

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

MAXELL, LTD.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 5:19-cv-00036-RWS

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**DEFENDANT APPLE INC.'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL DISMISSAL OF PLAINTIFF'S
COMPLAINT FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES.....	2
III. BACKGROUND	3
IV. LEGAL STANDARD.....	4
V. ARGUMENT	6
A. This Court Should Dismiss Maxell’s Induced Infringement Claims For Failing To Plausibly Allege Apple’s Specific Intent	6
B. This Court Should Dismiss Maxell’s Claims for Pre-Suit Indirect and Willful Infringement of the ’586 Patent For Not Plausibly Alleging Apple’s Knowledge of the Patent	8
C. This Court Should Dismiss Maxell’s Claims For Pre-Suit Indirect And Willful Infringement of All Asserted Patents For Failing To Plausibly Allege Knowledge of Infringement	10
VI. CONCLUSION.....	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Pages

Cases

<i>Am. Vehicular Scis. LLC v. Mercedes-Benz U.S. Int’l, Inc.</i> , No. 6:13-cv-307 MHS-JDL, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 184564 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 7, 2014).....	8
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	4, 8
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	4
<i>Cevallos v. Silva</i> , 541 Fed. Appx. 390 (5th Cir. 2013).....	4
<i>Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 1920 (2015).....	5, 9, 10
<i>Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. 6:14-cv-752-JRG-JDL, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 107354 (E.D. Tex. Jul. 15, 2015)	7
<i>Cross Med. Prods., Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	5
<i>Deere & Co. v. AGCO Corp.</i> , No. 18-827-CFC, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25885 (D. Del. Feb. 19, 2019).....	12
<i>Diamond Grading Techs. v. Am. Gem Soc’y</i> , No. 2:14-cv-1161-RWS-RSP, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 105697 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 30, 2016).....	9
<i>Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.</i> , 563 U.S. 754 (2011).....	5
<i>Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.</i> , 136 S. Ct. 1923 (2016).....	5, 6, 11
<i>Hypermedia Navigation v. Google LLC</i> , No. 18-CV-06137-HSG, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 56803 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 2, 2019).....	12
<i>In re Bill of Lading Transmission and Processing Sys. Patent Litig.</i> , 681 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	4, 5
<i>Nalco Co. v. Chem-Mod, LLC</i> , 883 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	5
<i>Preferential Networks IP, LLC v. AT&T Inc. Mobility, LLC</i> , No. 2:16-cv-01374-JRG-RSP, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 140979 (E.D. Tex. July 15, 2017)	6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(continued)

	Pages
<i>Smit v. SXSX Holdings, Inc.</i> , 903 F.3d 522 (5th Cir. 2018)	8
<i>State Indus. v. A.O. Smith Corp.</i> , 751 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	9
<i>Stragent, LLC v. BMW of N. Am., LLC</i> , No. 6:16-cv-446-RWS-KNM, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 156084 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 3, 2017)	7
<i>T-Rex Prop. AB v. Regal Entm't Grp.</i> , No. 6:16-cv-927-RWS-KNM, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 156859 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 31, 2017) (report and recommendation adopted, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 155605 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 22, 2017)).....	11
<i>Välinge Innovation AB v. Halstead New Eng. Corp.</i> , No. 16-1082-LPS-CJB, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 88696 (D. Del. May 29, 2018).....	12
<i>Vita-Mix Corp. v. Basic Holding, Inc.</i> , 581 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	5
<i>WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.</i> , 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	6
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 271(b)	6

I. INTRODUCTION

The Court should dismiss Maxell’s claims of indirect and willful infringement because Maxell did not allege facts to plausibly show that Apple had the requisite “specific intent” to induce infringement or that Apple knew of its alleged infringement of the asserted patents before Maxell filed this suit.¹ Instead, repeating the same form for each of the ten asserted patents, Maxell premises its indirect and willful infringement claims solely on two allegations: (1) Apple was “on notice” of each asserted patent through pre-suit interactions with Maxell; and (2) Apple gave its users online “instructions” regarding their general use of its accused products. These allegations amount to little more than conclusory statements that do not meet Maxell’s burden to plead indirect and pre-suit willful infringement.

First, the Complaint fails to allege facts sufficient to support a reasonable inference that Apple specifically intended to cause others to infringe Maxell’s patents—a required element of induced infringement. Maxell alleges only that Apple “instructs its customers through at least user guides or websites.” *See, e.g.*, Complaint at ¶ 27. These allegations, even if true, do not explain how Apple’s “user guides or websites” reveal a specific intent to cause infringement. Rather, they only demonstrate Apple’s intent to market and support its products. Thus, Maxell has not stated a valid induced infringement claim under Rule 12(b)(6).

Second, for the ’586 patent, the Complaint fails to plausibly allege that Apple knew—before this lawsuit—that this patent even existed. Specifically, Maxell’s alleged pre-suit interactions with Apple all predate the ’586 patent’s issuance, yet the Complaint alleges that Apple

¹ The patents asserted in this case are Patent Nos. 6,748,317 (“the ’317 patent”); 6,580,999 (“the ’999 patent”); 8,339,493 (“the ’493 patent”); 7,116,438 (“the ’438 patent”); 6,408,193 (“the ’193 patent”); 10,084,991 (“the ’991 patent”); 6,928,306 (“the ’306 patent”); 6,329,794 (“the ’794 patent”); 10,212,586 (“the ’586 patent”); and 6,430,498 (“the ’498 patent”) (collectively, “the asserted patents”).

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.