

**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 LG ELECTRONICS'  
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. LGE CANNOT ESCAPE LIABILITY BY BLAMING THIRD PARTIES.....4

    A. LGE Is Liable Under *Akamai* for Providing OTA Updates to Group 1 Devices. ...5

    B. LGE Also Is Liable for Providing OTA Updates to “Group 2” Devices.....8

    C. LGE’s Claim That the Accused Devices Do Not [REDACTED] Is Irrelevant and, in Any Event, Is Factually Disputed.....11

        1. LGE’s Devices [REDACTED] .....11

        2. LGE’s [REDACTED] Argument Is Legally Irrelevant Because End-Users Do Not Perform a Method Step. ....12

        3. If LGE’s End Users Perform any Method Step, LGE Directs or Controls That Performance. ....13

            i) LGE conditioned its end users’ participation in an activity or receipt of a benefit. ....15

            ii) LGE established the manner and timing of performance. ....16

VI. LGE INFRINGES BECAUSE IT CAUSES THE ACCUSED DEVICES TO “CONFIRM WHETHER A PROGRAM IS LICENSED.” .....17

    A. LGE Causes the Accused Devices to “Confirm Whether a Program Is Licensed Using at Least the Verification Structure.” .....18

    B. LGE’s Criticisms of Dr. Martin Fail to Demonstrate the Absence a Dispute of Material Fact as to LGE’s Infringement. ....21

        1. Dr. Martin Does Not Equate “Verifying” with “Mere Data Integrity.” .....22

        2. LGE’s Brand-New Construction is Untimely and Wrong.....23

        3. LGE Infringes Even Under Its New Erroneous Construction. ....25

VII. LGE INFRINGES BECAUSE IT CAUSES THE ACCUSED DEVICES TO “ESTABLISH OR CERTIFY THE EXISTENCE OF A PSEUDO-UNIQUE KEY.” .....26

    A. The Court Should Reject LGE’s New “Pseudo Unique Key” Construction. ....27

    B. LGE Infringes Under the Ordinary Meaning of “Pseudo Unique Key.” .....29

C.	LGE’s New “Pseudo-Unique Key” Construction Is Wrong.....	30
D.	LGE’s Hybrid Claim Construction/Non-Infringement Arguments Concerning the “Pseudo-Unique Key” Are Illogical, Irrelevant, and Contrary to Fact. ....	34
VIII.	THE ACCUSED DEVICES’ “LICENSE RECORD LOCATION” IS IN THE “ERASABLE, NON-VOLATILE MEMORY OF THE BIOS.” .....	36
A.	The Court Already Rejected LGE’s “Stores the BIOS” Construction. ....	37
B.	Dr. Martin Never Opined That Any Memory “Accessed By” the BIOS Is “Memory of the BIOS.” .....	38
IX.	LGE IS NOT ENTITLED TO PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON ANCORA’S ██████████ ANALYSIS FOR ██████████ MOBILE DEVICES.....	39
X.	THE ACCUSED DEVICES PERFORM THE STEP OF “ACTING ON THE PROGRAM ACCORDING TO THE VERIFICATION.” .....	40
XI.	LGE’S COMPLAINTS ABOUT “REPRESENTATIVE CODE” ARE BASELESS. ....	44
A.	The Federal Circuit Has Held That Experts May Rely on Representative Code...45	
1.	Dr. Martin Methodically Surveyed the Accused Devices To Identify and Document Any Material Variations Between Them. ....	46
2.	LGE And Its Expert Identified Not One Mistake in Dr. Martin’s Analysis.....	47
XII.	LGE FAILS TO MEET ITS BURDEN TO SHOW THAT THE ARBAUGH PATENT IS PRIOR ART AS A MATTER OF LAW. ....	49
XIII.	WILLFULNESS / ENHANCED DAMAGES. ....	50
XIV.	CONCLUSION.....	50

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>AAMP of Fla., Inc v. Auto. Data Sols., Inc.</i> , 2015 WL 12843845 (M.D. Fla. Oct. 8, 2015) .....	37
<i>Acceleron, LLC v. Dell, Inc.</i> , 2018 WL 7018005 (N.D. Ga. Nov. 14, 2018) .....	28
<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).....	29
<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. barnesandnoble.com, Inc.</i> , 239 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	28
<i>Ancora Technologies, Inc. v. TCT Mobile (US) Inc.</i> , No. SACV 19-2192-GW-ADSx (C.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2020).....	24, 25, 31, 32
<i>Ancora Techs., Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 744 F.3d 732 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	2
<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).....	50
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 881 F. Supp. 2d 1132 (N.D. Cal. 2012) .....	44
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.</i> , 2014 WL 252045 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2014).....	23, 29
<i>BMC Res., Inc. v. Paymentech, L.P.</i> , 498 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	5
<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) .....	11, 14

<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	49
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Teva Parenteral Medicines, Inc.</i> , 845 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	4, 14
<i>Envirotech, Inc. v. Redline Detection, LLC</i> , 2015 WL 12743875 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 30, 2015) .....	41
<i>Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	13
<i>ESW Holdings, Inc. v. Roku, Inc.</i> , 2021 WL 1069047 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 18, 2021) .....	16
<i>Fenner Inv., Ltd. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 632 F. Supp. 2d 627 (E.D. Tex. 2009).....	37
<i>Flash-Control, LLC v. Intel Corp.</i> , 2020 WL 4561591 (W.D. Tex. July 21, 2020) .....	32
<i>Gillette Co. v. Energizer Holdings, Inc.</i> , 405 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	28
<i>Haemonetics Corp. v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.</i> , 607 F.3d 776 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	31
<i>Huawei Techs. v. Samsung Elecs. Co, Ltd.</i> , 340 F. Supp. 3d 934 (N.D. Cal. 2018) .....	24, 29
<i>Hydro-Thermal Corp. v. Pro-Sonix, LLC</i> , 2010 WL 1441239 (E.D. Wis. Apr. 8, 2010).....	37
<i>IBM Corp. v. Booking Holdings Inc.</i> , 775 F. App'x 674, 675, 678 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	13
<i>Illumina Inc. v. Complete Genomics Inc.</i> , 2013 WL 1282977 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 26, 2013).....	50
<i>IOENGINE, LLC v. PayPal Holdings, Inc.</i> , 2019 WL 330515 (D. Del. Jan. 25, 2019).....	14, 17
<i>KPN v. Zoll Med. Corp.</i> , 656 F. App'x 504, 512, 516 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	13
<i>Kronisch v. United States</i> , 150 F.3d 112 (2d Cir. 1998).....	44
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	49

# 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.