

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

The CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF
TECHNOLOGY,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:21-cv-446

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO TRANSFER
TO THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Samsung’s motion to transfer – a thinly disguised effort to seek summary adjudication – fails across the board.....	1
A.	Samsung is not an intended third-party beneficiary of the PLA.....	2
B.	Samsung cannot invoke a [REDACTED] [REDACTED].....	5
III.	Samsung’s Claim to a License of the Patents-in-Suit is Unmeritorious.....	6
A.	The PLA does not cover the Patents-in-Suit.....	6
B.	The ’710 Patent was not and could not have been a CIP of the ’852 Application.....	7
C.	The other Patents-in-Suit also are not CIPs of the ’852 Application.....	8
D.	The parties’ course of conduct corroborates that the Patents-in-Suit were not covered by the PLA.	9
E.	The parties sought to confirm their mutual understanding under the [REDACTED] [REDACTED].....	10
F.	Samsung admits the IV-Samsung Agreement [REDACTED] [REDACTED].....	13
G.	Samsung’s remaining arguments cannot support transfer under § 1404.	13
IV.	Conclusion	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Agence France Presse v. Morel</i> , 769 F. Supp. 2d 295 (S.D.N.Y. 2011).....	3
<i>Alling v. Universal Mfg. Corp.</i> , 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 718 (Cal. Ct. App. 1992).....	4, 5
<i>Atl. Marine Constr. Co. v. United States Dist. Court for W. Dist. Tex.</i> , 571 U.S. 49 (2013).....	13, 14
<i>Autodesk, Inc. v. Alter</i> , 2018 WL 1335858 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 15, 2018).....	3
<i>Gen. Protecht Grp., Inc. v. Leviton Mfg. Co.</i> , 651 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	4, 14, 15
<i>Goonewardene v. ADP, LLC</i> , 434 P.3d 124 (Cal. 2019).....	2
<i>Implicit, LLC v. Juniper Networks, Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 10356908 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 22, 2020).....	15
<i>In re Lab'y Corp. of Am. Holdings</i> , 2022 WL 1498775 (Fed. Cir. May 12, 2022).....	14
<i>Peteet v. Dow Chem. Co.</i> , 868 F.2d 1428 (5th Cir. 1989).....	14
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 2017 WL 959856 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 13, 2017).....	14, 15
<i>Zix Corp. v. Echoworx Corp.</i> , 2016 WL 7042221 (E.D. Tex. June 9, 2016).....	14, 15
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 120.....	7, 8
35 U.S.C. § 121.....	8
35 U.S.C. § 365(c).....	8
Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 1856(c).....	9



Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 1.78 (2001)	8
37 C.F.R. § 1.78(a)(2) (2001)	7

I. Introduction

Samsung's motion to transfer venue is built on a series of unsupported assertions that fail to coalesce in any way to warrant its requested relief. The Patents-in-Suit¹ are indisputably *not* covered by any license to Intellectual Ventures or, in turn, to Samsung. None of the Patents-in-Suit [REDACTED], nor are the Patents-in-Suit [REDACTED]. Indeed, the parties to that agreement – Caltech and Cellular Elements (CE) – expressly agreed that [REDACTED].

In any event, that is a question for a dispositive motion, which Samsung elected not to bring to this Court – instead opting for the procedural tactic of embedding its license defense within a belated transfer motion. This Court can readily dispense of Samsung's motion to transfer venue on its face because Samsung cannot invoke [REDACTED] of a Patent License Agreement (PLA) between two other parties. Samsung is neither a [REDACTED]. Allowing Samsung to claim rights under the agreement would be inconsistent with [REDACTED], and Samsung cannot meet the separate hurdle of showing that the [REDACTED]. That clause very deliberately provides [REDACTED], and Samsung is not [REDACTED]. Finally, Samsung requests transfer pursuant to § 1404 without providing a full § 1404 analysis, further revealing the insufficiency of its motion.

II. Samsung's motion to transfer – a thinly disguised effort to seek summary adjudication – fails across the board.

As shown below in Section III, Samsung can claim no license to the Patents-in-Suit. But Samsung has not asked the Court to render a ruling on a dispositive motion. To the contrary,

¹ The "Patents-in-Suit" are U.S. Patent Nos. 7,116,710 ("the '710 Patent"), 7,421,032 ("the '032 Patent"), 7,916,781 ("the '781 Patent"), and 8,284,833 ("the '833 Patent").

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.