

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

MAXELL, LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 5:19-cv-00036

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PUBLIC VERSION

**MAXELL, LTD.'S OPPOSITION TO APPLE'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE
TESTIMONY OF ROBERT L. STOLL**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	LEGAL STANDARD.....	2
III.	ARGUMENT	4
A.	Mr. Stoll Will Testify Only About Topics for Which He Has Extensive Qualifications and Will Not Usurp the Role of the Court or Jury.	5
1.	Mr. Stoll Is a Qualified Expert on Identifying Facts Relevant to the Public Accessibility of Prior Art.....	5
2.	Mr. Stoll Offers Opinions Only on Public Accessibility Based on His Unique USPTO Expertise.	6
B.	Mr. Stoll’s Opinions on Public Availability Should Not Be Excluded.	7
1.	Mr. Stoll’s Opinions on The Public Accessibility of Abowd Are Not Opinions About “Library Records” and Should Not Be Excluded.	8
2.	Mr. Stoll’s Opinions on the Public Use of Cyberguide Are Helpful to the Jury and Should Not Be Excluded.	10
3.	Mr. Stoll’s Opinions on the Alleged Public Use of NavTalk Are Helpful to the Jury and Should Not Be Excluded.....	11
4.	Mr. Stoll’s Opinions on the Public Accessibility of the Sony Cameras Are Helpful to the Jury And Should Not Be Excluded.....	12
C.	Mr. Stoll Details the Basis and Methodologies of His Opinions.....	14
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>#1 Fan Co., LLC v. Pepco Licensed Prods.</i> , No. SA-09-CA-1029-FB, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 167039 (W.D. Tex. Apr. 8, 2011)	2
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Communs., Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	8
<i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. E’Lite Optik, Inc.</i> , No. 3:98-CV-2996-D, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14834 (N.D. Tex. Apr. 4, 2002)	2
<i>Bausch & Lomb, Inc. v. Alcon Labs., Inc.</i> , 79 F. Supp. 2d 252 (W.D.N.Y. 2000)	4
<i>Cybergym Research, LLC v. Icon Health & Fitness, Inc.</i> , No. 2:05-CV-527, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 102197 (E.D. Tex. Sep. 4, 2007)	3
<i>Dey, L.P. v. Sunovion Pharm., Inc.</i> , 715 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	10
<i>i4i Ltd. P’ship v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 598 F.3d 831 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	8
<i>Ihde v. HME, Inc.</i> , No. 4:15-CV-00585, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 120933 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 1, 2017)	4, 10
<i>Inline Packaging, LLC v. Graphic Packaging Int’l, LLC</i> , 351 F. Supp. 3d 1187 (D. Minn. 2018).....	2
<i>Innovative Sonic Ltd. v. Research In Motion Ltd.</i> , No. 3:11-CV-706 (N.D. Tex. Jan. 09, 2013)	2
<i>Jazz Pharms., Inc. v. Amneal Pharms., LLC</i> , 895 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	8
<i>Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael</i> , 526 U.S. 137 (1999).....	2
<i>Liquid Dynamics Corp. v. Vaughan Co.</i> , No. 01 C 6934, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 29992 (N.D. Ill. Sep. 30, 2004).....	3, 4
<i>Magna Elecs., Inc. v. TRW Auto. Holdings Corp.</i> , No. 12-654, 2016 WL 4239181 (W.D. Mich. Jan. 29, 2016)	1, 2

..

In re Namenda Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litig.,
331 F. Supp. 3d 152 (S.D.N.Y. 2018).....3

Network-1 Techs. v. Alcatel-Lucent USA, Inc.,
No. 11-CV-492, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 154434 (E.D. Tex. Sep. 21, 2017).....3, 4, 7

Portus Sing. PTE Ltd. v. Kenyon & Kenyon LLP,
No. 16-CV-6865, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 55449 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 27, 2020).....2

Regeneron Pharms., Inc. v. Merus B.V.,
No. 14-CV-1650, ECF No. 364 (S.D.N.Y. Jun. 4, 2015).....2

Robroy Indus. Tex., LLC v. Thomas & Betts Corp.,
No. 2:15-CV-512-WCB, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 54230 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 10,
2017).....12

Sanitec Indus., Inc. v. Micro-Waste Corp.,
No. H-04-3066, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36460 (S.D. Tex. June 2, 2006).....4

Sundance, Inc. v. DeMonte Fabricating Ltd.,
550 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....2, 7, 11, 12

Szoka v. Woodle,
No. C 02-5524 SI, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 30791 (N.D. Cal. June 7, 2004).....3

Veazey v. Allstate Tex. Lloyd’s,
No. 3-04-CV-0182-L, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8797 (N.D. Tex. Mar. 6, 2006).....2

W. Plastics, Inc. v. Dubose Strapping, Inc.,
334 F. Supp. 3d 744 (E.D.N.C. 2018).....2

Zimmer Surgical, Inc. v. Stryker Corp.,
365 F. Supp. 3d 466 (D. Del. 2019).....3, 4, 8

Statutes

U.S.C. 102(a), 102(b), 102(g).....9

35 U.S.C. 103.....14

35 U.S.C. 287.....3

35 U.S.C. 101, 112, 102, 103.....15

Other Authorities

37 CFR I.....15

MPEP § 2133.03.....14

...

Rule 7022

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.