

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION**

ANCORA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

LG ELECTRONICS INC. and LG
ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:20-CV-00034-ADA

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

ANCORA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
and SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
AMERICA, INC.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:20-CV-00034-ADA

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PUBLIC VERSION

ANCORA'S OPPOSITION TO SAMSUNG'S MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE '941 PATENT	2
III.	OPERATION OF THE ACCUSED OTA UPDATE FUNCTIONALITY	3
IV.	LEGAL STANDARD.....	3
V.	SAMSUNG INFRINGES BECAUSE IT CAUSES THE ACCUSED DEVICES TO “ESTABLISH OR CERTIFY THE EXISTENCE OF A PSEUDO-UNIQUE KEY”	4
A.	The Court Should Reject Samsung’s New “Pseudo Unique Key” Construction. ...	4
B.	Samsung Infringes Under the Ordinary Meaning of “Pseudo Unique Key.”	7
C.	Samsung’s New “Pseudo-Unique Key” Construction Is Wrong.....	9
D.	Adopting a New Construction at This Stage Would Unduly Prejudice Ancora. ...	12
VI.	SAMSUNG INFRINGES BECAUSE IT CAUSES THE ACCUSED DEVICES TO “CONFIRM WHETHER A PROGRAM IS LICENSED”	12
A.	Samsung Causes the Accused Devices to “Confirm Whether A Program Is Licensed Using At Least The Verification Structure.”	13
B.	Samsung’s Criticisms of Dr. Martin’s Opinions Fail to Demonstrate the Absence a Dispute of Material Fact as to Samsung’s Infringement.....	16
VII.	SAMSUNG IS NOT ENTITLED TO SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON ITS THEORY THAT THE ENTIRE METHOD IS PERFORMED ON THE ACCUSED DEVICES	19
A.	At a Minimum, Whether the Claim 1 “Using An Agent” Step Is Performed Entirely on the Accused Devices Is a Disputed Factual Issue.	20
B.	Samsung Makes No Arguments Regarding Claim 2.	25
C.	At a Minimum, Samsung Directed and Controlled Its Users’ Infringement.	26
1.	Samsung’s end users do not perform any step of Claim 1.....	26

2.	If Samsung’s end users perform a method step of Claim 1, Samsung directs or controls that performance.	27
	i) Samsung conditioned its end users’ participation in an activity or receipt of a benefit.	28
	ii) Samsung established the manner and timing of performance.	33
D.	A Triable Issue Exists as to Whether Samsung Is Liable for the Acts of Its CDNs and Carriers.	35
E.	Samsung’s Claim That the Accused Devices Do Not Perform “Automatically” Is Irrelevant and, in Any Event, Is Factually Disputed.	40
VIII.	SAMSUNG’S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT BASED ON A [REDACTED] IS A RED HERRING.	42
IX.	SAMSUNG IS NOT LICENSED, AND THERE IS NO EXHAUSTION	44
X.	SAMSUNG FAILS TO MEET ITS BURDEN TO SHOW THAT THE ARBAUGH PATENT IS PRIOR ART AS A MATTER OF LAW	46
XI.	THE ACCUSED DEVICES WRITE A VERIFICATION STRUCTURE TO THE ERASABLE NON-VOLATILE “MEMORY OF THE BIOS”	48

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Adaptix, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 78 F. Supp. 3d 952 (N.D. Cal. 2015)	42
<i>Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.</i> , 797 F.3d 1020 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (en banc).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.</i> , 805 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	7, 11
<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. barnesandnoble.com, Inc.</i> , 239 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	6
<i>Ancora Technologies, Inc. v. TCT Mobile (US) Inc.</i> , No. SACV 19-2192-GW-ADSx (Slip Op.) (C.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2020).....	9
<i>Ancora Techs., Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 744 F.3d 732 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	2, 18
<i>Ancora Techs., Inc. v. HTC Am., Inc.</i> , 908 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	2, 3
<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> , 477 U.S. 242 (1986).....	3
<i>Apator Miitors ApS v. Kamstrup A/S</i> , 887 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	47, 48
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.</i> , 2014 WL 252045 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986).....	3
<i>Digital Reg of Tex., LLC v. Adobe Sys. Inc.</i> , 2014 WL 2604324 (N.D. Cal. June 10, 2014).....	38, 43
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	46
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Parenteral Medicines, Inc.</i> , 845 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	27, 28
<i>Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Flash-Control, LLC v. Intel Corp.</i> , 2020 WL 4561591 (W.D. Tex. July 21, 2020).....	10

<i>Gillette Co. v. Energizer Holdings, Inc.</i> , 405 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	4, 6
<i>Haemonetics Corp. v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.</i> , 607 F.3d 776 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	10
<i>Huawei Techs. v. Samsung Elecs. Co, Ltd.</i> , 340 F. Supp. 3d 934 (N.D. Cal. 2018)	7
<i>IBM Corp. v. Booking Holdings Inc.</i> , 775 F. App'x 674 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	42
<i>Illumina Inc. v. Complete Genomics Inc.</i> , 2013 WL 1282977 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 26, 2013).....	47
<i>IOENGINE, LLC v. PayPal Holdings, Inc.</i> , 2019 WL 330515 (D. Del. Jan. 25, 2019).....	27, 34
<i>In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig.</i> , 2009 WL 8635161 (C.D. Cal. May 1, 2009)	45
<i>Keurig, Inc. v. Sturm Foods, Inc.</i> , 732 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	45
<i>Koninklijke Philips N.V. v. Zoll Med. Corp.</i> , 656 F. App'x 504 (Fed. Cir. 2016).	41, 42
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	46
<i>Marlowe Patent Holdings LLC v. Dice Elecs., LLC</i> , 293 F.R.D. 688 (D.N.J. 2013).....	12
<i>MIT v. Shire Pharm., Inc.</i> , 839 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	11
<i>Monsanto Co. v. Bowman</i> , 657 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	45
<i>NeuroGrafix v. Brainlab, Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 5642946 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 21, 2020)	28
<i>Nichols v. Enterasys Networks, Inc.</i> , 495 F.3d 185 (5th Cir. 2007)	25, 42
<i>NTP, Inc. v. Research In Motion, Ltd.</i> , 418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	44
<i>Nuance Commc'ns, Inc. v. ABBYY USA Software House, Inc.</i> , 813 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	7
<i>Pernix Ireland Pain DAC v. Alvogen Malta Operations Ltd.</i> , 323 F. Supp. 3d 566 (D. Del. 2018)	28, 31

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.