

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN RE PAPST LICENSING GMBH & CO.  
KG LITIGATION

This Document Relates To:  
**1:08-cv-01407**

Misc. Action No. 07-493 (RMC)  
MDL Docket No. 1880

**PAPST'S REPLY TO COUNTERCLAIMS OF  
DEFENDANT EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY**

Plaintiff Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG ("Papst") replies to the Counterclaims of Defendant Eastman Kodak Company ("Kodak") filed August 18, 2008 [Docket No. 202 in MDL action 07-493] as follows:

**THE PARTIES**

1. Kodak is a New Jersey corporation having its principal place of business at 343 State Street, Rochester, NY 14650.

REPLY: Papst admits that, upon information and belief, Kodak is a New Jersey corporation and maintains its principal place of business at 343 State Street, Rochester, NY 14650.

2. According to paragraph 3 of its Complaint, Papst purports to be a company existing under the laws of The Federal Republic of Germany having its principal place of business at Bahnhofstrasse 33, 78112 St. Georgen, Germany.

REPLY: Admit.

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

3. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over these Counterclaims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, 2201 and 2202.

REPLY: Admit.

4. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Papst by virtue of its having consented to the jurisdiction of this Court by filing its Complaint.

REPLY: Papst filed its Complaint in the United States District Court for the N.D. of Illinois, and on that basis Papst denies the allegations in this paragraph pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 293, because Papst has a designated representative in Chicago. However, Papst admits that this Court has jurisdiction over the parties pursuant to its powers as the MDL court for these proceedings.

5. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391.

REPLY: Papst refers to its answer to Paragraph No. 4 above, but for purposes of this MDL proceeding, admits the allegation in this paragraph.

**COUNTERCLAIM COUNT I  
DECLARATORY JUDGMENT FOR INVALIDITY, ENFORCEABILITY  
AND NON-INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,470,399**

6. Kodak realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 5 of these Counterclaims.

REPLY: Papst incorporates by reference its answer to paragraphs 1 through 5 above as if fully set forth herein.

7. United States Patent No. 6,470,399 (“the ‘399 patent”) is entitled “Flexible Interface For Commission Between A Host And An Analog I/O Device Connected To The Interface Regardless The Type Of The I/O Device” and issued on October 22, 2002. Papst claims that it owns the ‘399 patent.

REPLY: Admit.

8. Papst has asserted that a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery is likely to provide evidentiary support that Kodak has infringed and is infringing the ‘399 patent.

REPLY: Admit.

9. Kodak has not directly infringed, contributorily infringed or induced infringement of and does not directly infringe, contributorily infringe or induce infringement of any claim of the '399 patent.

REPLY: Deny.

10. One or more claims of the '399 patent are invalid for failing to comply with the conditions for patentability set forth in Title 35, United States Code § 101 *et. Seq.*, including, without limitation, §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 112.

REPLY: Deny.

11. Papst contends that the '399 patent is enforceable.

REPLY: Admit.

12. Kodak denies Papst's contention and alleges that the '399 patent is unenforceable by reason of the patent having been procured through inequitable conduct and fraud.

REPLY: Papst admits that Kodak states that it denies Papst's contention and that Kodak alleges that the '399 patent is unenforceable by reason of the patent having been procured through inequitable conduct and fraud, but Papst denies that Kodak has any valid grounds to support such claims.

13. In or about 1996, Michael Tasler, the sole named inventor of the '399 patent, authored a thesis entitled *Design and Construction of a Universal Data Acquisition and Control System for Scanning Probe Microscopy* (the "Thesis"). The Thesis was in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Mr. Tasler's Master of Arts degree at the University of Texas at Austin.

REPLY: Papst Licensing is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these averments in this paragraph.

14. On information and belief, the Thesis was published and made publicly available in or about 1996, before the filing of the application for the '399 patent, and is prior art to the '399 patent. Mr. Tasler, the author of the Thesis, was aware of the publication of the Thesis.

REPLY: Papst states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these averments in this paragraph.

15. The Thesis is material because a reasonable examiner would have considered the information contained in the Thesis important in deciding whether to allow the application to issue into the '399 patent.

REPLY: Deny.

16. The Thesis is directed toward an interface device to interface a scanning electron microscope with a PC using an industry-standard printer port. The Thesis is directed to solving the same problems as the '399 patent, *i.e.*, PCs are not fast enough to handle the large amount of data using a direct connection to the scanning electron microscope, and the printer port provides compatibility with many different hosts because it is standard on most PCs. The Thesis describes "a Universal Data Acquisition and Control System for Scanning Probe Microscopy" that interfaces with a PC through the standard printer port. The Thesis further describes the system as comprising a DSP Motherboard with memory, a first connecting device for interfacing with the PC through the standard printer port, a second connecting device, the TLC320AC01, for interfacing the STM scanner with the DSP Motherboard, where the DSP Motherboard is configured to communicate with the PC via the printer port and includes software that communicates with the PC via the standard printer port.

REPLY: The averments in this paragraph are Kodak's incomplete characterization and interpretation of the document Kodak refers to herein as The Thesis, but insofar as an answer is required, denied.

17. Mr. Tasler and, on information and belief, others substantially involved in the prosecution of the application resulting in the '399 patent were aware or should have been aware of the Thesis and its contents during the time that the application resulting in the '399 patent was pending in the Patent and Trademark Office.

REPLY: Papst states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these averments in this paragraph.

18. During the time that that the application resulting in the '399 patent was pending in the Patent and Trademark Office, the Thesis was never disclosed to the patent examiner.

REPLY: Papst states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these averments in this paragraph.

19. On information and belief, Mr. Tasler and/or others substantially involved in the prosecution of the application resulting in the '399 patent intentionally failed to disclose the Thesis with the intent to deceive or mislead the patent examiner, and/or acted in reckless disregard of their duty to disclose material information.

REPLY: Papst states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these averments in this paragraph.

20. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between the parties hereto regarding the infringement, validity and enforceability of the '399 patent.

REPLY: Admit.

21. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time. Papst's assertion of patent infringement will irreparably injure and will continue to injure Kodak. Kodak has no adequate remedy at law.

REPLY: Deny.

**COUNTERCLAIM COUNT II**  
**DECLARATORY JUDGMENT FOR INVALIDITY, UNENFORCEABILITY**  
**AND NON-INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,895,449**

22. Kodak realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 21 of these Counterclaims.

REPLY: Papst incorporates by reference its answer to paragraphs 1 through 21 above as if fully set forth herein.

23. United States Patent No. 6,895,449 (“the ‘449 patent”) is entitled “Flexible Interface For Communication Between A Host And An Analog I/O Device Connected To The Interface Regardless The Type Of The I/O Device” and issued on May 17, 2005. Papst claims that it owns the ‘449 patent.

REPLY: Admit.

24. Papst has asserted that a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery is likely to provide evidentiary support that Kodak has infringed and is infringing the ‘449 patent.

REPLY: Admit.

25. Kodak has not directly infringed, contributorily infringed or induced infringement of and does not directly infringe, contributorily infringe or induce infringement of any claim of the ‘449 patent.

REPLY: Deny.

26. One or more claims of the ‘449 patent are invalid for failing to comply with the conditions for patentability set forth in Title 35, United States Code § 101 *et. seq.*, including, without limitation, §§ 101, 102, 103 and/or 112.

REPLY: Deny.

27. Papst contends that the ‘449 patent is enforceable.

REPLY: Admit.

28. Kodak denies Papst’s contention and alleges that the ‘449 patent is unenforceable by reason of the patent having been procured through inequitable conduct and fraud.

REPLY: Papst admits that Kodak states that it denies Papst’s contention and that Kodak alleges that the ‘449 patent is unenforceable by reason of the patent having been procured through

inequitable conduct and fraud, but Papst denies that Kodak has any valid grounds to support such claims.

29. In or about 1996, Michael Tasler, the sole named inventor of the ‘449 patent, authored a thesis entitled *Design and Construction of a Universal Data Acquisition and Control System for Scanning Probe Microscopy* (the “Thesis”). The Thesis was in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Mr. Tasler’s Master of Arts degree at the University of Texas at Austin.

REPLY: Papst Licensing is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these averments in this paragraph.

30. On information and belief, the Thesis was published and made publicly available in or about 1996, before the filing of the application for the ‘449 patent, and is prior art to the ‘449 patent. Mr. Tasler, the author of the Thesis, was aware of the publication of the Thesis.

REPLY: Papst states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these averments in this paragraph.

31. The Thesis is material because a reasonable examiner would have considered the information contained in the Thesis important in deciding whether to allow the applications to issue into the ‘399 and ‘449 patents.

REPLY: Deny.

32. The Thesis is directed toward an interface device to interface a scanning electron microscope with a PC using an industry-standard printer port. The Thesis is directed to solving the same problems as the ‘449 patent, *i.e.*, PCs are not fast enough to handle the large amount of data using a direct connection to the scanning electron microscope, and the printer port provides compatibility with many different hosts because it is standard on most PCs. The Thesis describes “a Universal Data Acquisition and Control System for Scanning Probe Microscopy” that interfaces with a PC through the standard printer port. The Thesis further describes the system as comprising a DSP Motherboard with memory, a first connecting device for interfacing with the PC through the standard

printer port, a second connecting device, the TLC320AC01, for interfacing the STM scanner with the DSP Motherboard, where the DSP Motherboard is configured to communicate with the PC via the printer port and includes software that communicates with the PC via the standard printer port.

REPLY: The averments in this paragraph are Kodak's incomplete characterization and interpretation of the document Kodak refers to herein as The Thesis, but insofar as an answer is required, denied.

33. Mr. Tasler and, on information and belief, others substantially involved in the prosecution of the application resulting in the '449 patent were aware or should have been aware of the Thesis and its contents during the time that the application resulting in the '449 patent was pending in the Patent and Trademark Office.

REPLY: Papst states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these averments in this paragraph.

34. During the time that that the application resulting in the '449 patent was pending in the Patent and Trademark Office, the Thesis was never disclosed to the patent examiner.

REPLY: Papst states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of these averments in this paragraph.

35. On information and belief, Mr. Tasler and/or others substantially involved in the prosecution of the application resulting in the '449 patent intentionally failed to disclose the Thesis with the intent to deceive or mislead the patent examiner, and/or acted in reckless disregard of their duty to disclose material information.

REPLY: Papst states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in this paragraph.

36. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between the parties hereto regarding the infringement, validity and enforceability of the '449 patent.

REPLY: Admit.

37. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time. Papst's assertion of patent infringement will irreparably injure and will continue to injure Kodak. Kodak has no adequate remedy at law.

REPLY: Deny.

*Unless specifically admitted above, Papst denies each and every allegation set forth in Kodak's counterclaims and Papst denies that Kodak is entitled to any relief in this action either as requested or otherwise.*

Papst's Defenses

1. The counterclaims fail to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.
2. Kodak does infringe the '399 patent and '499 patents directly and or indirectly.
3. The claims of the '399 patent and the '449 patents are valid and enforceable.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Papst respectfully requests a trial by jury of all issues so triable.

Dated: September 5, 2008

By: S/ Robert F. Muse  
Robert F. Muse (Bar No. 166868)  
STEIN, MITCHELL & MEZINES LLP  
1100 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 737-7777  
(202) 296-8312 (Fax)

James P. White  
Jerold B. Schnayer  
Joseph E. Cwik  
HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS  
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.  
120 South Riverside Plaza, 22nd Floor  
Chicago, IL 60606  
(312) 655-1500  
(312) 655-1501 (fax)  
**Attorneys for Papst Licensing GmbH & Co.  
KG**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing **PAPST'S REPLY TO COUNTERCLAIMS OF DEFENDANT EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY** was served on this the 5<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2008 upon the attorneys for the Camera Manufacturers as follows:

**For The Casio Parties** (via e-mail):

Laura Krawczyk  
Morgan Lewis & Bockius LLP  
101 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10178-0060  
Phone: (212) 309-6000  
Fax: (212) 309-6001  
lkrawczyk@morganlewis.com

J. Kevin Fee  
Morgan Lewis & Bockius LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
jkfee@morganlewis.com

Scott D. Stimpson  
The Law Office of Scott D. Stimpson  
Suite 1102  
445 Hamilton Avenue  
White Plains, NY 10601  
stimpsonlaw@gmail.com

**For The Samsung Parties** (via e-mail):

Patrick J. Kelleher  
Drinker Biddle Gardner Carton  
191 North Wacker Drive, Suite 3700  
Chicago, IL 60606-1698  
Phone: (312) 569-1375  
Fax: (312) 569-3375  
patrick.kelleher@dbr.com

**Camera Manufacturers' Administrative Counsel and**

**For The Fujifilm Parties and**

**For Konica-Minolta Business Solutions U.S.A., Inc.** (via e-mail):

Steven J. Routh  
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP  
1152 15th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: (202) 339-8400  
Fax: (202) 339-8500  
sjrouth@orrick.com

Sten Jensen  
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP  
1152 15th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: (202) 339-8400  
Fax: (202) 339-8500  
sajensen@orrick.com

**For the Olympus Parties** (via e-mail):

Richard deBodo  
Rachel M. Capoccia  
Hogan & Hartson, LLP  
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Phone: (310) 785-4694  
Fax: (310) 785-4601  
rdebodo@hhlaw.com  
rmcapoccia@hhlaw.com

**For The Matsushita and Victory Company of Japan Parties** (via e-mail):

Richard deBodo  
Rachel M. Capoccia  
Hogan & Hartson, LLP  
1999 Avenue of the Stars  
Suite 1400  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Phone: (310) 785-4694  
Fax: (310) 785-4601  
rdebodo@hhlaw.com  
rmcapoccia@hhlaw.com

Adam K. Levin, Esq.  
Hogan & Hartson LLP  
555 13th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
aklevin@hhlaw.com

**For the Ricoh Parties** (via e-mail):

Paul Devinsky  
McDermott Will & Emery LLP  
600 13th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: (202) 756-8369  
Fax: (202) 756-8087  
pdevinsky@mwe.com

Michael Switzer  
McDermott Will & Emery LLP  
227 West Monroe Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-5096  
Phone: (312) 984-3666  
Fax: (312) 984-7700  
mswitzer@mwe.com

Richard L. Horwitz  
Potter Anderson & Corroon, LLP  
1313 North Market Street, 6th Floor  
PO Box 951  
Wilmington, DE 19899  
Phone: (302) 984-6000  
Fax: (302) 658-1192  
rhorwitz@potteranderson.com

**For Hewlett-Packard Company** (via email):

Charlene M. Morrow  
Heather N. Mewes  
Fenwick & West LLP  
555 California Street, Suite 1200  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Phone: (415) 875-2300  
Fax: (415) 281-1350  
cmorrow@fenwick.com  
hmewes@fenwick.com

**For the Nikon Parties** (via e-mail):

David L. Witcoff  
Marc S. Blackman  
Jones Day  
77 West Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60601  
Phone: (312) 782-3939  
Fax: (312) 782-8585  
dlwitcoff@jonesday.com  
msblackman@jonesday.com

**For the Sanyo Parties** (via e-mail):

Breighanne A. Eggert  
Michael A. Dorfman  
Timothy J. Vezeau  
Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP  
525 West Monroe Street  
Chicago, IL 60661  
Phone: (312) 902-5200  
Fax: (312) 902-1061  
breighanne.eggert@kattenlaw.com  
michael.dorfman@kattenlaw.com  
timothy.vezeau@kattenlaw.com

**For Eastman Kodak Company** (via e-mail):

Eric S. Namrow, Esq.  
Jones Day  
51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
esnamrow@jonesday.com

James L. Wamsley, III  
Jones Day  
901 Lakeside Avenue  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
jlwamsleyiii@jonesday.com

Mark Campagna, Esq.  
Jones Day  
1420 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 800  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
mcampagna@jonesday.com

**For the Canon Parties** (via e-mail):

Scott W. Burt, Esq.  
Jones Day  
77 West Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60601  
swburt@jonesday.com

/s/ John L. Ambrogio  
Attorney for Papst Licensing GmbH & Co.  
KG