

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

Ocean Semiconductor LLC,

Plaintiff

v.

Silicon Laboratories Inc.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No.: 6:20-cv-1214

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PATENT CASE

**PLAINTIFF OCEAN SEMICONDUCTOR LLC'S OPPOSITION
TO DEFENDANT SILICON LABORATORIES INC.'S MOTION
TO DISMISS FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM**

/s/ Alex Chan

Timothy Devlin

tdevlin@devlinlawfirm.com

Henrik D. Parker

hparker@devlinlawfirm.com

Alex Chan (State Bar No. 24108051)

achan@devlinlawfirm.com

DEVLIN LAW FIRM LLC

1526 Gilpin Avenue

Wilmington, Delaware 19806

Telephone: (302) 449-9010

Facsimile: (302) 353-4251

DATED: March 25, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	LEGAL STANDARD.....	2
A.	The High Bar for a Motion to Dismiss	2
B.	The Broad Reach of Infringement Under 35 U.S.C. § 271(g).....	3
III.	ARGUMENT	4
A.	Ocean’s Complaint Asserts Plausible Acts of Infringement	4
1.	The Complaint Provides Plausible Details Linking TSMC’s Manufacturing Tools Directly to the Accused Products.....	5
2.	Ocean Provides Plausible Details Beyond What Section 271(g) Requires	6
B.	The <i>Iqbal/Twombly</i> Standard Does Not Require Ocean to Identify <i>All</i> Third-Party Foundries and Manufacturing Tools at the Pleading Stage	8
1.	Silicon Labs Has Sufficient Notice as to What It Must Defend Because Ocean Has Identified at Least One Foundry and Five Manufacturing Tools Used to Manufacture the Accused Products	8
2.	Silicon Labs’ Cases Are Inapposite	9
C.	Ocean’s Complaint Sufficiently Asserts Claims for Induced Infringement as Silicon Labs Gained Knowledge of the Processes and Tools Used to Manufacture Its Products Through Its Contractual Relationships with the Foundries	10
D.	The Complaint Sufficiently Asserts Claims for Willful Infringement	13
1.	Ocean’s Complaint Sufficiently Pleads Willful Infringement Because Silicon Labs Had Notice of the Asserted Patents.....	13
2.	This Court Has Previously Ruled that Egregious Conduct Is Not Required to be Pled at the Pleading Stage.....	14
E.	The 402, 538, 305, and 248 Patents Are All Directed to the Manufacture of Products and Are Subject to Section 271(g).....	14
1.	The ’402 Patent Involves the Making of Physical Products Such as Silicon Wafers, and Ocean’s Pleadings Reflect that Fact.....	14
2.	The ’538 Patent Involves the Making of Physical Products Such as Silicon Wafers, and Ocean’s Pleadings Reflect that Fact.....	16
3.	The ’305 and ’248 Patents Involve the Making of Physical Products Such as Silicon Wafers, and Ocean’s Pleadings Reflect that Fact	18
F.	No System Claims of the ’651 Patent Were Asserted Under Section 271(g).....	19
G.	In All Events, Fact Issues Preclude Dismissal.....	20
H.	At Worst, Rather Than Dismissing the Complaint, Leave to Amend Should Be Granted	
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Artrip v. Ball Corp.</i> , 735 Fed. Appx. 708 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	10
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	2
<i>Bayer AG v. Housey Pharm., Inc.</i> 340 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	3, 4, 16, 17
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	2, 3, 7
<i>Bio-Rad Labs Inc. v. Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc.</i> , 267 F. Supp. 3d 499 (D. Del. 2017).....	14
<i>Bio-Technology General Corp. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> 80 F.3d 1553, 38 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	3, 4
<i>Causey v. Sewell Cadillac-Chevrolet, Inc.</i> 394 F.3d 285 (5th Cir. 2004)	3
<i>DermaFocus LLC v. Ulthera, Inc.</i> , 201 F. Supp. 3d 465 (D. Del. 2016)	14
<i>Disc Disease Sols. Inc. v. VGH Sols., Inc.</i> 888 F.3 1256 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	3
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Am. Cyanamid Co.</i> 82 F.3d 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	3, 4
<i>Encoditech, LLC v. Citizen Watch Co. of Am.</i> C.A. No. 18-1335-XR, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 105833 (W.D. Tex. June 25, 2019).....	3
<i>Estech Sys. v. Regions Fin. Corp.</i> , No. 6:20-cv-00322-ADA, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 200484 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 28, 2020)	10
<i>Frye v. Anadarko Petro. Corp.</i> , 953 F.3d 285 (5 th Cir. 2019)	2
<i>Griggs v. Hinds Junior Coll.</i> , 563 F.2d 179 (5th Cir. 1977).....	20
<i>In re Bill of Lading Transmission & Processing Sys. Patent Litig.</i> , 681 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	9
<i>James v. J2 Cloud Servs., LLC</i> , 887 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	12
<i>Janssen Pharma., N.V. v. Mylan Pharms. Inc.</i> , No. 15-760-SLR-SRF, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 192881 (D. Del. Oct. 18, 2016)	7

Kyowa Hakka Bio, Co. Ltd. v. Ajinomoto Co., No. 17-313, 2018-MSG, U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22392 (D. Del. Feb. 12, 2018) 6

Lone Star Motor Imp., Inc. v. Citroen Cars Corp., 288 F.2d 69, 75 (5th Cir. 1961) 20

Lormand v. US Unwired, Inc., 565 F.3d 228 (5th Cir. 2009) 2

McZeal v. Sprint Nextel Corp., 501 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2007) 8, 10

Motiva Patents, LLC v. Sony Corp., 408 F. Supp. 3d 819 (E.D. Tex. 2019)..... 9, 12

Parity Networks, LLC v. Cisco Sys., No. 6:19-cv-00207-ADA, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 144094 (W.D. Tex. Jul. 26, 2019) 13

Plano Encryption Techs. v. Alkami Tech., No. 2:16-cv-1032-JRG, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 221765 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 22, 2017) 14

Skinner v. Switzer
562 U.S. 521 (2011)..... 3

Univ. of Mass. Med. Sch. v. L’Oréal S.A., No. 17-868-CFC-SRF, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 192832 (D. Del. Nov. 13, 2018) 8

Rules

Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a) 20

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 271 2, 3, 15

Other Authorities

5 Chisum on Patents § 16.02..... 4

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendant Silicon Laboratories Inc.’s (“Silicon Labs”) Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 14) is a hodgepodge of conclusory assertions about the adequacy of Ocean Semiconductor LLC’s (“Ocean”) Complaint (Dkt. 1) that both: (a) confuse the pleading standards and Rule 12(b)(6) law while citing to non-precedential and inapplicable case law; and (b) ignore the extensive evidentiary presentation (including citation to Silicon Labs’ website, presentations at trade shows, and Silicon Labs’ online Discussion Forum and Expert’s Corner) in that Complaint. While purporting to apply a “plausibility” standard, Silicon Labs actually argues for a much higher, and legally improper, pleading standard that would require Ocean to know, and lay out in the Complaint, substantially more than is required under the *Iqbal/Twombly* Supreme Court standard. This misapplication of legal standards runs throughout Silicon Labs’ Motion.

Indeed, despite having specified in the Complaint at least one foundry, identified five manufacturing tools, and described more than 165 accused products manufactured by the foundry using the tools, Silicon Labs wants more—it seeks to require Ocean to identify *every* foundry and *every* tool that might be found to infringe. That is not the law. Ocean need only plead facts sufficient to place Silicon Labs on notice as to what it must defend—and Ocean did.

Similarly, in support of its inducement claims, Ocean has provided evidence and factual allegations—allegations that the Court must accept as true—that would allow an inference that Silicon Labs knew about the manufacturing processes and equipment used to manufacture its own products by virtue of its contractual relationships with its foundries. Already exceeding what is typically required under the *Iqbal/Twombly* pleading standard, Ocean’s Complaint also offered three specific classes of information that Ocean expects discovery will reveal and that would lend credence to Ocean’s inducement allegations. If this information is insufficient to meet the *Iqbal/Twombly* pleading standard, it is difficult to imagine what would.

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.