

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, Ste. 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 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*  
HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.  
8 HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC.,  
HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES USA, INC., and  
9 HISILICON TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.

10  
11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
12 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

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

15 Plaintiffs / Counterclaim-  
16 Defendants,

16 v.

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

19 Defendants / Counterclaim-  
20 Plaintiffs,

21 and

22 SAMSUNG RESEARCH AMERICA,

23 Defendant,

23 v.

24 HISILICON TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.,

25 Counterclaim-Defendant.

Case No. 3:16-cv-02787-WHO

**HUAWEI’S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT  
WITH RESPECT TO:**

- 1. **SAMSUNG’S ANTITRUST CLAIM**
- 2. **NON-INFRINGEMENT OF  
SAMSUNG’S ’350 PATENT CLAIM**
- 3. **NON-INFRINGEMENT OF  
SAMSUNG’S ’130 PATENT CLAIMS**
- 4. **NON-INFRINGEMENT OF  
SAMSUNG’S RE105 PATENT**
- 5. **NON-INFRINGEMENT OF  
SAMSUNG’S ’825 PATENT CLAIMS**

Hearing Date: August 8, 2018  
Time: 2:00 p.m.  
Location: Courtroom 2, 17th Floor  
Judge: Hon. William H. Orrick

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1

2 I. SAMSUNG’S ANTITRUST CLAIM IS SUBJECT TO SUMMARY JUDGMENT..... 1

3 A. Samsung Cannot Establish Actionable Exclusionary Conduct..... 1

4 B. Samsung Cannot Establish Harm To Competition..... 5

5 C. The Act of State Doctrine Bars Samsung’s Antitrust Claim..... 6

6 II. SAMSUNG HAS NOT PRESENTED A QUESTION OF MATERIAL FACT ON THE

7 TECHNICAL ISSUES ..... 8

8 A. ’350 Patent - Selection of Different Quantization Coefficients Is Not Determining a

9 Cell-Specific Ratio. .... 8

10 B. Samsung’s Improper Claim Constructions Are Contrary to Plain Meaning..... 9

11 1. ’130 Patent - “Mapping the Data Information to

12 *Remaining Symbols*” Occurs *After* Mapping a

13 Reference Signal To a Middle Symbol..... 10

14 2. ’105 Patent – “FT Pre-Coded Symbols” Cannot

15 Contain Control Information..... 11

16 3. ’825 Patent – Applying the Plain Meaning of

17 *Indicating*, the Huawei Accused Products Do Not

18 Receive System Information *Indicating* a Group of

19 IDs..... 13

20 III. CONCLUSION ..... 15

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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

1		
2		
3	<b>Cases</b>	
4	<i>ACTV, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co.</i> ,	
5	346 F.3d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	12
6	<i>Aerotec Int'l, Inc. v. Honeywell Int'l, Inc.</i> ,	
7	836 F.3d 1171 (9th Cir. 2016) .....	2
8	<i>Apple, Inc. v. Motorola Mobility, Inc.</i> ,	
9	886 F. Supp. 2d 1061 (W.D. Wis. 2012) .....	3, 6
10	<i>Cadence Pharm. Inc. v. Exela PharmSci Inc.</i> ,	
11	780 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	11
12	<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> ,	
13	477 U.S. 317 (1986).....	9, 11
14	<i>Credit Suisse v. U.S. Dist. Court for the Cent. Dist. of Cal.</i> ,	
15	130 F.3d 1342 (9th Cir. 1997) .....	7
16	<i>Del. Valley Floral Grp. v. Shaw Rose Nets, LLC</i> ,	
17	597 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	13
18	<i>Dippin' Dots, Inc. v. Mosey</i> ,	
19	476 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	12
20	<i>Egyptian Goddess, Inc. v. Swisa, Inc.</i> ,	
21	543 F.3d 665 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	13
22	<i>Fed. Trade Comm'n v. Qualcomm Inc.</i> ,	
23	Case No.17-CV-00220-LHK, 2017 WL 2774406 (N.D. Cal. June 26, 2017).....	2
24	<i>First Nat'l Bank of Ariz v. Cities Serv. Co.</i> ,	
25	391 U.S. 253 (1968).....	2
26	<i>Freedman Seating Co. v. Am. Seating Co.</i> ,	
27	420 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	11
28	<i>Fujifilm Corp. v. Motorola Mobility, LLC</i> ,	
	Case No. 12-cv-03587-WHO, 2015 WL 757575 (N.D. Cal. Feb 20, 2015) .....	9, 10
	<i>Gorlick Dist. Centers, LLC v. Car Sound Exhaust Sys., Inc.</i> ,	
	723 F. 3d 1019 (9th Cir. 2013) .....	5
	<i>Hynix Semiconductor Inc. v. Rambus Inc.</i> ,	
	527 F. Supp. 2d 1084 (N.D. Cal. 2007) .....	2, 6

1	<i>In re Online DVD-Rental Antitrust Litig.</i> ,	
2	779 F.3d 914 (9th Cir. 2015) .....	3
3	<i>In re Phillipine Nat'l Bank</i> ,	
4	397 F.3d 768 (9th Cir. 2005) .....	7
5	<i>In re Wholesale Grocery Prods. Antitrust Litig.</i> ,	
6	752 F.3d 728 (8th Cir. 2014) .....	3
7	<i>Intellicall, Inc. v. Phonometrics, Inc.</i> ,	
8	952 F.2d 1384 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	11
9	<i>Limelight Networks, Inc. v. Akamai Techs, Inc.</i> ,	
10	134 S. Ct. 2111 (2014).....	10
11	<i>Liu v. Republic of China</i> ,	
12	892 F.2d 1419 (9th Cir. 1989) .....	7
13	<i>Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co., v. Zenith Radio Corp.</i> ,	
14	475 U.S. 574 (1986).....	2
15	<i>McCarty v. Lehigh Val R Co</i> ,	
16	160 U.S. 110 (1895).....	8
17	<i>OptimumPath, LLC v. Belkin Int'l, Inc.</i> ,	
18	466 Fed. App'x 904 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	9
19	<i>OptimumPath, LLC v. Belkin Int'l, Inc.</i> ,	
20	No. C 09-01398 CW, 2011 WL 1399257 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 12, 2011).....	9
21	<i>Pacing Techs., LLC v. Garmin Int'l, Inc.</i> ,	
22	778 F.3d 1021 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	13
23	<i>PersonalWeb Techs. LLC v. Int'l Bus. Machines Corp.</i> ,	
24	Case No. 16-cv-01266-EJD, 2017 WL 2180980 (N.D. Cal. May 18, 2017).....	9
25	<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> ,	
26	415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	14
27	<i>Planet Bingo, LLC v. GameTech Int'l, Inc.</i> ,	
28	472 F. 3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	11
	<i>Power Mosfet Techs., L.L.C. v. Siemens AG</i> ,	
	378 F.3d 1396 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	12
	<i>Rambus Inc. v. FTC</i> ,	
	522 F.3d 456 (D.C. Cir. 2008) .....	5
	<i>Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa' per Azioni</i> ,	
	158 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	14

1 *Research In Motion Ltd. v. Motorola, Inc.*,  
 2 644 F. Supp. 2d 788 (N.D. Tex. 2008) .....2

3 *Smart Wearable Techs. Inc. v. Fitbit Inc.*,  
 4 Case No. 17-cv-05068-VC, 2018 WL 659013 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 1, 2018) .....13

5 *TAP Pharm. Prods., Inc. v. Owl. Pharm., LLC*,  
 6 419 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....14

7 *TechSearch, L.L.C. v. Intel Corp.*,  
 8 286 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....13

9 *Townshend v. Rockwell Int’l Corp.*,  
 10 No. C99-400SBA, 2000 WL 433505 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 28, 2000) .....4

11 *United States v. Grinnell Corp.*,  
 12 384 U.S. 563 (1966).....1

13 *Verizon Commc’ns Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP*,  
 14 540 U.S. 398 (2004).....1

15 *Yeager v. Bowlin*,  
 16 693 F3d 1076 (9th Cir. 2012) .....13

17 **Other**

18 Restatement (Second) of Foreign Relations of the United States § 41 cmt d. (1965) .....7

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.