

FILED UNDER SEAL

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

| | | |
|-------------------|---|----------------------------|
| MAXELL LTD., | § | |
| <i>Plaintiff,</i> | § | |
| v. | § | |
| ZTE (USA) INC., | § | Case No. 5:16-cv-00179-RWS |
| <i>Defendant.</i> | § | JURY TRIAL DEMANDED |
| | § | |
| | § | |
| | § | |
| | § | |
| | § | |
| | § | |

**DEFENDANT ZTE (USA), INC.’S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF
MAXELL, LTD.’S POST-TRIAL MOTIONS AND RENEWED MOTION FOR
JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW**

FILED UNDER SEAL

FILED UNDER SEAL

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| I. Introduction..... | 1 |
| II. The Court Should Deny Maxell’s Request for Judgment as a Matter of Law That ‘317 and ‘794 Patents Are Valid Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 | 1 |
| A. Eligibility of the ‘317 Patent..... | 2 |
| 1. The ‘317 Patent is Directed to an Abstract Idea | 2 |
| 2. The Asserted Claims of the ‘317 Patent Do Not Provide an Inventive Concept, and are Well-Understood, Routine and Conventional..... | 4 |
| B. Eligibility of the ‘794 Patent..... | 7 |
| 1. The ‘794 Patent is Directed to an Abstract Idea | 7 |
| 2. The Asserted Claims of the ‘794 Patent Do Not Provide an Inventive Concept, and Are Well-Understood, Routine and Conventional..... | 9 |
| III. Opposition to Request for Enhanced Damages | 11 |
| A. Legal Standard | 11 |
| B. Maxell Failed to Show Willful Infringement..... | 13 |
| C. Maxell Failed to Offer Evidence Sufficient to Support an Award of Enhanced Damages for Willfulness Under the Read Factors..... | 27 |
| 1. Whether the infringer deliberately copied the ideas or design of another | 28 |
| 2. Whether the infringer, when he knew of the other's patent protection, investigated the scope of the patent and formed a good-faith belief that it was invalid or that it was not infringed..... | 28 |
| 3. The infringer's behavior as a party to the litigation | 31 |
| 4. The defendant's size and financial condition | 36 |
| 5. Closeness of the case | 38 |
| 6. Duration of the defendant's misconduct | 43 |
| 7. Remedial action by the defendant..... | 45 |
| 8. The defendant's motivation for harm..... | 46 |
| 9. Whether the defendant attempted to conceal the misconduct..... | 48 |
| D. No Enhanced Damages Should be Awarded | 52 |
| IV. Opposition to Request for Attorneys’ Fees..... | 55 |
| A. Legal Standard | 55 |
| B. Maxell’s Claims are Unfounded | 55 |

FILED UNDER SEAL

- 1. ZTE Litigated in a Reasonable Manner56
- 2. ZTE’s Litigating Position Was Substantively Strong.....67
- V. Opposition to Motion for Pre and Post Judgment Interest and Costs.....68
 - A. Maxell is Not Entitled to Prejudgment Interest Calculated in the Manner that It Proposes..... 68
 - 1. Maxell Cannot Recover Prejudgment Interest for Running Royalties Prior to the Date on Which Each Running Royalty Would have been Due.....68
 - 2. Maxell is Not Entitled to Prejudgment Interest on Post-Judgment Damages or Enhanced Damages, if Awarded72
 - B. ZTE Does Not Object to an Award of Post-Judgment Interest 73
 - C. ZTE Does Not Object to Maxell’s Bill of Costs..... 73
- VI. Conclusion73

FILED UNDER SEAL**Table of Authorities**

| | Page(s) |
|---|----------------|
| <u>Cases</u> | |
| <i>Afros S.P.A. v. Krauss-Maffei Corp.</i> , 671 F. Supp. 1458 (D. Del. 1987)..... | 20 |
| <i>Alice Corp. Pty. v. CLS Bank Int'l</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2347 (2014)..... | 4, 8, 9 |
| <i>Barry v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> , 250 F. Supp. 3d 107 (E.D. Tex. 2017)..... | passim |
| <i>Beatrice Foods Co. v. New England Printing & Lithographing Co.</i> , 923 F.2d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1991)..... | 69, 72 |
| <i>Berkheimer v. HP Inc.</i> , 881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018)..... | 4 |
| <i>Boeing Co. v. Shipman</i> , 411 F.2d 365 (5th Cir. 1969) | 1 |
| <i>Boeing Co. v. United States</i> , 86 Fed. Cl. 303 (Fed. Cl. 2009) | 70 |
| <i>Chrimar Sys. v. Alcatel-Lucent Enter. USA</i> , 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 220804 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 23, 2017)..... | 43 |
| <i>Church & Dwight Co. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 49588 (D.N.J. June 23, 2003)..... | 47 |
| <i>Clear with Computs., LLC v. Dick's Sporting Goods, Inc.</i> , 21 F. Supp. 3d 758 (E.D. Tex. 2014)..... | 7 |
| <i>Creative Internet Advert. Corp. v. Yahoo!, Inc.</i> , 689 F. Supp. 2d 858 (E.D. Tex. 2010)..... | 31 |
| <i>Crucible, Inc. v. Stora Kopparbergs Bergslags AB</i> , 701 F. Supp. 1157 (W.D. Pa. 1988)..... | 38 |
| <i>Diamond Grading Techs. v. Am. Gem Soc'y</i> , 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 105697 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 30, 2016)..... | 14 |
| <i>Effective Expl., LLC v. BlueStone Nat. Res. II, LLC</i> , 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7707 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 18, 2018)..... | 43, 68 |

FILED UNDER SEAL

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <i>Eidos Display, LLC v. Chi Mei Innolux Corp.</i> , 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 34908 (E.D. Tex. 2018) | 31, 36, 47, 48 |
| <i>Elbit Sys. Land and C41 Ltd. v. Hughes Network Sys. LLC</i> , No. 2:15cv37, Dkt. 550 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 23, 2018) | 66, 67, 70 |
| <i>Erfindergemeinschaft UroPep GbR v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 111427 (E.D. Tex. July 18, 2017)..... | 39 |
| <i>Ericsson Inc. v. TCL Commc'n Tech. Holdings, Ltd.</i> , 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 183216 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 4, 2017) | 12 |
| <i>Ericsson Inc. v. TCL Commc'n Tech. Holdings, Ltd.</i> , 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78857 (E.D. Tex. May 10, 2018)..... | 13, 52, 70 |
| <i>Exergen Corp. v. Kaz USA, Inc.</i> , 725 F. App'x 959 (Fed. Cir. 2018)..... | 12, 53 |
| <i>Funai Elec. Co., Ltd. v. Daewoo Elecs. Corp.</i> , 616 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... | 54 |
| <i>Gautreaux v. Scurlock Marine, Inc.</i> , 107 F.3d 331 (5th Cir. 1997) | 1 |
| <i>General Motors Corp. v. Devex Corp.</i> , 461 U.S. 648 (1983)..... | 69, 70 |
| <i>Geodynamics, Inc. v. Dynaenergetics US, Inc.</i> , 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 210647 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 21, 2017)..... | 43 |
| <i>Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. v. Haeger</i> , 137 S. Ct. 1178 (2017)..... | 55 |
| <i>Gustafson, Inc. v. Intersystems Indus. Prods., Inc.</i> , 897 F.2d 508 (Fed. Cir. 1990)..... | 45 |
| <i>Hako-Med USA, Inc. v. Axiom Worldwide, Inc.</i> , 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 92712 (M.D. Fla.) | 28 |
| <i>Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.</i> , 136 S. Ct. 1923 (2016)..... | 11, 12, 54 |
| <i>Harris Corp. v. Fed. Express Corp.</i> , 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 96257 (M.D. Fla.) | 28 |
| <i>Imperium IP Holdings (Cayman), Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 203 F. Supp. 3d 755 (E.D. Tex. 2016)..... | 30, 31 |

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.