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

1

MAXELL, LTD.,	
Plaintiff,	Civil Action No. 5:19-cv-00036-RWS
v.	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
APPLE INC.,	
Defendant.	

APPLE INC.'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT LIMITING MAXELL'S CLAIM FOR DAMAGES FOR THE '999, '498, '493, AND '317 PATENTS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 287(a) AND FOR NO ENHANCED DAMAGES UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 284



TABLE OF CONTENTS

				Page	
I.	INTRODUCTION				
II.	STA	STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED BY THE COURT 1			
III.	STA	TATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS			
IV.	V. LEGAL STANDARDS			5	
	A.	Dama	nges Under 35 U.S.C. § 287	5	
	B.	Increa	ased Damages Under 35 U.S.C. § 284	6	
V.	ARG	UMEN	Γ	7	
	§ 287		ell's Damages Are Limited For Failure To Provide Notice Under	7	
		1.		8	
		2.		10	
		3.		10	
	B.	Maxe	ell Is Not Entitled To Any Enhanced Damages Under § 284	10	
		1.	Apple's Motion For No Enhanced Damages Is Ripe	11	
		2.	Apple's Conduct Was Neither Egregious Nor Worthy of Punishment	12	
VI.	CON	CLUSIO	ON	15	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>CASES</u>	Page
Amsted Indus. Inc. v. Buckeye Steel Castings Co.,	
24 F.3d 178 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	, 10
bioMerieux, S.A. v. Hologic, Inc., No. 18-cv-21, 2020 WL 759546 (D. Del. Feb. 7, 2020)	14
Bioverativ Inc. v. CSL Behring LLC, No. 17-cv-914, 2020 WL 1332921 (D. Del. Mar. 23, 2020)	14
Document Sec. Sys., Inc. v. Nichia Corp., No. 19-cv-08172 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2020)	14
Edwards v. Hartford Underwriters Ins. Co., No. 1:18-CV-370, 2019 WL 5790857, at *4 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 18, 2019), report and recommendation adopted, No. 1:18-CV-370, 2019 WL 5722111 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 4, 2019)	12
Eko Brands, LLC v. Adrian Rivera Maynez Enters., Inc., 946 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	1
Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Sys., Inc., No. 13-cv-03999, 2016 WL 3880774 (N.D. Cal. July 18, 2016), rev'd in part on other grounds, 879 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	14
Forsyth v. Barr, 19 F.3d 1527, 1533 (5th Cir. 1994)	13
Gart v. Logitech, Inc., 254 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	6, 9
Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A., 563 U.S. 754 (2011)	11
Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc., 136 S. Ct. 1923 (2016)	, 14
IP Power Holdings Ltd. v. Westfield Outdoor, Inc., No. 19-cv-01878, 2020 WL 2992415 (D. Nev. June 4, 2020)	14
LoggerHead Tools, LLC v. Sears Holdings Corp., No. 12-cv-9033, 2016 WL 5112017 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 20, 2016)	15
Mass. Inst. of Tech. v. Abacus Software, Inc., No. 5:01-cv-344, 2004 WL 5268125 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 29, 2004)	8, 9
Nike, Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 138 F.3d 1437 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	6



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (continued)

	Page
Read Corp. v. Portec, Inc., 970 F.2d 816 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	15
Solutran, Inc. v. U.S. Bancorp, No. 13-cv-02637, 2019 WL 405513 (D. Minn. Jan. 18, 2019)	14
SRI Int'l, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc., No. 13-cv-1534, 2020 WL 1285915 (D. Del. Mar. 18, 2020), appeal docketed, No. 20-1704 (Fed. Cir. Apr. 14, 2020)	7, 14
WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co., 829 F.3d 1317, 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	12
<u>STATUTES</u>	
35 U.S.C. § 271(a)	11
35 U.S.C. § 284	1, 2
35 U.S.C. § 287	2, 8, 10
35 U.S.C. § 287(a)	1, 6, 9, 10
RULES	
Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a)	6

I. INTRODUCTION

Apple moves for summary judgment that Maxell's damages period is limited and that Maxell is not entitled to enhanced damages.

First, Maxell seeks pre-suit damages starting on July 1, 2013 for Apple's alleged infringement of four¹ of the ten asserted patents. To get such damages, Maxell must prove that Apple had actual notice of its alleged infringement as required by 35 U.S.C. § 287(a).

Second, Maxell seeks enhanced damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 even though this is a typical patent infringement dispute that lacks any evidence of egregious behavior by Apple.

Accordingly, *Eko Brands*, *LLC v. Adrian Rivera Maynez Enterprises*, *Inc.* confirms that Maxell is not entitled to an award by the Court of enhanced damages on these facts. 946 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2020). Consequently, there is no reason to present the predicate question of "willful" infringement to the jury.

II. STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED BY THE COURT

Whether Apple is entitled to summary judgment that:

1.

¹ U.S. Patent Nos. 6,748,317; 6,580,999; 8,339,493; and 6,430,498.



DOCKET

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.

