Case 3:16-cv-02787-WHO Document 464 Filed 03/15/19 Page 1 of 4

1	Michael J. Bettinger (SBN 122196) mbettinger@sidley.com	David T. Pritikin (pro hac vice) dpritikin@sidley.com	
2	Irene Yang (SBN 245464) irene.yang@sidley.com	David C. Giardina (pro hac vice) dgiardina@sidley.com	
3	SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP 555 California Street, Ste. 2000	Douglas I. Lewis (pro hac vice) dilewis@sidley.com	
4	San Francisco, California 94104 415-772-1200 – Telephone	John W. McBride (pro hac vice) jwmcbride@sidley.com	
5	415-772-7400 – Facsimile	SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP One South Dearborn	
6		Chicago, Illinois 60603 312-853-7000 – Telephone	
7	Attorneys for Plaintiffs HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.	312-853-7036 – Facsimile	
8	HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC., HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES USA, INC., and		
9	HISILICON TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.		
10			
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
12			
13			
14	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.,	Case No. 16-cv-02787-WHO	
15	HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC., and HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES USA, INC.,	UNOPPOSED MOTION TO VACATE	
15 16	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES USA, INC., Plaintiffs / Counterclaim-Defendants,	THE ORDER GRANTING SAMSUNG'S MOTION FOR ANTISUIT INJUNCTION	
	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES USA, INC., Plaintiffs / Counterclaim-Defendants, v.	THE ORDER GRANTING SAMSUNG'S	
16	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES USA, INC., Plaintiffs / Counterclaim-Defendants, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,	THE ORDER GRANTING SAMSUNG'S MOTION FOR ANTISUIT INJUNCTION	
16 17	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES USA, INC., Plaintiffs / Counterclaim-Defendants, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,	THE ORDER GRANTING SAMSUNG'S MOTION FOR ANTISUIT INJUNCTION	
16 17 18	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES USA, INC., Plaintiffs / Counterclaim-Defendants, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., Defendants / Counterclaim-Plaintiffs,	THE ORDER GRANTING SAMSUNG'S MOTION FOR ANTISUIT INJUNCTION	
16 17 18 19	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES USA, INC., Plaintiffs / Counterclaim-Defendants, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., Defendants / Counterclaim-Plaintiffs, and	THE ORDER GRANTING SAMSUNG'S MOTION FOR ANTISUIT INJUNCTION	
16 17 18 19 20	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES USA, INC., Plaintiffs / Counterclaim-Defendants, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., Defendants / Counterclaim-Plaintiffs, and SAMSUNG RESEARCH AMERICA,	THE ORDER GRANTING SAMSUNG'S MOTION FOR ANTISUIT INJUNCTION	
16 17 18 19 20 21	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES USA, INC., Plaintiffs / Counterclaim-Defendants, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., Defendants / Counterclaim-Plaintiffs, and	THE ORDER GRANTING SAMSUNG'S MOTION FOR ANTISUIT INJUNCTION	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES USA, INC., Plaintiffs / Counterclaim-Defendants, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., Defendants / Counterclaim-Plaintiffs, and SAMSUNG RESEARCH AMERICA, Defendant,	THE ORDER GRANTING SAMSUNG'S MOTION FOR ANTISUIT INJUNCTION	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES USA, INC., Plaintiffs / Counterclaim-Defendants, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., Defendants / Counterclaim-Plaintiffs, and SAMSUNG RESEARCH AMERICA, Defendant, v.	THE ORDER GRANTING SAMSUNG'S MOTION FOR ANTISUIT INJUNCTION	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES USA, INC., Plaintiffs / Counterclaim-Defendants, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., Defendants / Counterclaim-Plaintiffs, and SAMSUNG RESEARCH AMERICA, Defendant, v. HISILICON TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.,	THE ORDER GRANTING SAMSUNG'S MOTION FOR ANTISUIT INJUNCTION	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES USA, INC., Plaintiffs / Counterclaim-Defendants, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., Defendants / Counterclaim-Plaintiffs, and SAMSUNG RESEARCH AMERICA, Defendant, v. HISILICON TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.,	THE ORDER GRANTING SAMSUNG'S MOTION FOR ANTISUIT INJUNCTION	



On February 26, 2019, Plaintiffs and Counterclaim-Defendants Huawei Technologies Co.,
Ltd., Huawei Device USA, Inc., Huawei Technologies USA, Inc., and HiSilicon Technologies Co.,
Ltd. (collectively, "Huawei") and Defendants and Counterclaim-Plaintiffs Samsung Electronics
Co., Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., and Samsung Research America, Inc. (collectively,
"Samsung") notified the Court that the parties had entered into a confidential settlement agreement,
and that they anticipated that in the following weeks they would complete the pending steps to
finalize the settlement. Dkt. 461. Pursuant to the terms of the parties' settlement, on March 6,
2019, Huawei moved to dismiss its appeal to the Federal Circuit of the Court's order granting
Samsung's motion for a preliminary antisuit injunction and requested that the Court of Appeals
remand the case to this Court for consideration of an anticipated unopposed motion to vacate the
order at issue in the appeal. See Dtk. 73, Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd. v. Samsung Electronics
Co., Ltd., Appeal No. 18-1979 (Fed. Cir.). The Federal Circuit granted Huawei's motion, in part,
on March 15, 2019, remanding the matter to this Court for consideration of Huawei's unopposed
motion to vacate and otherwise holding the appeal in abeyance. Dkt. 74, <i>Huawei Technologies Co.</i>
Ltd. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Appeal No. 18-1979 (Fed. Cir.). Huawei now files the
unopposed motion to vacate the Court's order granting Samsung's motion for a preliminary antisuit
injunction referenced in its motion in the Federal Circuit (Dkt. 280 (unsealed), Dkt. 281 (sealed),
hereinafter "the Order"). 1
Upon dismissal of a panding appeal, the Ninth Circuit's "astablished procedure" is to reman

Upon dismissal of a pending appeal, the Ninth Circuit's "established procedure" is to remand "so the district court can decide whether to vacate its judgment." *American Games Inc. v. Trade Products, Inc.*, 142 F.3d 1164, 1168 (9th Cir. 1998).² In the case of a preliminary injunction, once the dispute has become moot, by reason of settlement or otherwise, the preliminary injunction

of the regional circuit in which the district court sits because such rulings commonly involve procedural matters that are not unique to patent law"); *Microstrategy Inc. v. Apttus Corp.*, No. 3:15-CV-21-JAG, 2015 WL 12839248 at *1 (E.D. Va. Nov. 5, 2015) (applying Fourth Circuit law to a request to vacate an order dismissing a patent infringement suit for patent-ineligible subject matter).



¹ Upon resolution of this motion, the parties anticipate jointly filing a stipulation of dismissal of this action.
² Ninth Circuit law applies to this request to vacate, which does not involve matters unique to patent

law. See Broyhill Furniture Industries, Inc. v. Craftmaster Furniture Corp., 12 F.3d 1080, 1082

(Fed. Cir. 1993) (noting that in reviewing motions to vacate, the Federal Circuit "defer[s] to the law of the regional circuit in which the district court sits because such rulings commonly involve

procedural matters that are not unique to patent law"): Microstrategy Inc. v. Apttus Corp. No. 3:15-

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

should be vacated. See Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics v. United States Forest
Service, 408 F. Supp. 2d 916, 921 (N.D. Cal. 2006) (vacating a preliminary injunction order that
had become moot); Berkeley Community Health Project v. City of Berkeley, 119 F.3d 794, 794-795
(9th Cir. 1997) (parties settled while appeal of preliminary injunction was pending; Court of
Appeals remanded to allow district court to consider request to vacate, and dismissed the appeal
after the district court vacated its preliminary injunction order as moot). This Court entered the
preliminary antisuit injunction as a temporary measure to bar Huawei from seeking to enforce
injunction orders issued by the Shenzhen Court until this Court had "the ability to determine the
breach of contract claim," i.e., until the trial in this matter could be held. Dkt. 281 at 20-21. At the
time, the Court indicated that it expected the antisuit injunction to last "less than six months" and
that it was "limited to a particular order dealing with two patents" and "a specific form of relief."
Id. at 20. Based on the parties' settlement resolving all pending disputes between the parties—
including all disputes in the United States and China—the basis for the preliminary injunction no
longer exists.

Therefore, Huawei respectfully requests that the Court vacate its preliminary injunction, which the Court issued as Dkt. 280 (unsealed) and Dkt. 281 (sealed). Counsel for Samsung has stated that it does not oppose this motion.

Dated: March 15, 2019

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ Michael J. Bettinger

Michael J. Bettinger (SBN 122196) mbettinger@sidley.com
Irene Yang (SBN 245464)
irene.yang@sidley.com
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
555 California Street, Ste. 2000
San Francisco, California 94104
Telephone: +1 415 772-1200

Facsimile: +1 415 772-7400



25

26

27

Case 3:16-cv-02787-WHO Document 464 Filed 03/15/19 Page 4 of 4

1 David T. Pritikin (pro hac vice) dpritikin@sidley.com 2 David C. Giardina (pro hac vice) dgiardina@sidley.com 3 Douglas I. Lewis (pro hac vice) 4 dlewis@sidley.com John W. McBride (pro hac vice) 5 jwmcbride@sidley.com SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP 6 One South Dearborn 7 Chicago, Illinois 60603 Telephone: +1 312 853 7000 8 Facsimile: +1 312 853 7036 9 Attorneys for Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd., Huawei Device USA, Inc., Huawei 10 Technologies USA, Inc., and HiSilicon Technologies Co., Ltd. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

