

1 KEVIN P.B. JOHNSON, SBN 177129  
2 kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com  
3 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP  
4 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
5 Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
6 Telephone: (650) 801-5000

7 SEAN S. PAK, SBN 219032  
8 seanpak@quinnemanuel.com  
9 ADAM B. WOLFSON, SBN 262125  
10 adamwolfson@quinnemanuel.com  
11 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP  
12 50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
13 San Francisco, CA 94111  
14 Telephone: (415) 875-6600

15 KEVIN HARDY (*pro hac vice*)  
16 D.C. Bar No. 473941  
17 kevinhardy@quinnemanuel.com  
18 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP  
19 1300 I Street, N.W., Suite 900  
20 Washington, DC 20005  
21 Telephone: (202) 538-8000

22 *Attorneys for Defendant MediaTek Inc.*

23 [additional counsel listed in signature block]

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

29 REALTEK SEMICONDUCTOR CORP.,  
30 Plaintiff,

31 v.

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

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

36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
**DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
8010  
8011  
8012  
8013  
8014  
8015  
8016  
8017  
8018  
8019  
8020  
8021  
8022  
8023  
8024  
8025  
8026  
8027  
8028  
8029  
8030  
8031  
8032  
8033  
8034  
8035  
8036  
8037  
8038  
8039  
8040  
8041  
8042  
8043  
8044  
8045  
8046  
8047  
8048  
8049  
8050  
8051  
8052  
8053  
8054  
8055  
8056  
8057  
8058  
8059  
8060  
8061  
8062  
8063  
8064  
8065  
8066  
8067  
8068  
8069  
8070  
8071  
8072  
8073  
8074  
8075  
8076  
8077  
8078  
8079  
8080  
8081  
8082  
8083  
8084  
8085  
8086  
8087  
8088  
8089  
8090  
8091  
8092  
8093  
8094  
8095  
8096  
8097  
8098  
8099  
80100  
80101  
80102  
80103  
80104  
80105  
80106  
80107  
80108  
80109  
80110  
80111  
80112  
80113  
80114  
80115  
80116  
80117  
80118  
80119  
80120  
80121  
80122  
80123  
80124  
80125  
80126  
80127  
80128  
80129  
80130  
80131  
80132  
80133  
80134  
80135  
80136  
80137  
80138  
80139  
80140  
80141  
80142  
80143  
80144  
80145  
80146  
80147  
80148  
80149  
80150  
80151  
80152  
80153  
80154  
80155  
80156  
80157  
80158  
80159  
80160  
80161  
80162  
80163  
80164  
80165  
80166  
80167  
80168  
80169  
80170  
80171  
80172  
80173  
80174  
80175  
80176  
80177  
80178  
80179  
80180  
80181  
80182  
80183  
80184  
80185  
80186  
80187  
80188  
80189  
80190  
80191  
80192  
80193  
80194  
80195  
80196  
80197  
80198  
80199  
80200  
80201  
80202  
80203  
80204  
80205  
80206  
80207  
80208  
80209  
80210  
80211  
80212  
80213  
80214  
80215  
80216  
80217  
80218  
80219  
80220  
80221  
80222  
80223  
80224  
80225  
80226  
80227  
80228  
80229  
80230  
80231  
80232  
80233  
80234  
80235  
80236  
80237  
80238  
80239  
80240  
80241  
80242  
80243  
80244  
80245  
80246  
80247  
80248  
80249  
80250  
80251  
80252  
80253  
80254  
80255  
80256  
80257  
80258  
80259  
80260  
80261  
80262  
80263  
80264  
80265  
80266  
80267  
80268  
80269  
80270  
80271  
80272  
80273  
80274  
80275  
80276  
80277  
80278  
80279  
80280  
80281  
80282  
80283  
80284  
80285  
80286  
80287  
80288  
80289  
80290  
80291  
80292  
80293  
80294  
80295  
80296  
80297  
80298  
80299  
80200  
80201  
80202  
80203  
80204  
80205  
80206  
80207  
80208  
80209  
80210  
80211  
80212  
80213  
80214  
80215  
80216  
80217  
80218  
80219  
80220  
80221  
80222  
80223  
80224  
80225  
80226  
80227  
80228  
80229  
80230  
80231  
80232  
80233  
80234  
80235  
80236  
80237  
80238  
80239  
80240  
80241  
80242  
80243  
80244  
80245  
80246  
80247  
80248  
80249  
80250  
80251  
80252  
80253  
80254  
80255  
80256  
80257  
80258  
80259  
80260  
80261  
80262  
80263  
80264  
80265  
80266  
80267  
80268  
80269  
80270  
80271  
80272  
80273  
80274  
80275  
80276  
80277  
80278  
80279  
80280  
80281  
80282  
80283  
80284  
80285  
80286  
80287  
80288  
80289  
80290  
80291  
80292  
80293  
80294  
80295  
80296  
80297  
80298  
80299  
80200  
80201  
80202  
80203  
80204  
80205  
80206  
80207  
80208  
80209  
80210  
80211  
80212  
80213  
80214  
80215  
80216  
80217  
80218  
80219  
80220  
80221  
80222  
80223  
80224  
80225  
80226  
80227  
80228  
80229  
80230  
80231  
80232  
80233  
80234  
80235  
80236  
80237  
80238  
80239  
80240  
80241  
80242  
80243  
80244  
80245  
80246  
80247  
80248  
80249  
80250  
80251  
80252  
80253  
80254  
80255  
80256  
80257  
80258  
80259  
80260  
80261  
80262  
80263  
80264  
80265  
80266  
80267  
80268  
80269  
80270  
80271  
80272  
80273  
80274  
80275  
80276  
80277  
80278  
80279  
80280  
80281  
80282  
80283  
80284  
80285  
80286  
80287  
80288  
80289  
80290  
80291  
80292  
80293  
80294  
80295  
80296  
80297  
80298  
80299  
80200  
80201  
80202  
80203  
80204  
80205  
80206  
80207  
80208  
80209  
80210  
80211  
80212  
80213  
80214  
80215  
80216  
80217  
80218  
80219  
80220  
80221  
80222  
80223  
80224  
80225  
80226  
80227  
80228  
80229  
80230  
80231  
80232  
80233  
80234  
80235  
80236  
80237  
80238  
80239  
80240  
80241  
80242  
80243  
80244  
80245  
80246  
80247  
80248  
80249  
80250  
80251  
80252  
80253  
80254  
80255  
80256  
80257  
80258  
80259  
80260  
80261  
80262  
80263  
80264  
80265  
80266  
80267  
80268  
80269  
80270  
80271  
80272  
80273  
80274  
80275  
80276  
80277  
80278  
80279  
80280  
80281  
80282  
80283  
80284  
80285  
80286  
80287  
80288  
80289  
80290  
80291  
80292  
80293  
80294  
80295  
80296  
80297  
80298  
80299  
80200  
80201  
80202  
80203  
80204  
80205  
80206  
80207  
80208  
80209  
80210  
80211  
80212  
80213  
80214  
80215  
80216  
80217  
80218  
80219  
80220  
80221  
80222  
80223  
80224  
80225  
80226  
80227  
80228  
80229  
80230  
80231  
80232  
80233  
80234  
80235  
80236  
80237  
80238  
80239  
80240  
80241  
80242  
80243  
80244  
80245  
80246  
80247  
80248  
80249  
80250  
80251  
80252  
80253  
80254  
80255  
80256  
80257  
80258  
80259  
80260  
80261  
80262  
80263  
80264  
80265  
80266  
80267  
80268  
80269  
80270  
80271  
80272  
80273  
80274  
80275  
80276  
80277  
80278  
80279  
80280  
80281  
80282  
80283  
80284  
80285  
80286  
80287  
80288  
80289  
80290  
80291  
80292  
80293  
80294  
80295  
80296  
80297  
80298  
80299  
80200  
80201  
80202  
80203  
80204  
80205  
80206  
80207  
80208  
80209  
80210  
80211  
80212  
80213  
80214  
80215  
80216  
80217  
80218  
80219  
80220  
80221  
80222  
80223  
80224  
80225  
80226  
80227  
80228  
80229  
80230  
80231  
80232  
80233  
80234  
80235  
80236  
80237  
80238  
80239  
80240  
80241  
80242  
80243  
80244  
80245  
80246  
80247  
80248  
80249  
80250  
80251  
80252  
80253  
80254  
80255  
80256  
80257  
80258  
80259  
80260  
80261  
80262  
80263  
80264  
80265  
80266  
80267  
80268  
80269  
80270  
80271  
80272  
80273  
80274  
80275  
80276  
80277  
80278  
80279  
80280  
80281  
80282  
80283  
80284  
80285  
80286  
80287  
80288  
80289  
80290  
80291  
80292  
80293  
80294  
80295  
80296  
80297  
80298  
80299  
80200  
80201  
80202  
80203  
80204  
80205  
80206  
80207  
80208  
80209  
80210  
80211  
80212  
80213  
80214  
80215  
80216  
80217  
80218  
80219  
80220  
80221  
80222  
80223  
80224  
80225  
80226  
80227  
80228  
80229  
80230  
80231  
80232  
80233  
80234  
80235  
80236  
80237  
80238  
80239  
80240  
80241  
80242  
80243  
80244  
80245  
80246  
80247  
80248  
80249  
80250  
80251  
80252  
80253  
80254  
80255  
80256  
80257  
80258  
80259  
80260  
80261  
80262  
80263  
80264  
80265  
80266  
80267  
80268  
80269  
80270  
80271  
80272  
80273  
80274  
80275  
80276  
80277  
80278  
80279  
80280  
80281  
80282  
80283  
80284  
80285  
80286  
80287  
80288  
80289  
80290  
80291  
80292  
80293  
80294  
80295  
80296  
80297  
80298  
80299  
80200  
80201  
80202  
80203  
80204  
80205  
80206  
80207  
80208  
80209  
80210  
80211  
80212  
80213  
80214  
80215  
80216  
80217  
80218  
80219  
80220  
80221  
80222  
80223  
80224  
80225  
80226  
80227  
80228  
80229  
80230  
80231  
80232  
80233  
80234  
80235  
80236  
80237  
80238  
80239  
80240  
80241  
80242  
80243  
80244  
80245  
80246  
80247  
80248  
80249  
80250  
80251  
80252  
80253  
80254  
80255  
80256  
80257  
80258  
80259  
80260  
80261  
80262  
80263  
80264  
80265  
80266  
80267  
80268  
8

1 **TO ALL PARTIES AND TO THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on Thursday, December 4, 2025 at 10:00 a.m., or as soon  
3 as the matter may be heard, before the Honorable P. Casey Pitts of the United States District Court,  
4 Northern District of California at Courtroom 8 – 4th Floor, 280 South 1st Street, San Jose,  
5 California, Defendants MediaTek Inc.; IPValue Management, Inc.; and Future Link Systems, LLC  
6 (“Defendants”) will and hereby do move this Court for summary judgment, pursuant to this Court’s  
7 order granting leave to file a summary judgment motion to address the preclusive effects of two  
8 recent Federal Circuit opinions. Dkt. 273. Defendants’ motion is based upon this notice of motion,  
9 the supporting memorandum of points and authorities, the concurrently filed Declaration of Adam  
10 B. Wolfson, Exhibits A–W attached thereto, and any such evidence or argument as may be requested  
11 or permitted by the Court.

12

13 Dated: October 23, 2025 By: /s/ Adam B. Wolfson  
14 KEVIN P.B. JOHNSON, SBN 177129  
kevinjohnson@quinnmanuel.com  
15 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP  
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
16 Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Telephone: (650) 801-5000

17

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

22

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

26

27 *Attorneys for Defendant MediaTek Inc.*

28

1 **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION.....	1
BACKGROUND.....	1
A.    The Texas Court Held That FLS 1 Was Not Objectively Baseless .....	1
B.    The Texas Court Held That FLS 2 Was “Not Objectively Unreasonable”.....	2
C.    The ITC Held That Allegations Identical To FLS 2 Had Sufficient Evidence .....	2
D.    The Federal Circuit Opinions .....	2
E.    The Patents Were Licensed for a Substantial Sum by Realtek’s Supplier.....	3
LEGAL STANDARD .....	3
ARGUMENT .....	3
I.    REALTEK IS COLLATERALLY ESTOPPED FROM ARGUING THAT FLS 1 AND FLS 2 WERE OBJECTIVELY BASELESS.....	3
A.    The Elements of Collateral Estoppel Apply to The Ruling in FLS 1.....	4
B.    The Elements of Collateral Estoppel Apply to The Ruling in FLS 2.....	5
II.    COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL RESOLVES ALL BUT A SINGLE REMAINING COUNT OF THE AMENDED COMPLAINT .....	7
III.    REALTEK’S LIKELY COUNTERARGUMENTS FAIL .....	8
A.    Both Fairness and Efficiency Weigh in Favor of Collateral Estoppel .....	8
B.    Realtek’s Supposed Distinctions Between Objective Baselessness Tests Fail .....	10
C.    Preclusion Prevents Realtek From Seeking More Discovery to Relitigate.....	11
CONCLUSION .....	12

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Page

Cases

2	<i>20th Century Ins. Co. v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co.,</i>	
5	965 F.2d 747 (9th Cir. 1992).....	3
6	<i>Antonious v. Spalding &amp; Evenflo Cos.,</i>	
7	275 F.3d 1066 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	4, 5, 11
8	<i>Blonder-Tongue Labs., Inc. v. Univ. of Ill. Found.,</i>	
9	402 U.S. 313 (1971) .....	9
10	<i>Bryant v. Mil. Dep't of Miss.,</i>	
11	597 F.3d 678 (5th Cir. 2010).....	6
12	<i>Christian v. Mattel Inc.,</i>	
13	286 F.3d 1118 (9th Cir. 2002).....	11
14	<i>Granite Rock Co. v. Int'l Broth. Of Teamsters, Freight, Constr., Gen. Drivers, Warehousemen &amp; Helpers, Local 287 (AFL-CIO),</i>	
15	649 F.3d 1067 (9th Cir. 2011).....	8
16	<i>Howard v. City of Coos Bay,</i>	
17	871 F.3d 1032 (9th Cir. 2017).....	4
18	<i>Kamilche Co. v. United States,</i>	
19	53 F.3d 1059 (9th Cir. 1995).....	8, 11
20	<i>Liberty Lake Invs., Inc. v. Magnuson,</i>	
21	12 F.3d 155 (9th Cir. 1993).....	3
22	<i>Magnetar Technologies Corp. v. Intamin, Ltd.,</i>	
23	2008 WL 11338443 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 11, 2008).....	11
24	<i>Pacific Gas and Electric Co. v. Bear Stearns &amp; Co.,</i>	
25	50 Cal. 3d 1118 (1990).....	7
26	<i>Parklane Hosiery Co. v. Shore,</i>	
27	439 U.S. 322 (1979) .....	8, 9
28	<i>Prof'l Real Estate Invs., Inc. v. Columbia Pictures Indus.,</i>	
2	508 U.S. 49 (1993) .....	4, 5, 11
3	<i>Q-Pharma, Inc. v. Andrew Jergens Co.,</i>	
4	360 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	5, 11

1	<i>Snoqualmie Indian Tribe v. Washington</i> , 8 F.4th 853 (9th Cir. 2021).....	3, 8
2		
3	<i>Tyco Healthcare Grp. LP v. Mut. Pharm. Co.</i> , 762 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	10
4		
5	<i>United States v. Mendoza</i> , 464 U.S. 154 (1984) .....	9
6		
7	<i>United States v. Real Prop. Located at 475 Martin Lane</i> , 545 F.3d 1134 (9th Cir. 2008).....	9
8		

#### Rules & Statutes

9	28 U.S.C. § 1927 .....	2, 5, 6
10	Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 .....	1, 4, 5, 10, 11
11	Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(d).....	11
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 INDEX OF EXHIBITS  
2

3 Exhibit	4 Description
5 A	6 First Amended Complaint, <i>Future Link Systems, LLC v. Realtek Semiconductor Corp.</i> , No. 21-cv-363 (W.D. Tex. July 15, 2021) ("FLS 1")
7 B	8 Realtek Semiconductor Corp.'s Motion for Sanctions Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 dated Oct. 26, 2021 (FLS 1)
9 C	10 Sealed Omnibus Order and Memorandum Opinion dated Sept. 12, 2022 (joint FLS 1 and FLS 2)
11 D	12 Realtek Semiconductor Corp.'s Motion for Reconsideration of Order Denying Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs dated Oct. 11, 2022 (FLS 1)
13 E	14 Complaint, <i>Future Link Systems, LLC v. Realtek Semiconductor Corp.</i> , No. 21-cv-1353 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 22, 2021) ("FLS 2")
15 F	16 Realtek Semiconductor Corp.'s Motion for Attorneys' Fees dated April 18, 2022 (FLS 2)
17 G	18 Letter from Future Link Systems, LLC to International Trade Commission enclosing Complaint <i>In the Matter of Certain Integrated Circuit Products and Devices Containing the Same</i> (No. 337-TA-1295) dated Dec. 29, 2021 ("ITC Action")
19 H	20 Exhibit 28 to ITC Action Complaint ('439 patent infringement claim chart)
21 I	22 Exhibit 40 to ITC Action Complaint ('614 patent infringement claim chart)
23 J	24 Exhibit 2 to FLS 2 Complaint ('439 patent infringement claim chart)
25 K	26 Exhibit 4 to FLS 2 Complaint ('614 patent infringement claim chart)
27 L	28 Order No. 11: Denying Respondent Realtek Semiconductor Corp.'s Motion for Sanctions dated April 12, 2022 (ITC Action)
M	<i>Future Link Systems, LLC v. Realtek Semiconductor Corp.</i> , 2025 WL 2599581 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 9, 2025)
N	<i>Realtek Semiconductor Corp. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 140 F.4th 1375 (Fed. Cir. June 18, 2025)
O	Corrected Opening Brief for Defendant-Appellant Realtek Semiconductor Corp. dated Feb. 12, 2024 ( <i>Future Link Systems, LLC v. Realtek Semiconductor Corp.</i> , Fed. Cir. Appeal Nos. 23-1056, 23-1057)
P	Realtek Semiconductor Corp.'s Reply in Support of its Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs dated May 9, 2022 (FLS 1)
Q	Future Link System's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs dated May 2, 2022 (FLS 1)
R	Future Link System's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Attorneys' Fees dated May 2, 2022 (FLS 2)

1	S	Decision Granting Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review dated January 7, 2022 ( <i>Realtek Semiconductor Corp., v. Future Link Systems, LLC</i> , Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board, IPR2021-01182)
2	T	Patent Owner's Response dated May 2, 2022 ( <i>Realtek Semiconductor Corp., v. Future Link Systems, LLC</i> , Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board, IPR2021-01182)
3	U	Patent Owner's Sur-Reply dated Sept. 6, 2022 ( <i>Realtek Semiconductor Corp., v. Future Link Systems, LLC</i> , Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board, IPR2021-01182)
4	V	Decision Denying Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review dated Sept. 14, 2022 ( <i>Realtek Semiconductor Corp., v. Future Link Systems, LLC</i> , Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board, IPR2022-00688)
5	W	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response dated Sept. 22, 2022 ( <i>Realtek Semiconductor Corp., v. Future Link Systems, LLC</i> , Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board, IPR2022-01071)
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

## **INTRODUCTION**

The gravamen of Realtek’s case is that the two patent infringement lawsuits filed in the Western District of Texas by Future Link against Realtek were sham litigations, allegedly rendering them independently actionable along with any statements about them. No matter the specific theory of which act harmed Realtek (the litigations or the statements about them), Realtek must show that each of those cases was objectively baseless in order for its liability theories to survive. Although the Court found Realtek plausibly alleged baselessness under the deferential motion to dismiss standard, subsequent binding developments make clear that Realtek’s sham theory cannot proceed. The Texas Court held that neither of Future Link’s two patent cases (FLS 1 and FLS 2) was objectively baseless, and the Federal Circuit has affirmed the Texas Court’s judgment. Moreover, a final order from an ITC ALJ examined allegations identical to those in the second Texas complaint and also concluded that the allegations were not objectively baseless. Because other courts have already considered and conclusively rejected the same objective baselessness claims that Realtek makes here, the doctrine of collateral estoppel precludes Realtek from relitigating those final, binding decisions again—indeed, the doctrine’s entire purpose is to prevent such inefficient and repetitive litigation. Summary judgment should be entered dismissing all of Realtek’s claims that depend on its estopped objective baselessness arguments (Counts II, III, V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX).

## **BACKGROUND**

## A. The Texas Court Held That FLS 1 Was Not Objectively Baseless

20 Future Link sued Realtek in the Western District of Texas, asserting infringement of the U.S.  
21 Patent No. 7,917,680 (“FLS 1”). Ex. A. In November 2021, Realtek filed a motion for sanctions  
22 under Rule 11, extensively arguing that a reasonable pre-suit investigation would have revealed that  
23 “the entire [FLS 1] suit is ‘objectively baseless.’” Ex. B at 8–20. The Texas Court rejected Realtek’s  
24 motion, finding that the allegations in FLS 1 were “plausible and ***not objectively unreasonable***  
25 ***infringement allegations.***” Ex. C at 17 (emphasis added); *see also id.* at 12 (“FLS did not choose to  
26 file a frivolous case”). Realtek acknowledged the Texas Court’s holding in a reconsideration motion.  
27 Ex. D at 7 (conceding the holding, but arguing it was irrelevant).

1           **B. The Texas Court Held That FLS 2 Was “Not Objectively Unreasonable”**

2           Future Link filed a second complaint against Realtek in the Western District of Texas,  
 3 asserting infringement of U.S. Patents Nos. 8,099,614 and 7,685,439 (“FLS 2”). Ex. E. In April  
 4 2022, Realtek sought attorneys’ fees under 28 U.S.C. § 1927 and the Court’s inherent power,  
 5 arguing, *inter alia*, that Future Link asserted “baseless patent infringement claims.” Ex. F at 2; *see*  
 6 *also id.* at 4 (“FLS also asserted meritless claims in this litigation”). The Texas Court denied  
 7 Realtek’s motion, holding that Future Link had asserted “plausible and not objectively unreasonable  
 8 infringement allegations” that were *not* “meritless.” Ex. C at 16–18 (noting that the reasoning for  
 9 denying Realtek’s motion was the same as in FLS 1).

10           **C. The ITC Held That Allegations Identical To FLS 2 Had Sufficient Evidence**

11           Shortly after filing FLS 2, Future Link separately filed a complaint against Realtek in the  
 12 International Trade Commission (“ITC Action”), relying on the same allegations and claim charts  
 13 as in FLS 2. Ex. G. *Compare* Exs. H, I (claims charts from ITC Action) *with* Exs. J, K (identical  
 14 claim charts from FLS 2). Realtek sought sanctions, arguing that the ITC complaint was objectively  
 15 baseless, but the ALJ rejected Realtek’s argument, noting the “Commission reviewed Future Link’s  
 16 proposed Complaint and supporting materials, and found them sufficient to initiate the  
 17 investigation.” Ex. L at 1. The ALJ ruled that “it is not clear that the Complaint is defective at all or  
 18 that Future Link violated any pre-filing investigative duties,” and that “the claim charts at issue  
 19 appear to be adequate to the circumstances,” holding that “Realtek’s assertions of ‘no evidentiary  
 20 support’ are exaggerated.” *Id.* at 2. The full Commission declined to review the ALJ’s Order.

21           **D. The Federal Circuit Opinions**

22           Realtek sought Federal Circuit review of the Texas Court’s holdings and the ITC Order. The  
 23 Federal Circuit affirmed the Texas Court’s holdings that FLS 1 and 2 were objectively reasonable.  
 24 With respect to FLS 1, the Circuit found that “the district court did not abuse its discretion in  
 25 concluding that *Future Link’s claim of infringement was supported by a sufficient factual basis.*”  
 26 Ex. M at \*4–5 (citing Future Link’s claim charts, extensive cited evidence, and study of exemplar  
 27 accused products) (emphasis added). With respect to FLS 2, the Federal Circuit upheld the Texas  
 28

1 Court's finding that the litigation was not "meritless." *Id.* at \*12. In a separate appeal, the Circuit  
 2 rejected Realtek's appeal of the ITC ruling on jurisdictional grounds. Ex. N at 1379–81.

3 **E. The Patents Were Licensed for a Substantial Sum by Realtek's Supplier**

4 FLS 1, FLS 2, and the ITC Action were dismissed pursuant to a settlement and license  
 5 agreement whereby Realtek's supplier of the accused products received a license to the '680, '614,  
 6 and '439 patents (and others) for a substantial sum. *See* Dkt. 140-15.

7 **LEGAL STANDARD**

8 Summary judgment is proper where "the pleadings and discovery, read in the light most  
 9 favorable to the nonmoving party, demonstrate that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact,"  
 10 and the "moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." *20th Century Ins. Co. v. Liberty*  
 11 *Mut. Ins. Co.*, 965 F.2d 747, 750 (9th Cir. 1992). Collateral estoppel, also referred to as issue  
 12 preclusion, bars the relitigation of issues where (1) the same issue was at stake in both proceedings,  
 13 (2) the issue was litigated and decided, (3) there was a full opportunity to litigate the issue, and  
 14 (4) the merits of the issue were necessarily decided. *See Snoqualmie Indian Tribe v. Washington*, 8  
 15 F.4th 853, 863–64 (9th Cir. 2021).

16 **ARGUMENT**

17 In final rulings, the Texas Court held that Future Link's allegations in FLS 1 and FLS 2 were  
 18 not objectively baseless. All but a single count of Realtek's Amended Complaint requires Realtek  
 19 to establish the sham litigation exception to *Noerr-Pennington* immunity, which requires Realtek to  
 20 show, *inter alia*, that FLS 1 and 2 were objectively baseless. *See Liberty Lake Invs., Inc. v.*  
 21 *Magnuson*, 12 F.3d 155, 157–59 (9th Cir. 1993); Dkt. 217 at 8. As a matter of law, Realtek is now  
 22 collaterally estopped from arguing that FLS 1 and FLS 2 were objectively baseless, and summary  
 23 judgment as to all but Count X of the Amended Complaint is therefore appropriate.

24 **I. REALTEK IS COLLATERALLY ESTOPPED FROM ARGUING THAT FLS 1 AND  
 25 FLS 2 WERE OBJECTIVELY BASELESS**

26 Collateral estoppel "bars the relitigation of issues actually adjudicated in previous litigation."  
 27 *Snoqualmie*, 8 F.4th at 864. Relitigating the alleged objective baselessness of FLS 1 and 2 is  
 28 precisely what Realtek seeks to do here. After *repeatedly* losing its objective baselessness arguments

1 in FLS 1 and 2, as well as the ITC Action, Realtek asks this Court to permit a collateral attack on  
 2 the same issue. Under the doctrine of collateral estoppel, Realtek’s sham litigation claims must be  
 3 summarily rejected.

4       A.     The Elements of Collateral Estoppel Apply to The Ruling in FLS 1

5           1.     *Objective Baselessness was the “Same Issue” in FLS 1*

6       To determine whether an issue is “the same,” the most important factor considered by courts  
 7 in the Ninth Circuit is whether the argument in the previous proceeding substantially overlaps the  
 8 argument in the instant proceeding. *Howard v. City of Coos Bay*, 871 F.3d 1032, 1041–44 (9th Cir.  
 9 2017). Other factors, such as whether the same law applies, whether participation in the first action  
 10 could reasonably embrace the second, and how closely related the claims in the two proceedings  
 11 are, can be considered but are less important. *Id.* at 1044.

12       Realtek’s contention in FLS 1 is identical to its objective baselessness contention here. To  
 13 prevail on its sham litigation theory here, Realtek must show that “no reasonable litigant could  
 14 realistically expect success on the merits.” Dkt. 217 at 8 (citing *Prof'l Real Estate Invs., Inc. v.*  
 15 *Columbia Pictures Indus.*, 508 U.S. 49, 60 (1993) (“PRE”)). Realtek already argued this to the Texas  
 16 Court. *See* Ex. C at 5, 8–10 (summarizing Realtek’s argument that the allegations were “objectively  
 17 baseless”). The Texas Court rejected Realtek’s argument by finding that the allegations were  
 18 “plausible and **not objectively unreasonable**.” *Id.* at 17 (emphasis added); *see also id.* at 12 (“FLS  
 19 did not choose to file a frivolous case”). The Federal Circuit not only affirmed the Texas Court’s  
 20 ruling, but relied on the substantial evidence cited in the FLS 1 complaint to hold “the district court  
 21 did not abuse its discretion in concluding that **Future Link’s claim of infringement was supported**  
 22 **by sufficient factual basis.**” Ex. M at \*5 (emphasis added).

23       The other factors also demonstrate that the “same issue” is at play. The same objective  
 24 unreasonableness standard applies. *See Antonious v. Spalding & Evenflo Cos.*, 275 F.3d 1066, 1073–  
 25 74 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (in the Fifth Circuit where FLS 1 is pending, Rule 11 requires a showing that  
 26 “an objectively reasonable attorney would not believe, based on some actual evidence uncovered  
 27 during the prefilings investigation, that each claim limitation reads on the accused device”); *PRE*,  
 28 508 U.S. at 60 (reciting a similar objective baselessness standard as a factor for the sham litigation

1 exception to *Noerr-Pennington* immunity). Indeed, the overlap of the objective prongs of Rule 11  
 2 and the sham litigation exception is often invoked by courts. *E.g.*, *PRE*, 508 U.S. at 65; *see also Q-*  
 3 *Pharma, Inc. v. Andrew Jergens Co.*, 360 F.3d 1295, 1305 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (holding that case was  
 4 not objectively baseless when rejecting a sham litigation component of an antitrust counterclaim).  
 5 In addition, FLS 1 and the sham litigation exception are based on the same nucleus of facts  
 6 (sufficiency of the same complaint and claim chart), have similar parties (Realtek and Future Link),  
 7 and even Realtek’s counsel is substantially the same.

8           2.     *Realtek “Actually Litigated” Baselessness in FLS 1*

9           It is undisputed Realtek “actually litigated” objective baselessness in FLS 1 because it **told**  
 10 **the Federal Circuit so.** *See* Ex. O at n.1, 12, 14, 23–24; *see also* Ex. C at 5, 12, 17.

11           3.     *Realtek Had a Full and Fair Opportunity to be Heard*

12           Realtek had a full and fair opportunity to be heard because it fully briefed its arguments to  
 13 both the Texas Court and the Federal Circuit. *See* Ex. C; Ex. M. Additionally, Realtek’s counsel  
 14 here is substantially similar to the counsel that represented it in FLS 1.

15           4.     *Baselessness / Reasonableness Was Necessary to Final Judgment*

16           The Texas Court’s determinations that FLS 1 was not objectively baseless was a necessary  
 17 finding in denying Realtek’s Rule 11 motion. *See* Ex. C at 6 (describing Fifth Circuit’s standard for  
 18 Rule 11 as “an objective, not subjective standard”); *Antonious*, 275 F.3d at 1073–74.

19           Because the conditions for collateral estoppel are met, Realtek cannot collaterally attack the  
 20 Texas Court’s finding that Future Link’s allegations in FLS 1 were not objectively baseless. Thus,  
 21 all of Realtek’s current claims based on FLS 1’s objective baselessness necessarily fail.

22           B.     **The Elements of Collateral Estoppel Apply to The Ruling in FLS 2**

23           1.     *Objective Baselessness was the “Same Issue” in FLS 2*

24           Like in FLS 1, the relevant factors demonstrate that “same issue” of objective baselessness  
 25 was addressed by the Texas Court in FLS 2. Realtek sought fees under 28 U.S.C. § 1927 and, like  
 26 here, argued that the allegations in FLS 2 were “baseless” and “meritless claims.” Ex. F at 2, 4. The  
 27 Texas Court rejected Realtek’s argument, and instead found that Future Link had asserted “plausible  
 28 and not objectively unreasonable infringement allegations” that were **not** “meritless.” Ex. C at 16–

1 18 (the Texas Court referred to its reasoning for the FLS 1 case as well). The Federal Circuit agreed.  
 2 Ex. M at \*5. The law for § 1927 is substantially similar to the objective baselessness standard here.  
 3 *See Bryant v. Mil. Dep’t of Miss.*, 597 F.3d 678, 694 (5th Cir. 2010). The same nucleus of facts and  
 4 similar parties are at play here.

5 Further supporting the “same issue” condition is the ALJ’s findings in the ITC Action. The  
 6 infringement allegations in the ITC Action were identical. *Compare* Exs. H, I (claims charts from  
 7 ITC Action) *with* Exs. J, K (identical claim charts from FLS 2). After reviewing the same claim  
 8 charts that the Texas Court found “not objectively unreasonable,” the ALJ noted that the ITC had  
 9 already found the infringement allegations to be sufficiently supported to institute an investigation,  
 10 and confirmed that “Realtek’s assertions of ‘no evidentiary support’ are exaggerated.” Ex. L at 2.

11 Because Realtek has tried and failed (multiple times) to argue that Future Link’s FLS 2  
 12 allegations are objectively baseless, the “same issue” element of collateral estoppel is satisfied.

13 2. *Realtek “Actually Litigated” Baselessness in FLS 2*

14 As described in the previous section, Realtek previously argued to the Texas Court that FLS  
 15 2 was “baseless,” and the Texas Court instead found that the allegations were “not objectively  
 16 unreasonable.” Ex. F at 2, 4; Ex. C at 16–18. Realtek also briefed its argument to the ALJ in the ITC  
 17 Action. Ex. L at 2. Thus, the issue was “actually litigated” in multiple forums.

18 3. *Realtek Had a Full and Fair Opportunity to be Heard*

19 Realtek had a full and fair opportunity to be heard because it fully briefed its arguments to  
 20 both the Texas Court, ITC ALJ, and the Federal Circuit. *See* Exs. C, L, N, M. Additionally, its  
 21 counsel here is substantially similar to its counsel in FLS 2.

22 4. *Baselessness / Reasonableness Was Necessary to Final Judgment*

23 In order to deny Realtek’s sanctions motion in FLS 2, the Texas Court had to address  
 24 Realtek’s arguments that the allegations were “baseless” and “meritless.” It did so by finding that  
 25 the allegations were “plausible,” “not objectively unreasonable,” and not “meritless.” Ex. C at 16–  
 26 18. The Federal Circuit upheld the Texas Court’s findings, confirming that the Texas Court applied  
 27 the correct law when it found that Realtek had not shown that Future Link’s allegations in FLS 2  
 28 were meritless. Ex. M at 5. Because the Texas Court’s finding that the litigation was not meritless

1 was based on its holding that the allegations were not objectively baseless, the “no objective  
 2 baselessness” finding was necessary to the final judgment. Additionally, the finding of no objective  
 3 baselessness was necessary to the final judgment of the ITC, as discussed above.

4 All of the conditions for collateral estoppel are met, which means that Realtek cannot  
 5 collaterally attack the Texas Court’s (and ITC’s) finding that Future Link’s allegations in FLS 2  
 6 were not objectively baseless. As a result, all of Realtek’s current claims based on FLS 2 purportedly  
 7 being a sham must fail.

8 **II. COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL RESOLVES ALL BUT A SINGLE REMAINING  
 COUNT OF THE AMENDED COMPLAINT**

9 All but a single count of the Amended Complaint depend on Realtek being able to prove that  
 10 FLS 1 and 2 were objectively baseless. Counts II, III, V, and VI are antitrust claims asserting that  
 11 FLS 1 and FLS 2 are exempted from *Noerr-Pennington* immunity because they are purportedly  
 12 sham litigations. Dkt. 217 at 10–18 (the Court finding Realtek had plausibly pled the sham litigation  
 13 exception); *see also* Dkt. 130 at ¶¶ 280, 287, 302, 308 (Realtek’s Amended Complaint). Realtek’s  
 14 UCL claim (Count VII) and its Lanham Act claim (Count IX) depend on Realtek proving its sham  
 15 litigation allegations. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 130 at 26 (“Because Realtek has adequately pleaded that both  
 16 MediaTek and the PAE defendants violated federal law . . . , Realtek’s complaint states a valid UCL  
 17 claim”), 25 (“As to this limited statement about the alleged sham litigation, Realtek pleads a Lanham  
 18 Act claim sufficient to survive a motion to dismiss”); *see also Pacific Gas and Electric Co. v. Bear  
 19 Stearns & Co.*, 50 Cal. 3d 1118, 1137 (1990) (a plaintiff “seeking to state a claim for intentional  
 20 interference with contract or prospective economic advantage because defendant induced another to  
 21 undertake litigation, must allege that the litigation was [*inter alia*] **brought without probable  
 22 cause...**” (emphasis added)). Finally, Realtek’s tortious interference claim against MediaTek  
 23 (Count VIII) depends on Realtek being able to prove that FLS 1 and 2 were brought “without  
 24 probable cause.” Dkt. 130 at 27.<sup>1</sup> If the Court finds (as it should) that collateral estoppel applies,  
 25  
 26

27 <sup>1</sup> In its Motion for Leave, MediaTek assumed that Count VIII was not subject to collateral  
 28 baselessness. Upon further analysis, MediaTek recognized that collateral estoppel swept more broadly  
 than previously perceived.

1 preventing Realtek from making its already-rejected objective baselessness arguments, Realtek  
 2 would be estopped from proving a necessary element of Counts II, III, V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX, and  
 3 summary judgment dismissing each Count must be entered.

4 **III. REALTEK'S LIKELY COUNTERARGUMENTS FAIL**

5 None of the arguments Realtek has indicated it may present in opposition to summary  
 6 judgment has merit. Realtek's primary argument in its Amended Complaint and the motion to  
 7 dismiss briefing was that it intends to raise different facts (purported misrepresentation of the RPX  
 8 agreement, and later invalidity rulings by the PTAB) in support of its objective baselessness  
 9 argument. Realtek's strategy is squarely contrary to the purpose of collateral estoppel, which serves  
 10 to prevent a party from seeking a "second bite at the apple" by trying its luck with different  
 11 arguments to a different judge. *See, e.g., Parklane Hosiery Co. v. Shore*, 439 U.S. 322, 326–27  
 12 (1979); *Snoqualmie*, 8 F.4th at 864. Collateral estoppel applies to a legal determination irrespective  
 13 of "the particular arguments raised in support of it in the first case." *Kamilche Co. v. United States*,  
 14 53 F.3d 1059, 1063 (9th Cir. 1995). Realtek had every incentive and opportunity to make its best  
 15 arguments to the Texas Court, the ITC ALJ, and the Federal Circuit. Collateral estoppel doctrine is  
 16 expressly designed to prevent Realtek from relitigating a settled issue, even if Realtek can point to  
 17 evidence it did not raise previously.<sup>2</sup>

18 **A. Both Fairness and Efficiency Weigh in Favor of Collateral Estoppel**

19 Realtek may also argue that the application of collateral estoppel here is unfair. Dkt. 271 at  
 20 4–5 (citing *Parklane*, 439 U.S. at 330–31 & n.15). *Parklane* addresses concerns that may arise in  
 21 instances of *offensive* collateral estoppel where a "plaintiff is seeking to estop a defendant from  
 22 relitigating the issues which the defendant previously litigated and lost against another plaintiff."  
 23 439 U.S. at 329–30. Here, Defendants invoke *defensive* collateral estoppel against Realtek, and the

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
 26 <sup>2</sup> Realtek's previous reliance on *Granite Rock Co. v. Int'l Broth. Of Teamsters, Freight, Constr., Gen. Drivers, Warehousemen & Helpers, Local 287 (AFL-CIO)*, 649 F.3d 1067 (9th Cir. 2011), is also misplaced. There, the Court refused to apply collateral estoppel because the plaintiff  
 27 was not the same as (nor in privity with) either party in the prior proceeding and because the specific  
 28 issue had not been decided on the merits. *Id.* at 1070. Here, Realtek and Future Link were both  
 parties to FLS 1 and 2, and the issue (objective baselessness) was squarely decided by the Texas  
 Court and Federal Circuit.

1 imposition of defensive collateral estoppel is generally encouraged when applicable. *See id.* at 329;  
 2 *see also Blonder-Tongue Labs., Inc. v. Univ. of Ill. Found.*, 402 U.S. 313, 329 (1971) (applying  
 3 defensive collateral estoppel); *United States v. Real Prop. Located at 475 Martin Lane*, 545 F.3d  
 4 1134, 1144 (9th Cir. 2008) (same). Realtek has cited no cases where the unfairness doctrine has  
 5 been applied to defensive collateral estoppel.

6 There is also nothing “unfair” about applying collateral estoppel here in light of the Texas  
 7 Court’s and ITC ALJ’s rulings. *See United States v. Mendoza*, 464 U.S. 154, 159 (1984) (noting  
 8 that once a party has had a “full and fair opportunity to litigate an issue, “there is no sound reason  
 9 for burdening the courts with repetitive litigation.”) Realtek’s motivations have not changed, its  
 10 counsel is substantially the same as in FLS 1 and 2, and the relevant facts have not changed. Realtek  
 11 argues that it is purportedly unfair to apply collateral estoppel here because Realtek “could not test  
 12 FLS’s assertions regarding the RPX agreement because FLS would not provide Realtek or the  
 13 Western District of Texas with a copy of the agreement.” Dkt. 271 at 4–5. Realtek, however, never  
 14 requested a copy of the RPX agreement in FLS 1 or 2, even though it requested other discovery. *See*  
 15 Ex. P at 10. Indeed, Realtek did not address the RPX agreement at all in its briefing to the Texas  
 16 Court or the Federal Circuit. Realtek’s unfairness argument also fails because Future Link did not  
 17 cite the RPX agreement as evidence that its allegations were objectively reasonable. The RPX  
 18 agreement was raised solely in background in responding to some of Realtek’s sanctions motions.  
 19 Ex. Q at 3; Ex. R at 3. The Texas Court’s citation to the RPX agreement was its own finding, and  
 20 only used as a way to confirm that its findings of no objective baselessness were reasonable. Ex. C  
 21 at 12–13. And Future Link’s representations were accurate. Future Link represented to the Texas  
 22 Court that the RPX agreement “include[d] a license to ARM Holdings” and that it included a total  
 23 “license fee well in excess of \$10 million.” Ex. Q at 3; Ex. R at 3. These representations are both  
 24 true, as Realtek knows given that Realtek has had an unredacted copy of the agreement for a long  
 25 time. *See* Dkt. 140-15 (the unredacted RPX agreement).

26 Realtek may also expand its unfairness arguments to the eventual PTAB rulings invalidating  
 27 2 of the 3 patents asserted in FLS 1 and 2. With respect to the ’680 patent from FLS 1, Realtek’s  
 28 IPR against some of the asserted claims was instituted on January 7, 2022 (Ex. S; Realtek’s first

1 '680 IPR petition did not address asserted claims 15 and 20) and Realtek had filed a second petition  
 2 challenging the remaining claims shortly before the case was dismissed. Realtek never raised the  
 3 issue of the patent potentially being invalid in its Rule 11 briefing, its motion to supplement its Rule  
 4 11 briefing (filed after dismissal of the litigation), or its fees and costs briefing (also filed after  
 5 dismissal). Nor would the fact likely have had any impact on the Texas Court's ruling because  
 6 Realtek raised the eventual PTAB invalidity ruling in its appeal briefing (Ex. O at n.2) and it did not  
 7 change the Federal Circuit's affirmation of the Texas Court's findings. Moreover, even after the  
 8 RPX agreement, Future Link vigorously opposed invalidation of the instituted IPR. Exs. T, U. The  
 9 fact that the PTAB ultimately disagreed with Future Link's argument does not matter. *See, e.g.*,  
 10 *Tyco Healthcare Grp. LP v. Mut. Pharm. Co.*, 762 F.3d 1338, 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2014) ("Given the  
 11 presumption of patent validity and the burden on the patent challenger to prove invalidity by clear  
 12 and convincing evidence, it will be a rare case in which a patentee's assertion of its patent in the  
 13 face of a claim of invalidity will be so unreasonable as to support a claim that the patentee has  
 14 engaged in sham litigation."). The second '680 IPR was not instituted because Future Link had  
 15 effectively licensed all likely infringers shortly after the filing of the second '680 IPR petition and  
 16 disclaimed the patent rather than squander the PTAB's and Future Link's resources. *See* Ex. V. In  
 17 FLS 2, Realtek filed its IPR petition challenging one of the two asserted patents (the '614 patent)  
 18 two months *after* FLS 2 had been dismissed. Ex. W at 1. Future Link responded by disclaiming the  
 19 '614 patent because, given that "the vast majority of [likely infringers] are licensed..., Future Link  
 20 does not wish to waste the Board's resources litigating a patent that is already licensed to practically  
 21 the entire industry." *Id.* at 1–2. Realtek has never challenged the validity of the '439 patent asserted  
 22 in FLS 2. Nor did Realtek mention potential invalidity of the FLS 2 patents in its FLS 2 fees motion  
 23 or appeal briefing.

24 **B. Realtek's Supposed Distinctions Between Objective Baselessness Tests Fail**

25 Realtek's claim that compliance with Rule 11 does not automatically defeat a sham litigation  
 26 claim, *see* Dkt. 271 at 3–5, is a straw man. Realtek's previous, rejected arguments demonstrate that  
 27 the sham exception cannot apply in this case because multiple courts have already found that Future  
 28 Link's patent infringement suits were objectively reasonable. In both FLS 1 and FLS 2, Realtek

1 argued that the allegations were objectively baseless, and the Texas Court rejected this claim. There  
 2 is no relevant difference between the meaning of “objectively baseless” used by the Texas Court  
 3 (and ITC ALJ) when rejecting Realtek’s argument and the meaning that applies here. Realtek itself  
 4 conceded the identity between Rule 11 and the sham litigation standard before the Federal Circuit  
 5 when it argued that “an attorney violates Rule 11(b)(3) when an objectively reasonable attorney  
 6 would not believe” in success on the merits. *See* Ex. O at 39, 42 (citing *Antonious*, 275 F.3d at 1073–  
 7 74). *Antonious* confirms that a claim is “frivolous” (and sanctionable) only if it is both objectively  
 8 baseless and not the product of a reasonable investigation. *Id.* That standard aligns with the *PRE* test  
 9 exactly. *See PRE*, 508 U.S. at 65; *Q-Pharma*, 360 F.3d at 1304–05.<sup>3</sup>

10 **C. Preclusion Prevents Realtek From Seeking More Discovery to Relitigate**

11 Finally, Realtek may invoke Rule 56(d) to argue that additional discovery is necessary, such  
 12 as the “details surrounding the RPX agreement, FLS’s dismissal of the patent suit, and other aspects  
 13 of Defendants’ conduct.” *See* Dkt. 271 at 3. Collateral estoppel, however, is a legal inquiry, not a  
 14 factual one. *E.g.*, *Kamilche*, 53 F.3d at 1063. Moreover, the discovery identified by Realtek is not  
 15 relevant to *objective* baselessness. If relevant at all, the discovery would go towards the subjective  
 16 prong of the sham litigation analysis (*i.e.*, whether FLS 1 and 2 were solely brought as a pretense to  
 17 interfere with Realtek’s business opportunities), which is not at issue here. If the underlying suits  
 18 were not objectively baseless, subjective considerations are irrelevant. The Court needs no  
 19 additional discovery to rule on this Motion.

20

21

22

23

24 <sup>3</sup> Realtek has previously cited *Christian v. Mattel Inc.*, 286 F.3d 1118 (9th Cir. 2002), but  
 25 it also offers no support. *Christian* describes that Rule 11 will only be applied if a claim is  
 26 objectively baseless, which aligns with *PRE*’s objective basis prong. *Magnetar Technologies Corp.*  
 27 *v. Intamin, Ltd.*, 2008 WL 11338443 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 11, 2008) likewise does not support Realtek’s  
 28 position. There, at the pleading stage, the court allowed a sham litigation claim to proceed because  
 a prior vacated sanctions order did not expressly rule on the issue of objective baselessness. *Id.* at  
 \*5-7. Here, the Texas Court and Federal Circuit both *expressly* held that FLS 1 and 2 were not  
 objectively baseless.

1 **CONCLUSION**

2 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully request that the Court enter summary  
3 judgment that Realtek is collaterally estopped from arguing that FLS 1 and 2 are objectively  
4 baseless, and dismissing Counts II, III, V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX of the Amended Complaint.

5  
6 Dated: October 23, 2025

7 By: /s/ Adam B. Wolfson

8 KEVIN P.B. JOHNSON, SBN 177129  
9 kevinjohnson@quinnmanuel.com  
10 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP  
11 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
12 Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
13 Telephone: (650) 801-5000

14 SEAN S. PAK, SBN 219032  
15 seanpak@quinnmanuel.com  
16 ADAM B. WOLFSON, SBN 262125  
17 adamwolfson@quinnmanuel.com  
18 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP  
19 50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
20 San Francisco, CA 94111  
21 Telephone: (415) 875-6600

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

26 *Attorneys for Defendant MediaTek Inc.*

27 /s/ Brian D. Ledahl

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

26 Benjamin Hattenbach (SBN 186455)  
27 battenbach@irell.com  
Michael D. Harbour (SBN 298185)  
mharbour@irell.com  
28 Lucas S. Oxenford (SBN 328152)

1 loxenford@irell.com  
2 Skyler Terrebonne (SBN 347604)  
IRELL & MANELLA LLP  
3 1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Telephone: (310) 277-1010  
4

5 A. Matthew Ashley (SBN 198235)  
mashley@irell.com  
IRELL & MANELLA LLP  
6 840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 400  
Newport Beach, CA 92660  
Telephone: (949) 760-0991  
7

8 *Attorneys for Defendants IPValue Management, Inc.*  
*and Future Link Systems, LLC*  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**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 October 23, 2025

/s/ Adam B. Wolfson

Adam B. Wolfson