

PUBLIC VERSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. THE COURT SHOULD DENY ZTE’S REQUEST FOR JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW.	1
A. Legal Standard	1
B. ’794 Patent	2
1. <i>The record includes substantial evidence that the ZMAX 2 includes a controller for controlling operation based on remaining capacity.</i>	2
2. <i>The record includes substantial evidence that the controller sends a power consumption reduction instruction to each function device in a set GA.</i>	5
3. <i>Sets GA and GB do not overlap.</i>	9
4. <i>Dr. Phinney complied with the Court’s claim construction order.</i>	10
C. ’317 Patent	11
D. ’493 and ’729 Patents.....	15
1. <i>Substantial evidence supports the verdict that ZTE infringes claim 5 of the ’493 Patent.</i>	15
2. <i>Substantial evidence shows infringement of claim 1 of the ’729 Patent.</i>	24
E. ’491 and ’695 Patents.....	31
1. <i>Substantial evidence supports the jury’s verdict that ZTE infringed claim 8 of the ’491 Patent.</i>	31
2. <i>Substantial evidence supports the jury’s verdict that ZTE infringed claim 1 of the ’491 Patent.</i>	33
3. <i>Substantial evidence supports the jury’s verdict that ZTE infringed the ’695 Patent.</i>	36
F. ’193 Patent	36
1. <i>Substantial evidence supports a finding that the accused devices include a [REDACTED] [REDACTED]”</i>	36
2. <i>Substantial evidence supports finding the ZMAX 2 includes [REDACTED]</i>	40

PUBLIC VERSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
II. MARKING IS NO BASIS TO REDUCE DAMAGES.....	44
A. Legal standards	44
B. The marking issue is limited to the Casio G’zOne and a subset of patents.	45
C. ZTE failed to meet its burden of producing evidence that Casio did not mark the G’zOne.....	45
D. ZTE failed to meet its burden of producing evidence that the G’zOne practices a claim of any asserted patent.	46
E. The Court should not reduce the damages award.	47
III. SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE SUPPORTS THE JURY’S WILLFULNESS VERDICT.	48
A. ZTE USA knew of the asserted patents.	48
1. <i>Maxell presented substantial evidence that ZTE Corporation was aware of each asserted patent before the complaint.</i>	<i>48</i>
2. <i>Maxell presented substantial evidence for the jury to impute ZTE Corporation’s knowledge of the patents to ZTE USA.....</i>	<i>51</i>
B. ZTE USA knew or should have known its conduct risked infringement.	53
1. <i>ZTE cannot defend by arguing it believed the patents were invalid.....</i>	<i>53</i>
2. <i>Substantial evidence supports the jury’s finding that ZTE knew or should have known of a high risk that ZTE was infringing.</i>	<i>55</i>
IV. THE COURT SHOULD NOT REDUCE THE JURY’S DAMAGES AWARD AND REPLACE IT WITH ITS OWN DETERMINATION AS TO AN ONGOING ROYALTY RATE.....	58
V. THE ’317 AND ’794 ARE VALID UNDER SECTION 101	61
VI. ZTE IS NOT ENTITLED TO A NEW TRIAL.....	63
A. Legal Standard	63
B. Public Events Did Not Deny ZTE A Fair Trial.	64
1. <i>The Court properly screened for prejudice via voir dire.....</i>	<i>64</i>
2. <i>ZTE has not demonstrated a presumption of prejudice.</i>	<i>66</i>
3. <i>ZTE has not demonstrated any actual prejudice.</i>	<i>68</i>
C. The Closing Argument Does Not Warrant A New Trial.	69

PUBLIC VERSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
D. Admission Of Prior Licensing Negotiations To Establish Willfulness Does Not Warrant A New Trial.	70
1. <i>FRE permits disclosure of prior licensing negotiations.</i>	71
2. <i>The NDA does not prohibit disclosure of prior licensing negotiations.</i>	72
3. <i>ZTE invited any arguable error.</i>	74
E. A New Trial Is Not Warranted Based on ZTE’s Allegation Regarding the Entire Market Value Rule.	74
1. <i>ZTE did not object to evidence of the total revenues of the accused products.</i>	74
2. <i>There was no error or prejudice.</i>	77
F. Ms. Mulhern’s Reference To The <i>MMI</i> Rate Does Not Warrant a New Trial. 78	
VII. CONCLUSION.....	80

PUBLIC VERSION

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Accent Packaging, Inc. v. Leggett & Platt, Inc.</i> , 707 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	35
<i>ACCO Brands, Inc. v. ABA Locks Mfr. Co.</i> , 501 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	1
<i>Am. Home Assur. Co. v. United Space All., LLC</i> , 378 F.3d 482 (5th Cir. 2004)	1
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 258 F. Supp. 3d 1013 (N.D. Cal. 2017)	57
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	1
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prod. Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	44, 45, 54
<i>Baisden v. I'm Ready Prods., Inc.</i> , 693 F.3d 491 (5th Cir. 2012)	69, 70
<i>Barry v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> , 230 F. Supp. 3d 630 (E.D. Tex. 2017).....	54
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010).....	61
<i>Blitzsafe Texas, LLC v. Volkswagen Grp. Of Am., Inc.</i> , No. 2:15-cv-1274, 2016 WL 4778699 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 19, 2016).....	48
<i>Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 1920 (2015).....	55
<i>Desert Palace, Inc. v. Costa</i> , 539 U.S. 90 (2003).....	50
<i>Dura. Auto. Sys. Of Ind., Inc., v. CTS Corp.</i> , 285 F.3d 609 (7th Cir. 2002)	41, 42
<i>EEOC v. Boh Bros. Constr. Co.</i> , 731 F.3d 444 (5th Cir. 2013)	1

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.