

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

MAXELL, LTD.,

Plaintiff

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

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

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED



**APPLE INC.'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT MAXELL, LTD.'S
MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF DEFENDANT
APPLE INC.'S INVALIDITY EXPERT REPORTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ARGUMENT	2
A. Apple’s Expert Reports Do Not Present Any New Theories.....	2
1. Apple Disclosed The Written Description And Enablement Theories Upon Which Its Experts Rely	2
2. Apple More Than Adequately Disclosed Its Motivations To Combine.....	3
3. Apple’s Experts Present No New Invalidity Theories.....	8
B. Apple’s Experts Do Not Provide Opinions Of Invalidity Based On Prior Art In Excess Of The Final Election Of Prior Art	13
C. Even If The Court Finds That There Are Any New Theories, Exclusion Is Not Warranted.....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
<u>CASES</u>	
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , No. 2:15-cv-01455-WCB, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 225041 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 3, 2017)	6, 15
<i>Biscotti Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 2:13-cv-01015, 2017 WL 2267283 (E.D. Tex. May 24, 2017)	3
<i>Elbit Sys. Land & C4I Ltd. v. Hughes Network Sys., LLC</i> , No. 2:15-cv-00037-RWS-RSP (E.D. Tex. July 4, 2017).....	15
<i>Elbit Sys. Land & C4I Ltd. v. Hughes Network Sys., LLC</i> , No. 2:15-CV-37-RWS-RSP, 2016 WL 9307563 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 27, 2016)	7, 11, 12
<i>Elbit Sys. Land & C4I Ltd. v. Hughes Network Sys., LLC</i> , No. 215CV00037RWSRSP, 2017 WL 2651618 (E.D. Tex. June 20, 2017), <i>report and recommendation adopted</i> , No. 2:15-CV-00037-RWS, 2017 WL 4693971 (E.D. Tex. July 31, 2017).....	7
<i>EON Corp. IP Holdings, LLC v. Sensus USA Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:09-cv-116 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 21, 2010).....	7, 12
<i>Finisair Corp. v. DirecTV Grp., Inc.</i> , 424 F. Supp. 2d 896 (E.D. Tex. 2006).....	7
<i>Freeny v. Fossil Grp., Inc.</i> , No. 2:18-cv-00049 (E.D. Tex. May 30, 2019).....	7
<i>Life Techns. Corp. v. Biosearch Techs., Inc.</i> , No. 12-00852, 2012 WL 4097740 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 17, 2012).....	7
<i>LML Patent Corp. v. JPMorgan Chase & Co.</i> , No. 2:08-cv-448, 2011 WL 5158285 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 11, 2011).....	7
<i>Network-1 Techs., Inc. v. Alcatel-Lucent USA Inc.</i> , No. 6:11-cv-492-RWS-KNM (E.D. Tex. Oct. 11, 2017)	14
<i>O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Monolithic Power Sys., Inc.</i> , 467 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	7
<i>PerdiemCo v. Industrack LLC</i> , Case No. 2:15-cv-00727-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex. Oct. 24, 2016)	2
<i>PerdiemCo, LLC v. Industrack LLC</i> , No. 2:15-cv-00727-JRG (E.D. Tex. Oct. 12, 2016).....	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>Personal Audio v. Togi Entm't</i> , Case No. 2:13-cv-00013-JRG-RSP, Dkt. 202 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 6, 2014)	14
<i>Realtime Data, LLC v. Packeteer, Inc.</i> , No. 6:08-cv-144, 2009 WL 4782062 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 8, 2009)	7
<i>Tyco Healthcare Grp. LP v. Applied Med. Res. Corp.</i> , No. CIV.A. 9:06-CV-151, 2009 WL 5842062 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 30, 2009)	6

RULES

P.R. 3-3	3
P.R. 3-3(b).....	12
P.R. 3-3(c).....	12

I. INTRODUCTION

Invalidity contentions are designed to give adequate notice to allow the parties to litigate their cases. Maxell cannot seriously dispute that it had more than adequate notice of all of Apple's invalidity theories. Apple's invalidity contentions fully complied with the Patent Rules, disclosing all of the prior art references and combinations Apple would rely on, and providing motivations to combine those references. In attempting to manufacture disputes, Maxell imagines novel legal requirements and attempts to fault Apple for not complying with these non-existent requirements. For example, Maxell suggests that prior art combinations must be disclosed on a claim limitation basis in invalidity contentions for an expert to rely on those combinations in a report. This District expressly holds otherwise: combinations do not need to be disclosed on a limitation basis in invalidity contentions. All that is required is to chart the prior art references and disclose which references will be combined, and motivations to combine them. Apple complied with that requirement.

Similarly, Maxell criticizes experts for providing additional analysis of prior art and motivations to combine over the disclosure in Apple's invalidity contentions, and its brief includes charts suggesting that Apple's experts are presenting "new" theories by selecting snippets of Apple's expert reports that Maxell claims do not use exactly the same words as parts of Apple's invalidity contentions Maxell cites. In doing so, Maxell simply ignores other parts of Apple's invalidity contentions that very clearly disclose the grounds Maxell accuses of being "new." Also, this District holds that parties are not required to put forward their entire case in invalidity contentions; expert reports are necessarily more detailed.

Unsurprisingly considering that Apple's invalidity contentions clearly complied with the Patent Local Rules ("Patent Rules"), Maxell finds no authority to support its novel theories and the extreme relief it seeks for illusory disputes. To the contrary, the only cases Maxell cites do

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.