D. Mass. Aug. 15, 2014)..... 15

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 271..... 2

Rules

Fed. R. Civ. P. 15..... 14

I. INTRODUCTION

The Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 13) filed by by defendants Huawei Device USA, Inc., Huawei Device Co., Ltd., and HiSilicon Technologies Co., Ltd. (collectively “Huawei”), which is essentially a replica of a Rule 12(b) motion filed by NXP—a defendant in a parallel action pending in the Western District of Texas (*Ocean Semiconductor LLC. V. NXP Semiconductors N.V. et al.*, No. 6:20-cv-1212-ADA (W.D. Tex.)), misconstrues both the nature of the patents at issue and the applicable law. Each of the four patents asserted by Ocean Semiconductor LLC (“Ocean”) in this action that Huawei seeks to dismiss—U.S. Patent Nos. 6,725,402 (“402 patent”), 8,676,538 (“538 patent”), 6,907,305 (“305 patent”), and 6,968,248 (“248 patent”) (collectively “Asserted Patents”)—describes the manufacturing of semiconductors in excruciating detail and claims methods used for, and during, that manufacturing used, for example, to manufacture semiconductor wafers—physical products falling squarely within the scope of § 271(g). Huawei’s bare bones motion, which includes little factual or legal argument, coupled with Huawei’s (a) artificial attempt to limit the Court’s analysis to isolated claimed features; and (b) misapplication of the relevant law, falls far short of the high bar necessary to obtain dismissal. In all events, fact issues preclude dismissal and the Motion should be denied.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

A. The High Bar for a Motion to Dismiss

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), dismissal of a complaint or cause of action is appropriate if it fails to state a claim for relief that is “plausible on its face.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). When considering a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6), “[t]he court *must* accept all well-pleaded facts as true and *must* draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the plaintiff.” *Frye v. Anadarko Petro. Corp.*, 953 F.3d 285, 290-91 (5th Cir. 2019) (citing *Lormand v. US Unwired*,

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.