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

| MAXELL, LTD., | |
|---------------|----------------------------|
| Plaintiff, | Case No. 5:19-cv-00036-RWS |
| v. | JURY TRIAL DEMANDED |
| APPLE INC., | PUBLIC VERSION |
| Defendant. | |

MAXELL, LTD.'S OPPOSITION TO APPLE INC.'S RENEWED MOTION TO STAY PENDING DETERMINATION OF INTER PARTES REVIEW OF THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | | Page |
|------|-------|---|-------------|
| I. | Facti | ual Background | 2 |
| II. | Lega | ıl Standard | 5 |
| III. | Anal | ysis | 5 |
| | A. | The Prejudice Factor Weighs Against Stay | 5 |
| | B. | The Stage of the Proceedings Weighs Strongly Against Stay | 7 |
| | | 1. Discovery is Largely Complete and Trial Has Been Set | 8 |
| | | 2. Apple Unreasonably Delayed the Filing of its IPRs | 10 |
| | C. | The Narrow Potential Simplification of the Case Weighs Against Stay | 11 |
| IV. | Cond | clusion | 15 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| Page(s) |
|---|
| Cases |
| Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc., IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020) |
| Ericsson Inc. v. TCL Commc'n Tech. Holdings, Ltd., No. 2:15-cv-00011-RSP, 2016 WL 1162162 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 23, 2016)12 |
| Fall Line Patents, LLC v. Am. Airlines Grp., No. 6:17-cv-00202-RWS, 2018 WL 4169251 (E.D. Tex. May 21, 2018) |
| Image Processing Techs., LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd., No. 2:16-cv-505-JRG, Dkt. No. 306 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 25, 2017) |
| JumpSport, Inc. v. Acad., Ltd., No. 6:17-CV-00414-RWS, 2018 WL 1806900 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 17, 2018)6, 7 |
| NFC Tech. LLC v. HTC Am., Inc., No. 2:13-cv-1058, 2015 WL 1069111 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 11, 2015) |
| Parallel Networks Licensing, LLC v. Ramquest Software, Inc., No. 4:19-cv-487, 2020 WL 1236266 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 13, 2020) |
| Peloton Interactive, Inc. v. Flywheel Sports, Inc., No. 2:18-cv-00390-RWS-RSP, 2019 WL 3826051 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 14, 2019) |
| Realtime Data LLC v. Actian Corporation, No. 6:15-cv-463-RWS-JDL, 2016 WL 3277259 (E.D. Tex. June 14, 2016)7 |
| Saint Lawrence Commc'ns LLC v. ZTE Corp., No. 2:15-cv-349-JRG, 2017 WL 3396399 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 17, 2017)12 |
| SAS Institute, Inc. v. Iancu, 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018) |
| Smartflash LLC v. Apple Inc., 621 F. App'x 995 (Fed. Cir. 2015) |
| SSL Servs., LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc., No. 2:15-cv-433-JRG-RSP, 2016 WL 3523871 (E.D. Tex. June 28, 2016)12 |
| Stragent, LLC v. BMW of N. Am., LLC, No. 6:16-cv-446-RWS-KNM, 2017 WL 2839260 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 20, 2017) |



| Tessera Advanced Techs., Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., No. 2:17-cv-00671-JRG, 2018 WL 3472700 (E.D. Tex. July 19, 2018) | 11 |
|--|----|
| Tinnus Enters., LLC v. Telebrands Corp., No. 6:15-cv-551, 2017 WL 379471 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 24, 2017) | 12 |
| TracBeam, L.L.C. v. T-Mobile US, Inc., No. 6:14-cv-678, 2016 WL 9225574 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 29, 2016) | 7 |
| Trover Grp., v. Dedicated Micros USA, No. 2:13-cv-1047-WCB, 2015 WL 1069179 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 11, 2015) | 14 |
| Statutes | |
| 35 U.S.C. § 112 | 12 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) | 4 |



The Court rightfully denied Apple's first premature motion to stay this case after the filing of Apple's petitions for *inter partes* review. In doing so, the Court held that each factor considered weighed against a stay, specifically making the following findings:

- Undue Prejudice: "[T]he time allowed for the IPR decision as well as a potential appeal could cause a lengthy delay that would significantly prejudice Maxell."
- Stage of the Proceedings: "The case is not in its infancy and is far enough along that a stay would interfere with ongoing proceedings."; "Apple has not sufficiently explained its delay in filing the petitions."
- **Simplification of Issues**: "[A]any finding at this time as to the likelihood of simplification would be pure speculation."

D.I. 298 at 3, 4, 6.

The factors weigh even more against a stay now. Since the Court's first ruling on the issue, the case has progressed even further, with summary judgment and *Daubert* briefing now complete, and the PTAB has now denied a majority of Apple's IPR petitions for which institution decisions have been rendered. Thus, the factors of undue prejudice and stage of the proceedings still unquestionably weigh against a stay. As to likely simplification, some speculation has now been removed. Specifically, it is now clear that the IPR proceedings cannot simplify issues for at least half of the Asserted Patents. In contrast, the amount of simplification that could arise with respect to the four patents subject to instituted IPRs and the one patent whose institution decision remains outstanding, remains questionable.

The timing of the IPRs was completely within Apple's control. Though it could have filed its petitions when the case was in its earlier stages, and thereby limit in part the potential prejudice to Maxell from a stay pending resolution of the proceedings, it chose instead to wait. As the Court observed in its last denial of Apple's stay request: "Apple has not sufficiently explained its delay in filing the [IPR] petitions. Apple filed its first wave of petitions nine months after Maxell filed suit and six months after Maxell served its initial infringement contentions." D.I. 298 at 4-5. The



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.

