

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

**CHRIMAR SYSTEMS, INC., CHRIMAR
HOLDING COMPANY, LLC,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

**ALCATEL-LUCENT ENTERPRISE USA
INC.,**

Defendant.

§
§
§ **CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:15-CV-00163-JDL**
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court is Defendant Alcatel-Lucent Enterprises USA, Inc. (“ALE”) Motion to Declare this Case Exceptional and For Attorney’s Fees. (Doc. No. 494.) Plaintiffs Chrimar Systems, Inc. d/b/a CMS Technologies and Chrimar Holding Company LLC (“Chrimar”) have filed a response (Doc. No. 497), to which ALE has filed a reply (Doc. No. 500), and Chrimar has filed a sur-reply (Doc. No. 503). For the reasons stated herein, the Court **DENIES** ALE’s Motion (Doc. No. 494).

BACKGROUND

On March 9, 2015, Plaintiffs filed the instant action against Defendant ALE. (Doc. No. 3.) Chrimar alleged infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,115,012 (“the ’012 Patent”), 8,902,760 (“the ’760 Patent”), 8,942,107 (“the ’107 Patent”), and 9,019,838 (“the ’838 Patent”) (“patents-in-suit”). This case proceeded through claim construction, dispositive motions and pretrial, and the trial between Chrimar and ALE commenced on October 3, 2016. Prior to trial, ALE stipulated to infringement, and the following claims, defenses, and counterclaims were presented

to the jury: damages, invalidity based on derivation and improper inventorship, fraud, and breach of contract. (Doc. No. 350.) On October 7, 2016 the trial concluded and the jury returned a verdict as follows: (1) Claims 31, 35, 43, and 60 of the '012 Patent were not invalid; Claims 1, 5, 72, and 103 of the '107 Patent were not invalid; Claims 1, 59, 69, 72, and 145 of the '760 Patent were not invalid, and Claims 1, 7, and 26 of the '838 Patent were not invalid; (2) the sum of money that would fairly and reasonably compensate Chrimar for ALE's infringement was \$324,558.34; (3) ALE did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Chrimar committed fraud against ALE; and (4) ALE did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Chrimar breached a contract with the IEEE. (Doc. No. 349.)

After the conclusion of the trial, on November 10, 2016, Chrimar moved to declare this case exceptional under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and requested attorney's fees. (Doc. No. 380.) The court declined to declare this case exceptional and denied Chrimar's request for attorney's fees. (Doc. No. 412.) The Court then entered final judgment affirming the findings of the jury and awarding post judgment ongoing royalties. (Doc. No. 423.) Both ALE and Chrimar filed appeals. (Doc. Nos. 440, 447.)

On appeal, the Federal Circuit affirmed the verdict in its entirety, but rejected the claim construction of the term "adapted" as set forth in claim 31 of the '012 Patent. (Doc. No. 463.) Specifically, the Federal Circuit rejected the Court's construction of the claim term "adapted" as "designed, configured, or made" and adopted ALE's proposed construction that "adapted" means "modified." *Id.* The remainder of the Court's rulings were affirmed, including the infringement damages award, the Court's ruling on fees, and the fraud judgment. *Id.* The case was remanded for further proceedings consistent with that opinion and the corresponding mandate subsequently issued. (Doc. No. 465.)

On July 10, 2018, the Court held a status conference to discuss how to proceed with the case on the sole issue before the Court—liability as to claim 31 of the '012 Patent based upon the Federal Circuit's modified construction of the term "adapted" found therein. (Doc. No. 467.) At that time, Chrimar offered to dismiss the '012 Patent and ALE raised, for the first time, an argument that it should not have to pay any damages, including ongoing royalties, because the patents-in-suit had since been found invalid by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board ("PTAB").

The Court ultimately dismissed the asserted claim of infringement of the '012 Patent with prejudice and denied ALE's request to stay and/or sever the ongoing royalties. (Doc. No. 476.) In its reasoning for denying a stay, the court noted that "the ongoing royalties were affirmed by the Federal Circuit with the Circuit Court's express knowledge that the PTAB had invalidated at the patents-in-suit." (Doc. No. 476, at 5 –6, citing Doc. No. 463, at 6 n. 1 ("The claims of the '107, '838, '012, and '760 patents to which ALE stipulated infringement in this case were all determined to be unpatentable by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in four final written decisions.")). ALE filed a motion to reconsider, which the Court denied. (Doc. No. 480.) The Court then issued an amended final judgment. (Doc. No. 481.) ALE filed an appeal. (Doc. No. 485.) Without deciding the issues on the merits on appeal, the Federal Circuit determined that this case was still "pending" as a result of arguments raised by ALE and therefore applied the then-affirmed unpatentability decisions of the PTAB, vacating this Court's final judgment and remanding the case for dismissal. (Doc. No. 490.) The Court subsequently entered an amended final judgment consistent with the mandate of the Federal Circuit. (Doc. No. 493.) Thereafter, ALE brought the instant motion for attorney's fees. (Doc. No. 494.)

LEGAL STANDARD

35 U.S.C. § 285 provides that a “court in exceptional cases may award reasonable attorney fees to the prevailing party.” A case is exceptional when it “stands out from others with respect to the substantive strength of the party’s litigating position (considering both the governing law and the facts of the case) or the unreasonable manner in which the case was litigated.” *Octane Fitness, LLC v. ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.*, 134 S. Ct. 1749, 1756 (2014). Whether or not a case is deemed “exceptional” is a matter left to the Court’s discretion and must be made on a case-by-case basis, with consideration of “the totality of the circumstances.” *Id.*; *see also Highmark Inc. v. Allcare Health Mgmt. Sys., Inc.*, 134 S. Ct. 1744, 1748 (2014) (“[T]he determination of whether a case is ‘exceptional’ under § 285 is a matter of discretion.”); *Eon-Net LP v. Flagstar Bancorp*, 653 F.3d 1314, 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (“we are mindful that the district court has lived with the case and the lawyers for an extended period.”).

Some factors the Court may consider in making its determination under § 285 are “frivolousness, motivation, objective unreasonableness (both in the factual and legal components of the case) and the need in particular circumstances to advance considerations of compensation and deterrence.” *Octane*, 134 S. Ct at 1756 n.6. To be considered exceptional, conduct need not be “independently sanctionable.” *See id.* Nor is a finding of bad faith required; “a case presenting either subjective bad faith or exceptionally meritless claims” may warrant an award of fees. *Id.* at 1757. “After determining that a case is exceptional, the district court must determine whether attorney fees are appropriate,” which is within the Court’s discretion. *Cybor Corp. v. FAS Techs., Inc.*, 138 F.3d 1448, 1460 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (citations omitted). Ultimately, a party must prove entitlement to attorney’s fees by a preponderance of the evidence. *Octane Fitness*, 134 S. Ct. at 1758.

DISCUSSION

ALE argues that this Court has the inherent authority to award fees for Chrimar's abuse of the judicial process and to declare this case exceptional. (Doc. No. 494, at 5–6.) ALE cites the following reasons for finding this case exceptional and awarding fees: (1) Chrimar failed to stipulate to non-infringement of the '012 Patent after the Federal Circuit vacated the Court's claim construction and instead moved to dismiss the '012 Patent with an insufficient covenant not to sue; (2) Chrimar refused to stay this case pending appellate review of the PTAB's final written decisions; (3) Chrimar engaged in conduct prior to the trial in this case that renders the case exceptional; and (4) Chrimar's opposition to the motion for costs lacks a legitimate basis. (Doc. No. 494.) Chrimar argues that its efforts to dismiss the '012 Patent and oppose a request to sever ongoing royalties were made in good faith to efficiently end this litigation, and that ALE's complaints of pre-trial litigation misconduct are unfounded. (Doc. No. 497.)

The Court will focus first on the post-trial conduct cited by ALE as a basis for fees given that the Court has already declined to find this case exceptional based upon pre-trial and trial conduct (Doc. No. 412), and the post-trial conduct is what ultimately rendered ALE the prevailing party on the asserted claims of infringement. As to the conduct pertaining to the asserted claim of the '012 Patent after remand, the Court does not find that conduct to render this case exceptional. As discussed above, the Federal Circuit had affirmed the finding of infringement for three of the four asserted patents and vacated the claim construction as to the '012 Patent. (Doc. No. 463.) ALE contends that the Federal Circuit's interpretation of the word "adapted" in the '012 Patent should have resulted in a stipulation of non-infringement by Chrimar. (Doc. No. 494.) Chrimar instead offered to dismiss the '012 Patent with prejudice and provide a covenant not to sue. This dispute between the parties ultimately turned on the terms of

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.