

1 Michael J. Bettinger (SBN 122196)  
mbettinger@sidley.com  
2 Irene Yang (SBN 245464)  
irene.yang@sidley.com  
3 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
555 California Street, Suite 2000  
4 San Francisco, California 94104  
(415) 772-1200 – Telephone  
5 (415) 772-7400 – Facsimile

David T. Pritikin (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
dpritikin@sidley.com  
David C. Giardina (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
dgiardina@sidley.com  
Douglas I. Lewis (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
dilewis@sidley.com  
John W. McBride (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
jwmcbride@sidley.com  
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
One South Dearborn  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
(312) 853-7000 – Telephone  
(312) 853-7036 – Facsimile

6  
7  
8  
9 *Attorneys for Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd.,*  
*Huawei Device USA, Inc., Huawei Technologies*  
10 *USA, Inc., and HiSilicon Technologies Co. Ltd.*

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
12 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
13 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

14 HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.,  
HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC., and  
HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES USA, INC.,

15 Plaintiffs / Counterclaim-Defendants,

16 v.

17 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,  
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,  
18 INC.,

19 Defendants / Counterclaim-Plaintiffs,

20 and

21 SAMSUNG RESEARCH AMERICA,

22 Defendant,

23 v.

24 HISILICON TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.,

25 Counterclaim-Defendant.

Case No. 16-cv-02787-WHO

**HUAWEI’S DAUBERT MOTION ON  
TECHNICAL ISSUES**

Hearing Date: August 8, 2018  
Time: 2:00 PM  
Judge: Hon. William H. Orrick

**REDACTED VERSION OF  
DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1		
2	I.	BACKGROUND .....1
3	II.	LEGAL STANDARDS .....1
4	III.	THE COURT SHOULD PRECLUDE SAMSUNG’S EXPERTS FROM OFFERING
5		OPINIONS AT TRIAL THAT ARE BASED ON IMPROPER CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS
		.....2
6	A.	Huawei’s ’613 Patent.....2
7	1.	Dr. Lyon’s Opinions Based on an Improper Construction of “Position
8		Information” Should Be Excluded.....3
9	2.	Dr. Lyon’s Opinions Regarding What He Calls a “Non-Zero Offset” Have No
		Basis in the Claims and Should Be Excluded. ....6
	3.	Dr. Lyon’s Divided Infringement Opinions Rest on an Improper Construction
		of Claims 1 and 5 and Should Be Excluded. ....7
10	B.	Huawei’s ’587 Patent.....9
11	1.	Dr. Lyon’s Divided Infringement Opinions Rest on an Improper Construction
		of Claims 3 and 9 and Should Be Excluded. ....9
12	C.	Samsung’s ’105 patent.....10
13	1.	Overview.....10
14	2.	Dr. Prucnal’s Opinions Regarding Mapping FT Precoded Symbols and Non-
		FT Precoded Modulation Control Symbols at Different Times Should Be
		Excluded. ....10
15	D.	Samsung’s ’130 Patent.....12
16	1.	Dr. Bambos Opinions Based on an Improper Construction of “Mapping Data
17		Information to Remaining Symbols” Should Be Excluded. ....12
18	2.	Dr. Bambos’s Opinions Based on an Improper Construction of “CQI
		Information Being Multiplexed with the Data Information” Should Be
		Excluded. ....13
19	E.	Huawei’s ’239 Patent.....14
20	1.	Dr. Madisetti’s Opinions Based on an Improper Construction of “Obtaining”
21		Should Be Excluded.....14
22	2.	Dr. Madisetti’s Opinions Requiring a “Sequence” to Be a ZC Sequence Are
		Based on an Improper Construction and Should Be Excluded.....15
	3.	Dr. Madisetti’s Opinions Based on an Improper Construction of “n
		sequences” Should Be Excluded.....17
23	F.	Huawei’s ’892 Patent.....17
24	1.	Dr. Madisetti’s Opinion Requiring the UE to Select Ncs Is Based on an
25		Improper Construction and Should Be Excluded. ....18
26	2.	Dr. Madisetti’s Opinions Based on an Improper Construction of “A Set of
27		Random Access Preambles” Should Be Excluded. ....19
28	G.	Samsung’s ’825 Patent.....20
	1.	Dr. Valenti’s Opinions Based on an Improper Construction of “Without
		Checking a Downlink Channel” Should Be Excluded. ....20
	H.	Samsung’s ’726 patent.....23
	1.	Dr. Bambos’s Opinions Based on an Improper Construction of “associating a

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

HARQ process with the calculated HARQ process ID” Should Be Excluded.  
.....23

IV. CONCLUSION.....25

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****Page(s)****Cases**

1		
2		
3	<b>Cases</b>	
4	<i>Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.</i> ,	
5	692 F.3d 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2012), <i>rev'd on other grounds</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2111 (2014).....	7, 9
6	<i>Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.</i> ,	
7	797 F.3d 1020 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (en banc).....	7, 9
8	<i>Al-Site Corp. v. VSI Int'l, Inc.</i> ,	
9	174 F. 3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	22
10	<i>Cat Tech LLC v. TubeMaster, Inc.</i> ,	
11	528 F.3d 871 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	25
12	<i>Cordis Corp. v. Boston Sci. Corp.</i> ,	
13	561 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	2
14	<i>CytoLogix Corp. v. Ventana Med. Sys., Inc.</i> ,	
15	424 F.3d 1168, 1172-73 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	2
16	<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> ,	
17	509 U.S. 579 (1993).....	1
18	<i>Dayco Prods, Inc. v. Total Containment, Inc.</i> ,	
19	258 F.3d 1317, 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	17
20	<i>FotoMedia Techs, LLC v. AOL, LLC</i> ,	
21	2009 WL 2175845 (E.D. Tex. July 21, 2009) .....	8
22	<i>France Telecom S.A. v. Marvell Semiconductor Inc.</i> ,	
23	No. 12-cv-04967-WHO, 2014 WL 4272771 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2014) .....	1
24	<i>Fujifilm Corp. v. Motorola Mobility LLC</i> ,	
25	No. 12-CV-03587-WHO, 2015 WL 1265009 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 19, 2015).....	2
26	<i>Hoganas AB v. Dresser Indus., Inc.</i> ,	
27	9 F.3d 948 (Fed. Cir. 1993) .....	6
28	<i>Imaginal Systematic, LLC v. Leggett &amp; Platt, Inc.</i> ,	
	805 F.3d 1102 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	21, 22
	<i>K-2 Corp. v. Salomon S.A.</i> ,	
	191 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	19
	<i>Laryngeal Mask Co. v. Ambu A/S</i> ,	
	618 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	6

1 *Liquid Dynamics Corp. v. Vaughan Co.*,  
 449 F.3d 1209 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....1

2

3 *MediaTek Inc. v. Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.*,  
 No. 11-cv-05341-YGR, 2014 WL 971765, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 5, 2014).....2

4

5 *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*,  
 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....4, 5

6 *Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. Micro Therapeutics, Inc.*,  
 No. 03-cv-05669-JW, 2007 WL 2429412 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 2007) .....1

7

8 *Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa' per Azioni*,  
 158 F.3d 1243, 1250 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....4

9

10 *Tech. Patents LLC v. T-Mobile (UK) Ltd.*,  
 700 F.3d 482 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....8

11

12 *Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*,  
 632 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....8

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

# 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.