

KEVIN P.B. JOHNSON, SBN 177129  
kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com  
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP  
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

SEAN S. PAK, SBN 219032  
seanpak@quinnemanuel.com  
ADAM B. WOLFSON, SBN 262125  
adamwolfson@quinnemanuel.com  
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP  
50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

KEVIN HARDY (*pro hac vice*)  
D.C. Bar No. 473941  
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP  
1300 I Street, N.W., Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: (202) 538-8000  
Facsimile: (202) 538-8100  
kevinhardy@quinnemanuel.com

*Attorneys for Defendant MediaTek Inc.*

[additional counsel listed in signature block]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

REALTEK SEMICONDUCTOR CORP.,  
Plaintiff,

v.

MEDIATEK INC.; IPVALUE  
MANAGEMENT INC.; and FUTURE LINK  
SYSTEMS, LLC,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:23-cv-02774-PCP

**DEFENDANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AN  
ADDITIONAL MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Judge: Hon. P. Casey Pitts

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11, Defendants MediaTek Inc., IPValue Management, Inc., and Future Link Systems, LLC (collectively, “Defendants”) respectfully submit this Administrative Motion for Leave to File an Additional Motion for Summary Judgment. Defendants intend to show that Realtek’s antitrust and related claims (Counts II, III, V, VI, VII, and IX of the First Amended Complaint (“FAC”)) are barred by the Federal Circuit’s September 9, 2025, precedential decision in *Future Link Systems, LLC v. Realtek Semiconductor Corp.*, No. 23-1056 (the “September Federal Circuit Opinion”) and the Federal Circuit’s June 18, 2025, decision in *Realtek Semiconductor Corporation v. International Trade Commission*, No. 23-1187 (the “June Federal Circuit Opinion”) (collectively, the “Federal Circuit Opinions”). An early, targeted motion for summary judgment is warranted because, if granted, only narrow common law claims would remain—a single count against MediaTek (Count VIII, tortious interference with prospective economic advantage) and a single count against Future Link (Count X, breach of contract).

Realtek’s antitrust and subsidiary claims depend on Realtek proving that the sham litigation exception to *Noerr-Pennington* immunity applies to Future Link’s two Western District of Texas complaints. On March 7, 2025, the Court denied in part Defendants’ motion to dismiss, holding that the FAC plausibly pled sufficient facts to support Realtek’s allegation that the sham litigation exception to *Noerr-Pennington* immunity applied as to Counts II, III, V, and VI of the FAC. Dkt. 217 (the “March Order”) at 10–18; *see also* Dkt. 130 at ¶¶280, 287, 302, 308.<sup>1</sup> Realtek’s UCL claim (Count VII) and its Lanham Act claim (Count IX) also depend on proving its allegations of sham litigation and were not dismissed. *See, e.g.*, March Order at 26 (“Because Realtek has adequately pleaded that both MediaTek and the PAE defendants violated federal law . . . , Realtek’s complaint states a valid UCL claim”), 25 (“As to this limited statement about the alleged sham litigation, Realtek pleads a Lanham Act claim sufficient to survive a motion to dismiss”).

In light of the Federal Circuit Opinions, Defendants intend to show that collateral estoppel

---

<sup>1</sup> The remainder of Realtek’s antitrust claims were previously dismissed by the Court, including Realtek’s Counts I and IV. March Order at 33. Count IX (false advertising) was also dismissed as against MediaTek. *Id.*

1 applies and summarily resolves Counts II, III, V, VI, VII, and IX in Defendants’ favor. With respect  
2 to the first Western District of Texas lawsuit, Realtek made a Rule 11 motion that, like here, required  
3 it to show that “an objectively reasonable attorney would not believe, based on some actual evidence  
4 uncovered during the prefiling investigation, that each claim limitation reads on the accused device.”  
5 *Antonious v. Spalding & Evenflo Cos.*, 275 F.3d 1066, 1074 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (law cited by Realtek  
6 in its Texas Rule 11 motion). Realtek’s motion was denied by the district court, and the Federal  
7 Circuit reviewed that denial. September Federal Circuit Op. at 9–12. The Circuit *affirmed* in all  
8 respects the Texas district court’s Rule 11 determination that the complaint was not objectively  
9 baseless, finding that “the district court did not abuse its discretion in concluding that Future Link’s  
10 claim of infringement was supported by sufficient factual basis.” *Id.* at 12 (quotes and citation  
11 removed) (citing Future Link’s claim charts, extensive cited evidence, and study of exemplar  
12 accused products).

13 As for the second Western District of Texas case, Realtek moved under 28 U.S.C. § 1927  
14 for attorneys’ fees, which required Realtek to demonstrate that the complaint was “patently  
15 meritless.” *See, e.g., Bryant v. Military Department of Mississippi*, 597 F.3d 678, 694 (5th Cir.  
16 2010); *Levine v. Millennium Tr. Co., LLC*, 2013 WL 12157580, at \*1 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 20, 2013)  
17 (same). The district court denied Realtek’s motion, thereby finding that the case was not patently  
18 meritless, and the Federal Circuit affirmed this ruling. September Federal Circuit Op. at 12–13.  
19 Realtek’s claims that the second Western District of Texas action was objectively baseless are thus  
20 collaterally estopped.

21 Moreover, the infringement claims in the second Western District of Texas case were  
22 identical to those asserted by Future Link against Realtek in the International Trade Commission—  
23 a point of proof requiring no additional discovery since the records from those cases (which the  
24 parties have agreed can be used in this case) constitute the relevant evidence. Like in the second  
25 Western District of Texas case, Realtek moved for attorneys’ fees at the ITC, and, like in the second  
26 Western District of Texas, the ITC “rejected Realtek’s argument that the ITC proceeding lacked any  
27 reasonable basis.” March Order at 17; *see also* 19 U.S.C. § 210.4(c)(3) (one of the statutes invoked  
28 by Realtek’s briefing; requiring a complaint be supported by sufficient “evidentiary support”). The

1 June Federal Circuit Opinion found the ITC's ruling was unappealable to the Federal Circuit,  
 2 making the ITC findings final and conclusive. June Federal Circuit Op. at 2.

3 Given the costs associated with antitrust litigation, which will increase dramatically in the  
 4 coming months, Defendants believe that the most efficient use of judicial and party resources is to  
 5 brief this discrete issue now in an early summary judgment motion while preserving the ability to  
 6 also file a summary judgment motion addressing additional issues later, if necessary. This request  
 7 is not being made for purposes of delay or distraction. Because of the significant impact collateral  
 8 estoppel will have on the majority of issues in this case, Defendants believe the requested targeted  
 9 motion will help streamline issues moving forward. Defendants therefore request the Court grant  
 10 Defendants an exception to its one summary judgment motion per party rule.

11 Prior to filing this motion, Defendants consulted with Realtek regarding whether it would  
 12 stipulate to the request. Realtek declined, stating it did not believe an early summary judgment  
 13 motion was warranted. Pursuant to Local Rule 7-11(a), the attached declaration of Adam Wolfson  
 14 describes Defendants' efforts and why a stipulation could not be obtained.

15 A proposed order granting the relief requested herein is attached.

16  
 17 Dated: September 17, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

18  
 19 /s/ Adam B. Wolfson

20 KEVIN P.B. JOHNSON, SBN 177129  
 kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com  
 21 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP  
 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
 22 Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
 Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
 23 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

24 SEAN S. PAK, SBN 219032  
 seanpak@quinnemanuel.com  
 25 ADAM B. WOLFSON, SBN 262125  
 adamwolfson@quinnemanuel.com  
 26 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP  
 50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
 27 San Francisco, CA 94111  
 Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
 28 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

1 KEVIN HARDY (pro hac vice)  
2 D.C. Bar No. 473941  
3 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP  
4 1300 I Street, N.W., Suite 900  
5 Washington, DC 20005  
6 Telephone: (202) 538-8000  
7 Facsimile: (202) 538-8100  
8 kevinhardy@quinnemanuel.com

*Attorneys for Defendant MediaTek Inc.*

9 /s/ Brian D. Ledahl

10 Brian D. Ledahl (SBN 186579)  
11 bledahl@raklaw.com  
12 Andrew D. Weiss (SBN 232974)  
13 aweiss@raklaw.com  
14 RUSS AUGUST & KABAT  
15 12424 Wilshire Blvd. 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
16 Los Angeles, CA 90025  
17 Phone: (310) 826-7474

18 Benjamin Hattenbach (SBN 186455)  
19 bhattenbach@irell.com  
20 Michael D. Harbour (SBN 298185)  
21 mharbour@irell.com  
22 Lucas S. Oxenford (SBN 328152)  
23 loxenford@irell.com  
24 Skyler Terrebonne (SBN 347604)  
25 IRELL & MANELLA LLP  
26 1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900  
27 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
28 Telephone: (310) 277-1010  
Fax: (310) 273-7199

A. Matthew Ashley (SBN 198235)  
mashley@irell.com  
IRELL & MANELLA LLP  
840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 400  
Newport Beach, CA 92660  
Telephone: (949) 760-0991  
Fax: (949) 760-5200

*Attorneys for Defendants IPValue Management, Inc.  
and Future Link Systems, LLC*

**ATTESTATION PURSUANT TO CIVIL LOCAL RULE 5-1**

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3) of the Northern District of California, I attest that concurrence in the filing of the document has been obtained from each of the other signatories to this document.

Executed on September 17, 2025

/s/ Adam B. Wolfson

Adam B. Wolfson

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

REALTEK SEMICONDUCTOR CORP.,  
Plaintiff,

v.

MEDIATEK INC.; IPVALUE  
MANAGEMENT INC.; and FUTURE LINK  
SYSTEMS, LLC,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:23-cv-02774-PCP

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
DEFENDANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AN  
ADDITIONAL MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Judge: Hon. P. Casey Pitts

1 Before the Court is Defendants' September 17, 2025 Administrative Motion for Leave to  
2 File an Additional Motion for Summary Judgment.

3 Because Defendants' contemplated motion will address discrete legal issues and  
4 developments subsequent to the Court's ruling on Defendants' motions to dismiss, the Court grants  
5 leave for Defendants to file a joint motion for summary judgment beyond the single such motion  
6 generally permitted by the Court's standing order. The motion shall be briefed in accordance with  
7 the applicable Local Rules.

8  
9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10  
11 DATED \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
P. CASEY PITTS  
United States District Judge



KEVIN P.B. JOHNSON, SBN 177129  
kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com  
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP  
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

SEAN S. PAK, SBN 219032  
seanpak@quinnemanuel.com  
ADAM B. WOLFSON, SBN 262125  
adamwolfson@quinnemanuel.com  
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP  
50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

KEVIN HARDY (*pro hac vice*)  
D.C. Bar No. 473941  
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP  
1300 I Street, N.W., Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: (202) 538-8000  
Facsimile: (202) 538-8100  
kevinhardy@quinnemanuel.com

*Attorneys for Defendant MediaTek Inc.*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

REALTEK SEMICONDUCTOR CORP.,

Plaintiff,

v.

MEDIATEK INC.; IPVALUE  
MANAGEMENT INC.; and FUTURE LINK  
SYSTEMS, LLC,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:23-cv-02774-PCP

**DECLARATION OF ADAM WOLFSON  
IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS'  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR  
LEAVE TO FILE AN ADDITIONAL  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT**

Judge: Hon. P. Casey Pitts

1 I, Adam B. Wolfson, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice in the State of California, and a member of the  
3 Bar of this Court. I am a partner at the law firm Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, and  
4 counsel of record for Defendant MediaTek, Inc. ("MediaTek") in this case. I am familiar with the  
5 facts set forth herein and, if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to those facts  
6 under oath. I submit this declaration in support of Defendants' Administrative Motion for Leave to  
7 File an Additional Motion for Summary Judgment.

8 2. On September 15, 2025, my colleague contacted counsel for Plaintiff Realtek  
9 Semiconductor Corp. ("Realtek"), on behalf of all Defendants to request consent to file a stipulation  
10 regarding Defendants' contemplated request for leave to file a summary judgment motion.

11 3. On September 16, 2025, counsel for Realtek indicated that they would oppose and  
12 would not stipulate to Defendants' request for leave.

13  
14 I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that  
15 the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and that this Declaration was executed  
16 on September 17, 2025 at Los Angeles, California.

17  
18 By: /s/ Adam B. Wolfson  
19 Adam B. Wolfson  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28