

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 OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT APPLE INC.'S MOTION
TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF MAXELL'S OPENING EXPERT REPORTS THAT
EXCEED THE SCOPE OF MAXELL'S P.R. 3-1 INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS
AND NEW EXPERT THEORIES OFFERED AFTER EXPERT REPORTS**

PUBLIC VERSION

Table of Contents

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LEGAL STANDARDS	1
III. ARGUMENT	2
A. Maxell’s Opening Expert Reports Do Not Contain Any New Infringement Theories.....	2
1. ██████████ Theory in Dr. Madisetti’s Report	2
2. ██████████ Theory in Dr. Vojcic’s and Mr. Crockett’s Reports	7
3. ██████████ DOE Theory in Dr. Madisetti’s Report	10
B. Dr. Tim Williams Does Not Intend to Offer Any Opinions Not Disclosed in His Expert Reports at Trial, and Thus There is Nothing to Strike.....	11
C. Apple Has Not Shown That It Has Suffered Any Prejudice.....	13
IV. CONCLUSION.....	14

PUBLIC VERSION

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Bridgelux, Inc. v. Cree, Inc.</i> , No. 9:06-cv-240, 2008 WL 5549448 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 20, 2008).....	12
<i>Core Wireless Licensing, S.A.R.L. v. LG Elecs., Inc.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-91, 2016 WL 3655302 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 21, 2016).....	2, 13
<i>EON Corp. IP Holdings, LLC v. Sensus USA Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:09-cv-116, 2010 WL 346218 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 21, 2010).....	1
<i>Erfindergemeinschaft UroPep GbR v. Eli Lilly and Co.</i> , 240 F. Supp. 3d 605 (E.D. Tex. 2017).....	13
<i>Laserdynamics, Inc. v. Quanta Computer, Inc.</i> , No. 2:06-cv-348-JRG-CE, D.I. 724 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 18, 2011)	14
<i>Linex Techs., Inc. v. Belkin Int’l, Inc.</i> , 628 F. Supp. 2d 703 (E.D. Tex. 2008).....	1
<i>Mobile Telecommunications Technologies, LLC v. Blackberry Corp.</i> , No. 3:12-cv-1652, 2016 WL 2907735 (N.D. Tex. May 17, 2016).....	2
<i>Motion Games, LLC v. Nintendo Co.</i> , No. 6:12-cv-878, 2015 WL 1774448 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 16, 2015)	2
<i>O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	11
<i>PerdiemCo, LLC v. IndusTrack LLC</i> , No. 2:15-cv-00727, 2016 WL 8189021 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 25, 2016).....	14
<i>Realtime Data, LLC v. Packeteer, Inc.</i> , No. 6:08-cv-144, 2009 WL 2590101 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 18, 2009).....	2, 13
<i>Tinnus Enterprises, LLC v. Telebrands Corp.</i> , No. 6:15-cv-00551-RWS, 2019 WL 1556252 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 10, 2019)	12
Other Authorities	
Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2)(B)(ii).....	8

PUBLIC VERSION

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
Maxell	Plaintiff Maxell, Ltd.
Apple	Defendant Apple Inc.
Infr. Cont.	Plaintiff Maxell, Ltd's Infringement Contentions Pursuant to Patent Local Rules 3-1 and 3-2 served June 12, 2019 and appendices thereto and Plaintiff Maxell, Ltd's Second Supplemental Infringement Contentions Pursuant to Patent Local Rules 3-1 and 3-2 served March 13, 2020 and appendices thereto Relevant Excerpts at Ex. 1
Madiseti Rpt.	Initial Expert Report of Vijay Madiseti, Ph.D. Concerning Apple's Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8,339,493, served May 7, 2020 Relevant Excerpts at Ex. 2
<i>Markman</i> Hr. Tr.	Transcript of <i>Markman</i> Hearing dated January 8, 2020 Relevant Excerpts at Ex. 3
Vojcic Rpt.	Initial Expert Report of Branimir Vojcic, Ph.D. Concerning Apple's Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,408,193, served May 7, 2020 Relevant Excerpts at Ex. 4
Crockett Rpt.	Expert Report of John Crockett Regarding Source Code Relating to Cellular Functionalities, served May 7, 2020 Relevant Excerpts at Ex. 5
Williams Dep. Tr.	Deposition Transcript of Tim A. Williams, Ph.D., dated June 25, 2020 Relevant Excerpts at Ex. 6

..

PUBLIC VERSION

I. INTRODUCTION

Apple's Motion (D.I. 365) improperly conflates *theories* of infringement with *evidence* of infringement. Maxell's opening expert reports do not disclose any new infringement theories; rather, they (1) provide a more technically detailed explanation of Maxell's previously disclosed infringement theories and (2) identify confidential evidence in support of such theories that was produced by Apple during discovery and was not otherwise publicly available. The information Apple seeks to strike is exactly the type of information and documentary evidence allowed and required in an expert report under Rule 26. Apple's attempt to address its disagreement with Maxell's expert's *application* of existing infringement theories through a motion to strike is improper. Cross examination—not exclusion—is the proper means for Apple to attack the bases of the infringement opinions of Maxell's experts. Moreover, there is no prejudice here as Apple's experts have already fully responded to these allegedly new infringement theories. The Court should therefore deny Apple's Motion in its entirety.

II. LEGAL STANDARDS

Proper infringement contentions under P.R. 3-1 provide a defendant with notice of a plaintiff's infringement theories. *Linex Techs., Inc. v. Belkin Int'l, Inc.*, 628 F. Supp. 2d 703, 706 (E.D. Tex. 2008) (noting "enough specificity is required to give an alleged infringer notice of the patentee's claims"); *see also* D.I. 204 at 4 and 338 at 4. "The Rules do not require the disclosure of specific evidence nor do they require a plaintiff to prove its infringement case." *EON Corp. IP Holdings, LLC v. Sensus USA Inc.*, Case No. 6:09-cv-116, 2010 WL 346218, at *2 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 21, 2010). "Infringement contentions are not intended to act as a forum for argument about the substantive issues but rather serve the purpose of providing notice to the Defendants of infringement theories beyond the mere language of the patent claim." *Motion Games, LLC v. Nintendo Co.*, No. 6:12-cv-878, 2015 WL 1774448, at *2 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 16, 2015); *see also*

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.