



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

RFCYBER CORP.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 6:21-cv-00916-ADA

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**



**APPLE'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF RFCYBER'S  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. BACKGROUND .....	2
III. LEGAL STANDARDS .....	4
A. Good Cause Is Required For Untimely Amendment of Pleadings. ....	4
B. Courts Have Discretion To Deny A Futile Motion To Amend. ....	4
C. Pre-Suit Indirect And Willful Infringement Require Actual Knowledge Of The Patents And Of Alleged Infringement. ....	5
IV. RFCYBER CANNOT ESTABLISH GOOD CAUSE TO AMEND ITS COMPLAINT. ....	6
A. RFCyber Has No Plausible Explanation For Its Failure To Timely Move For Leave To Amend. ....	6
B. RFCyber’s Proposed Amendment Is Not Important Because It Is Futile.....	7
1. The Emails Between Dr. Zheng And Apple Do Not Support Claims Of Pre-Suit Indirect Or Willful Infringement. ....	8
2. Mr. Lasker’s Deposition Testimony Cannot Support Claims Of Pre-Suit Indirect Or Willful Infringement. ....	10
3. RFCyber’s Willful Blindness Allegations Also Are Futile. ....	11
C. Apple Will Be Unfairly Prejudiced By RFCyber’s Futile Attempt To Reinject Its Dismissed Claims Of Pre-Suit Indirect And Willful Infringement.....	14
D. The Availability-Of-A-Continuance Factor Also Favors Denying RFCyber’s Motion To Amend At This Late Stage Of The Case.....	14
V. CONCLUSION.....	15

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Affinity Labs of Tex., LLC v. Toyota Motor N. Am.</i> , No. W:13-cv-365, 2014 WL 2892285 (W.D. Tex. May 12, 2014) .....	5
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	4
<i>Atlas Glob. Techs., LLC v. Sercomm Corp.</i> , No. 6-21-CV-00818-ADA, 2022 WL 16557650 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 31, 2022).....	6, 12
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	4
<i>BillJCo, LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , 583 F. Supp. 3d 769 (W.D. Tex. 2022).....	9
<i>DSU Med. Corp. v. JMS Co.</i> , 471 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	5
<i>Fahim v. Marriott Hotel Servs., Inc.</i> , 551 F.3d 344 (5th Cir. 2008) .....	4, 14
<i>Filgueira v. U.S. Bank Nat. Ass’n</i> , 734 F.3d 420 (5th Cir. 2013) .....	7, 8
<i>Flypsi, Inc. v. Google LLC</i> , No. 6:22-CV-0031-ADA, 2022 WL 3593053 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 22, 2022).....	12
<i>Fujitsu Ltd. v. Netgear Inc.</i> , 620 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	5
<i>Glob.-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.</i> , 563 U.S. 754 (2011).....	5, 6, 8, 11
<i>Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.</i> , 579 U.S. 93 (2016).....	5
<i>Kirsch Rsch. &amp; Dev., LLC v. Tarco Specialty Prods., Inc.</i> , No. 6:20-cv-00318-ADA, 2021 WL 4555802 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 4, 2021).....	5
<i>Meetrix IP, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , No. 1-18-CV-309-LY, 2018 WL 8261315 (W.D. Tex. Nov. 30, 2018).....	6

*Parity Networks, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*,  
No. 6:19-CV-00207-ADA, 2019 WL 3940952 (W.D. Tex. July 26, 2019).....5, 8, 10

*SiOnyx, LLC v. Hamamatsu Photonics K.K.*,  
330 F. Supp. 3d 574 (D. Mass. 2018) .....5

*Stripling v. Jordan Prod. Co., LLC*,  
234 F.3d 863 (5th Cir. 2000) .....4, 7

*Sw. Bell Tel. Co. v. City of El Paso*,  
346 F.3d 541 (5th Cir. 2003) .....4

*Teradyne, Inc. v. Astronics Test Sys., Inc.*,  
No. 20-cv-2713, 2020 WL 8173024 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 6, 2020) .....9

*USC IP P’ship, L.P. v. Facebook, Inc.*,  
No. 6:20-CV-00555-ADA, 2021 WL 3134260 (W.D. Tex. July 23, 2021).....6, 13

*VLSI Tech., LLC v. Intel Corp.*,  
No. 6:19-CV-000254-ADA, 2019 WL 11025759 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 6, 2019).....6, 13

**Court Rules**

Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 12(b)(6) .....4, 14

Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 15(a) .....4

Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 16(b) .....1, 4

Apple respectfully opposes the motion by Plaintiff RFCyber for leave to file a second amended complaint (ECF No. 133), which should be denied with prejudice and without further leave to amend.

## I. INTRODUCTION

On September 12, 2022, the Court granted Apple's renewed motion to dismiss RFCyber's claims of pre-suit indirect and willful infringement, correctly finding that "RFCyber's Amended Complaint does not plead sufficient facts that would support an allegation of pre-suit knowledge of the patents." ECF No. 98 at 5. In that Order, the Court set a specific deadline of "ninety (90) days after the start of fact discovery" for RFCyber to try to reallege its dismissed claims. *Id.* That deadline came and went nearly five months ago. Now, with less than one month left in an already-extended fact discovery period, RFCyber is trying to reinject its dismissed claims back into this case based on the same facts and circumstances the Court already found did not withstand pleading scrutiny. *See* ECF No. 98. This is the opposite of good cause for amending a complaint under Federal Rule 16(b).

Despite its effort to repackage the evidence by citing recent discovery responses and deposition testimony, RFCyber presents no new facts or circumstances that differ from those analyzed by the Court in its September 2022 Order dismissing RFCyber's claims of pre-suit indirect and willful infringement. *See id.* The Court therefore should deny with prejudice RFCyber's futile motion for the same reasons the Court granted Apple's renewed motion to dismiss last September. And RFCyber provides no reason for missing the amendment deadline by nearly five months, especially where Apple produced all of the documents RFCyber relies on more than five months ago. RFCyber's allegations were insufficient in September 2022 when the Court granted Apple's renewed motion to dismiss, and they are insufficient now. RFCyber therefore has no good cause for this late amendment to its pleading.

# 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.