

United States District Court
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION

IMPERIUM IP HOLDINGS (CAYMAN),	§	
LTD.	§	
	§	Civil Action No. 4:14-CV-00371
v.	§	Judge Mazzant
	§	
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,	§	
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,	§	
INC., SAMSUNG	§	
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA,	§	
LLC, and SAMSUNG SEMICONDUCTOR,	§	
INC.	§	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law on the Validity of U.S. Patent No. 6,836,290 (Dkt. #336). After reviewing the relevant pleadings, the Court denies Plaintiff's motion.

BACKGROUND

On June 9, 2014, Plaintiff filed the instant action against Defendants, alleging infringement of United States Patent Nos. 6,271,884 (the "'884 Patent"), 7,092,029 (the "'029 Patent"), and 6,836,290 (the "'290 Patent"). On February 8, 2016, the jury returned a verdict in favor of Plaintiff. Particularly, the jury found the following: (1) Defendants infringed Claims 1, 5, 14, and 17 of the '884 Patent; (2) Defendants infringed Claims 1, 6, and 7 of the '029 Patent; (3) Defendants willfully infringed the patents-in-suit; and (4) Claim 10 of the '290 Patent was invalid for obviousness (Dkt. #253). The jury awarded \$4,840,772 in damages for infringement of the '884 Patent and \$2,129,608.50 in damages for infringement of the '029 Patent (Dkt. #253). On August 24, 2016, the Court awarded enhanced damages for willful infringement and entered final judgment (Dkt. #329; Dkt. #330).

On September 21, 2016, Plaintiff filed its motion for judgment as a matter of law (Dkt. #336). On October 11, 2016, Defendants filed a response (Dkt. #339). On October 21, 2016, Plaintiff filed a reply (Dkt. #342). On October 31, 2016, Defendants filed a sur-reply (Dkt. #345).

LEGAL STANDARD

Upon a party's renewed motion for judgment as a matter of law following a jury verdict, the Court should properly ask whether "the state of proof is such that reasonable and impartial minds could reach the conclusion the jury expressed in its verdict." Fed. R. Civ. P. 50(b); *see also Am. Home Assurance Co. v. United Space All.*, 378 F.3d 482, 487 (5th Cir. 2004). "The grant or denial of a motion for judgment as a matter of law is a procedural issue not unique to patent law, reviewed under the law of the regional circuit in which the appeal from the district court would usually lie." *Finisar Corp. v. DirectTV Grp., Inc.*, 523 F.3d 1323, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2008). "A JMOL may only be granted when, 'viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the verdict, the evidence points so strongly and overwhelmingly in favor of one party that the court believes that reasonable jurors could not arrive at any contrary conclusion.'" *Versata Software, Inc. v. SAP Am., Inc.*, 717 F.3d 1255, 1261 (Fed. Cir. 2013) (quoting *Dresser-Rand Co. v. Virtual Automation, Inc.*, 361 F.3d 831, 838 (5th Cir. 2004)).

Under Fifth Circuit law, a court should be "especially deferential" to a jury's verdict and must not reverse the jury's findings unless they are not supported by substantial evidence. *Baisden v. I'm Ready Prods., Inc.*, 693 F.3d 491, 499 (5th Cir. 2012). "Substantial evidence is defined as evidence of such quality and weight that reasonable and fair-minded men in the exercise of impartial judgment might reach different conclusions." *Threlkeld v. Total Petroleum, Inc.*, 211 F.3d 887, 891 (5th Cir. 2000). A motion for judgment as a matter of law must be

denied “unless the facts and inferences point so strongly and overwhelming in the movant’s favor that reasonable jurors could not reach a contrary conclusion.” *Baisden*, 693 F.3d at 498 (citation omitted). However, “[t]here must be more than a mere scintilla of evidence in the record to prevent judgment as a matter of law in favor of the movant.” *Arismendez v. Nightingale Home Health Care, Inc.*, 493 F.3d 602, 606 (5th Cir. 2007).

In evaluating a motion for judgment as a matter of law, a court must “draw all reasonable inferences in the light most favorable to the verdict and cannot substitute other inferences that [the court] might regard as more reasonable.” *E.E.O.C. v. Boh Bros. Constr. Co.*, 731 F.3d 444, 451 (5th Cir. 2013) (citation omitted). However, “[c]redibility determinations, the weighing of evidence, and the drawing of legitimate inferences from the facts are jury functions, not those of a judge.” *Reeves v. Sanderson Plumbing Prods., Inc.*, 530 U.S. 133, 150 (2000). “[T]he court should give credence to the evidence favoring the nonmovant as well as that ‘evidence supporting the moving party that is uncontradicted and unimpeached, at least to the extent that the evidence comes from disinterested witnesses.’” *Id.* at 151 (citation omitted).

ANALYSIS

Plaintiff moves for judgment as a matter of law based on the jury’s determination that Claim 10 of the ’290 Patent was invalid as obvious in combination with other prior art. Plaintiff’s motion challenges the legal sufficiency of the evidence supporting the jury’s verdict. Plaintiff argues that Defendants offered no evidence to support any of their reasons to combine U.S. Patent No. 6,452,632 (“Umeda”) with U.S. Patent No. 5,929,655 (“Roe”) or Japanese Patent Publication No. 1997-6592 (“Toshiba”) to reach the particular combination of elements mentioned in Claim 10. Specifically, Plaintiff makes the following arguments: (1) Defendants produced no evidence that combining Roe or Toshiba with Umeda would have reduced pin count

or cost; (2) Defendants offered no evidence that combining Roe or Toshiba with Umeda would increase performance or versatility; and (3) Defendants offered no evidence that Roe or Toshiba would have increased the performance and versatility of Umeda by enabling support for well-known standards. Thus, Plaintiff asserts that judgment as a matter of law is justified and Claim 10 is valid and not obvious. In response, Defendants contend that they presented clear and convincing evidence that Claim 10 was obvious in view of Umeda in combination with Roe or Toshiba.

There is a presumption that a patent is valid. *Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.*, 234 F.3d 654, 662 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Defendants bear the burden of proving invalidity by clear and convincing evidence, and the burden never shifts to Plaintiff, the patentee, to prove validity. A patent is invalid for obviousness “if the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious before the effective filing date of the claimed invention to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the claimed invention pertains.” 35 U.S.C § 103. Obviousness is a legal determination based upon underlying factual findings. *Soverain Software LLC v. Newegg Inc.*, 705 F.3d 1333, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013). The factual findings are based upon several factors, including “(1) the scope and content of the prior art, (2) the difference between the prior art and the claimed invention, (3) the level of ordinary skill in the field of the invention, and (4) any relevant objective considerations.” *Id.* (citing *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17–18 (1966)). Although the Court must determine the ultimate legal question of obviousness, the Court must presume the jury resolved all underlying factual findings in favor of the verdict and accept the jury’s findings if supported by substantial evidence. *Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.*, 688 F.3d 1342, 1356–57 (Fed. Cir. 2012).

Here, substantial evidence supports the jury's finding of obviousness. Claim 10 of the '290 Patent recites:

10. A CMOS imaging apparatus, comprising:
a *CMOS image sensor*, the sensor having a *data interface circuit* comprising:
a first single-ended interface connected to a first signal output line;
a second single-ended interface connected to a second signal output line;
and
a differential interface having a normal signal output connected to the first output line and a complementary signal output connected to the second signal output line;
wherein an output of the data interface circuit is selectable between a single-ended interface output and a differential interface output; and
an *image processor* connected to the CMOS image sensor to receive the signals output by the data interface circuit.

'290 Patent at 5:45–6:6 (emphasis added). The claimed invention has three primary components: (1) a “CMOS image sensor”; (2) a “data interface circuit” within the CMOS image sensor that sends output signals from the sensor; and (3) an “image processor” that receives signals from the data interface circuit.

Both parties presented expert testimony regarding the obviousness of Claim 10. Defendants' invalidity expert, Dr. Jacob Baker, testified regarding the obviousness of Claim 10. Dr. Baker contended that a person of ordinary skill in the art would combine the disclosure in Umeda with the interface disclosed in Roe or Toshiba. Umeda discloses a solid-state image sensor that includes (1) an image sensor, such as a CMOS type image sensor; (2) an interface section within the image sensor that transmits signals; and (3) a section that receives signals from the interface section. Umeda at Fig. 6. Umeda does not claim a particular type of interface section to use with the invention.

At trial, Dr. Baker described what Umeda seeks in an appropriate interface section:

Q. (By Mr. Pepe) Now, Dr. Baker, what does this slide show?

A. This slide shows what Umeda desires with an interface.

Q. And what are those characteristics?

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.