

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

FRACTUS, S.A.	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
v.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO.
	§	3:18-CV-2838-K
ZTE CORPORATION,	§	
ZTE (USA), INC., and	§	
ZTE (TX), INC.,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff Fractus' Amended Motion to Compel (the "Motion") (Doc. No. 144). Also before the Court is ZTE's Opposed Motion for Leave to File Sur-Reply in Opposition to Plaintiff Fractus' Amended Motion to Compel (the "Motion for Leave") (Doc. No. 168). The Court **GRANTS** the Motion for Leave. After considering the Motion, brief in support, response, reply, and sur-reply, as well as all supporting material and relevant law, the Court **GRANTS** the Motion.

This is a patent infringement case in which Fractus, S.A. ("Fractus") has alleged that the Defendants ZTE Corporation; ZTE (USA), Inc.; and ZTE (TX), Inc. (collectively, the "Defendants") have infringed certain patents assigned to Fractus. The patents in suit relate to antenna technology. The patents claim multiband antennas with particular geometric configurations so that the antennas are multilevel antennas. Fractus asserts that the Defendants, who sell cellular phones, have infringed Fractus'

patents by making, using, offering to sell, or selling phones that have antennas that are claimed inventions of the patents in suit.

In the Motion, Fractus has moved this Court to compel the Defendants to produce certain information regarding the Defendants' sales of accused devices. In particular, Fractus requests the Court to order the Defendants to produce sales records for the accused devices. Fractus argues that the Defendants' attempts to produce this information are incomplete, inconsistent, and not verifiable. Fractus further asserts that this information is critical to the issues in this case because it is necessary to prove damages. In addition to production of these records, Fractus also asks the Court to order the Defendants to designate a representative to be deposed concerning the sales data production and the accuracy and completeness of that sales data.

The Defendants respond that they have attempted to produce reliable information regarding the number of accused devices sold and have cooperated with Fractus to correct any deficiencies in the production. The Defendants originally attempted to provide this information in the form of data tables. When Fractus raised issues with these data tables, the Defendants further supplemented the data tables multiple times. The Defendants then produced a data extract from ZTE's Oracle E-Business Suite system, which the Defendants assert is an Oracle created database used by ZTE for accounting and purchase order information. The Defendants assert that since this database is used to record all purchase information related to the accused devices, the production of the data extract sufficiently provides Fractus with the

requested information. For these reasons, the Defendants argue that they should not have to produce actual sales records documents. The Defendants claim that the cost and burden to produce these records outweigh the importance of the records, since the same information is included in the data extract.

The scope of discovery is controlled by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b) which provides that "[p]arties may obtain discovery regarding any nonprivileged matter that is relevant to any party's claim or defense and proportional to the needs of the case, considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in controversy, the parties' relative access to relevant information, the parties' resources, the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues, and whether the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit." FED. R. CIV. P. 26(b)(1).

The Court first notes that the parties do not appear to dispute the relevancy of the information requested by Fractus. Fractus asserts that the requested sales documents are directly relevant to the issue at hand in this case because the information is necessary to prove Fractus' damages if infringement did in fact occur. The Defendants appear to acknowledge this because they do not contest the relevance of the information contained in the requested documents. Instead, the Defendants simply argue the burden of producing actual sales documents outweighs the need for the information because they have already produced the information in the form of a data extract. The Court finds that the requested sales records are directly relevant to the

issues in this case and holds that Fractus has a right to obtain this information through discovery.

The Court now turns to the sufficiency of what was produced. The Defendants originally produced data tables containing sales data that the Defendants originally appeared to assert provided the information needed to calculate damages. It also appears that when Fractus questioned the reliability of this data, the Defendants attempted to supplement these tables multiple times with new sales numbers. Fractus also raised issues with what Fractus perceives as a discrepancy between the numbers produced and an IDC estimate of ZTE's cellular phones sales. (IDC is a third-party industry group that provides sales estimates for various cellular phone manufacturers.) According to Fractus, this discrepancy brings into question the reliability of the data produced by the Defendants in these data tables. In addition, the data tables appear to have been produced solely for the purpose of this litigation and that some versions of this information were created by the Defendants' counsel. Fractus asserts that this also raises questions regarding the reliability of the information provided.

The Court agrees with Fractus that the data tables provided by the Defendants are insufficient as a reliable, credible response to the request for sales figures of accused devices. The Court is not persuaded, however, by Fractus' IDC argument. The IDC sales estimates are just that, estimates by a third party that does not have direct access to ZTE's sales information and that creates these estimates from some apparently proprietary method. Considering this, the fact that a discrepancy exists between the

IDC estimates and the information produced by the Defendants is not surprising. This does not mean the Defendants' information is unreliable or incorrect. The Court is concerned, however, about the fact that these data tables appear to be created solely for the purpose of this litigation and that when pressed about discrepancies and other issues with the data, the Defendants repeatedly amended the tables and changed the sales numbers. These facts seriously bring into question the reliability of this information.

The Defendants argue that the production of and the supplements to the data tables are irrelevant to the issues here because the Defendants subsequently produced data extracts from its Oracle database that reflect the sales of the accused devices. The Defendants assert that this information is directly from the Defendants' database that is used to track sales and that it is more reliable than producing actual sales records such as purchase orders because, for example, a purchase order may have been subsequently changed or cancelled. The Defendants also assert that the costs and burden to produce actual sales documents outweigh the need for the information, since the Defendants have produced the same information in the form of a data extract.

The Court is not persuaded by the Defendants' argument that the burden of production outweighs the need and importance of the information. The requested information is directly relevant to the issues of infringement and damages. This is a critical issue in Fractus' case against the Defendants. Each occurrence of a sale of a phone containing a claimed antenna may be an act of patent infringement, and for

# 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.