

PUBLIC VERSION

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

MAXELL, LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 5:19-cv-00036-RWS

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PUBLIC VERSION

**MAXELL, LTD.'S OPPOSED MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF
DEFENDANT APPLE INC.'S OPENING EXPERT REPORTS BASED
ON UNDISCLOSED OR UNELECTED INVALIDITY THEORIES**

PUBLIC VERSION

Table of Contents

	PAGE
I. STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	1
II. LEGAL STANDARDS	2
III. ARGUMENT.....	4
A. Previously Undisclosed Invalidation Theories.....	4
1. New Opinions on Lack of Enablement/Written Description	4
2. New Motivations to Combine.....	5
3. New Invalidation Theories	6
4. The Applicable Factors Support Exclusion of the New Invalidation Positions.....	11
B. Opinions In Excess of the Final Election of Prior Art.....	12
IV. CONCLUSION	15

PUBLIC VERSION

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , Case No. 2:15-CV-1455-WCB, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 225041 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 3, 2017)	6
<i>Biscotti Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , No. 2:13-cv-01015, 2017 WL 2267283 (E.D. Tex. May 24, 2017)	4
<i>Finisair Corp. v. DirecTV Group, Inc.</i> , 424 F. Supp. 2d 896 (E.D. Tex. 2006).....	12
<i>Freeny v. Fossil Group, Inc.</i> , No. 2:18-cv-00049, 2019 WL 8688586 (E.D. Tex. July 25, 2019).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Life Techns. Corp. v. Biosearch Technologies, Inc.</i> , No. 12-00852, 2012 WL 4097740 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 17, 2012).....	12
<i>LML Patent Corp. v. JPMorgan Chase & Co.</i> , No. 2:08-cv-448, 2011 WL 5158285 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 11, 2011).....	6
<i>O2 Micro Intern. Ltd. v. Monolithic Power Systems, Inc.</i> , 467 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	6
<i>Realtime Data, LLC v. Packeteer, Inc.</i> , No. 6:08-cv-144, 2009 WL 4782062 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 8, 2009)	3
<i>Tech Pharmacy Services, LLC v. Alixa Rx LLC</i> , No. 4:15-CV-766, 2017 WL 3283325 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 2, 2017).....	2
<i>Tyco Healthcare Group LP v. Applied Medical Resources Corp.</i> , No. 9:06-cv-151, 2009 WL 5842062 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 30, 2009).....	4, 6, 12
Other Authorities	
Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(f).....	3

PUBLIC VERSION

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
Maxell	Plaintiff Maxell, Ltd.
Apple	Defendant Apple Inc.
POSITA/PHOSITA	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art
Bederson Rpt.	Opening Expert Report of Dr. Benjamin B. Bederson Regarding Invalidity of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,928,306 and 10,084,991 (Relevant Excerpts at Ex. 1)
Bims Rpt.	Opening Expert Report of Dr. Harry V. Bims Regarding Invalidity of U.S. Patent No. 6,408,193 (Relevant Excerpts at Ex. 2)
Bovik Rpt.	Opening Expert Report of Dr. Alan C. Bovik Regarding Invalidity of U.S. Patent No. 8,339,493 (Relevant Excerpts at Ex. 3)
Menascé '438/'586 Rpt.	Opening Expert Report of Dr. Daniel A. Menascé Regarding U.S. Patent Nos. 7,116,438 and 10,212,586 (Relevant Excerpts at Ex. 4)
Paradiso Rpt.	Opening Expert Report of Dr. Joseph A. Paradiso Regarding Invalidity of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,748,317, 6,580,999, 6,430,498 (Relevant Excerpts at Ex. 5)
Menascé '794 Rpt.	Opening Expert Report of Dr. Daniel A. Menascé Regarding U.S. Patent No. 6,329,794 (Relevant Excerpts at Ex. 6)
Final Election	Apple's Final Election of Prior Art served April 7, 2020 (Ex. 7)
Invalidity Contentions	Defendant Apple Inc.'s Invalidity Contentions Pursuant to Patent Local Rules 3-3 and 3-4 served August 14, 2019 and Defendant Apple Inc.'s First Supplemental Invalidity Contentions Pursuant to Patent Local Rules 3-3 and 3-4 served March 4, 2020 and exhibits thereto (Relevant Excerpts at Exs. 8-18)

..

PUBLIC VERSION

The Local Patent Rules require early disclosure of all prior art references, combinations of references, and motivations to combine, along with invalidity theories based on enablement or written description. This is in order to guide and narrow discovery in patent cases. To further narrow this case, the parties agreed to a Focusing Order (D.I. 44), requiring the parties to narrow the asserted claims and prior art before expert discovery. Though purporting to comply with this Order, Apple's invalidity reports contain many opinions that exceed the scope Apple's Invalidity Contentions or Final Election of Asserted Prior Art. Having failed to timely disclose and elect these positions, Apple should not be permitted to circumvent the rules and rely on them now. Thus, the Court should exclude any expert testimony relating to the previously undisclosed or unelected invalidity positions and preclude Apple from relying on such positions at trial. In addition, the deadline for rebuttal validity reports (June 4¹) will occur before briefing on this Motion is complete. As such, should the Court grant Maxell's Motion, Maxell also requests the Court award Maxell its attorneys' fees and costs for the prejudice it has suffered in addressing Apple's untimely theories.

I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

Local Patent Rule ("P.R.") 3-3 requires timely disclosure of all prior art references and combinations of references alleged to render an asserted claim invalid as well as invalidity theories based on enablement or written description. For each disclosed combination of references, P.R. 3-3 further requires timely disclosure of the alleged motivation to combine such references. On the date set forth by the Docket Control Order (D.I. 46) for such disclosures (August 14, 2019), Apple served its Invalidity Contentions. Such contentions were supplemented once, with leave of Court, on March 4, 2020. (Collectively, "Invalidity Contentions").

¹ Pursuant to this Court's May 8, 2020 Order (D.I. 325), rebuttal expert reports regarding the '794 Patent are due June 11, 2020.

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.