

No. 19-211

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

TIME WARNER CABLE, INC.; TIME WARNER
CABLE, LLC; TIME WARNER ENTERTAINMENT
COMPANY, L.P.; TIME WARNER ENTERTAINMENT-
ADVANCE/NEWHOUSE PARTNERSHIP;
TWC COMMUNICATIONS, LLC; AND TIME WARNER
CABLE INFORMATION SERVICES (KANSAS), LLC,

Petitioners,

v.

SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, L.P.,

Respondent.

**On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

J. MICHAEL JAKES

Counsel of Record

KATHLEEN A. DALEY

JASON L. ROMRELL

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,

FARABOW, GARRETT &

DUNNER, LLP

901 New York Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20001

(202) 408-4000

mike.jakes@finnegan.com

Counsel for Respondent

WILSON-EPES PRINTING CO., INC. – (202) 789-0096 – WASHINGTON, D. C. 20002

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Neither of the questions presented in the Petition is raised in the Federal Circuit's decision. The court did not sanction unapportioned damages awards or create a new rule for the written description requirement. The court simply applied established law to particular facts and concluded that the jury verdict was supported by substantial evidence. If this Court were to grant the Petition based on the Petitioners' questions, it would find that it must first reweigh questions of fact decided by the jury on such things as the meaning of "broadband" technology and the credibility of expert witnesses.

The questions presented in this case, properly stated, are:

1. Whether the Federal Circuit correctly affirmed the jury's reasonable royalty award as supported by substantial evidence where Sprint presented the jury with expert testimony and other evidence of multiple methodologies apportioning the incremental value of Petitioners' services attributable to Sprint's inventions.

2. Whether the Federal Circuit correctly affirmed the jury's finding that Sprint's patents are not invalid, where substantial evidence, including expert testimony, showed that the written descriptions are not limited to a single networking technology, but encompass a variety of broadband technologies.

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Respondent Sprint Communications Company, L.P., is wholly owned by Sprint Communications, Inc., either directly or indirectly.

Sprint Communications, Inc., is a wholly owned subsidiary of Sprint Corporation, which is a public company listed on the New York Stock exchange. SoftBank Corp., a public company listed on the Tokyo Stock Exchange First Section, owns 10% or more of the stock of Sprint Corporation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.....	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
A. Sprint’s Inventions	3
B. Time Warner Abandoned Its Sprint Part- nership to “Go-It-Alone” and Save Billions	5
C. Litigation.....	5
1. Damages	6
2. Written Description.....	9
3. Judgment and Appeal	10
REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION	12
I. The Federal Circuit’s Nonprecedential Decision Applying Longstanding Princi- ples of Apportionment to Particular Facts Is Not Cert-Worthy	14
A. The Federal Circuit Correctly Affirmed—Consistent with <i>Garretson</i> — that the Jury’s Reasonable Royalty Award Was Apportioned to the Value of Sprint’s Inventions	14
B. This Case Presents No Internal Split on Apportioning Reasonable Royalty Damages	19

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

	Page
C. This Case Is a Poor Vehicle to Review Apportionment.....	23
II. The Federal Circuit’s Fact-Bound Application of Settled Written Descrip- tion Law Does Not Warrant This Court’s Review	28
A. The Federal Circuit Did Not Create the New Written Description Rule that Petitioners Say It Did.....	28
B. There Is No Intra-Circuit Split on Written Description.....	31
C. The Fact-Bound Nature of This Case Makes It a Poor Vehicle to Consider the Written Description Standard.....	33
CONCLUSION	35

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.