UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO CINCINNATI DIVISION

LEXMARK INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Plaintiff,

v.

INK TECHNOLOGIES PRINTER SUPPLIES, LLC, ET AL.

Defendants.

Case No. 1:10-CV-564-MRB

JUDGE MICHAEL BARRETT

DEFENDANT IMPRESSION PRODUCTS, INC.'S SECOND MOTION TO DISMISS

Defendant Impression Products, Inc., ("Impression"), by and through counsel,

respectfully moves this Court for an order dismissing the claims against it, pursuant to Rule

12(b)(6) of the FRCP, failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. The reasons for

this Motion are more fully set out in the accompanying Memorandum in Support.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Edward F. O'Connor Edward F. O'Connor ADMITTED PRO HAC VICE THE ECLIPSE GROUP LLP 2020 Main Street, Suite 600 Irvine, California 92614 Phone: (619) 239-4340 Fax: (619) 239-0116 Email: efo@eclipsegrp.com

and

Case: 1:10-cv-00564-MRB Doc #: 395 Filed: 09/16/13 Page: 2 of 9 PAGEID #: 8995

Crystal I. Maluchnik (0077875) George H. Carr (0069372) JANIK L.L.P. 3200 South Hill Blvd., Suite 300 Cleveland, Ohio 44147 440.838.7600 Fax: 440.838.7601 <u>crystal.maluchnik@janiklaw.com</u> george.carr@janiklaw.com

Attorneys for Defendant Impression Products, Inc.

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

Defendant Impression previously filed a motion to dismiss Lexmark's case to the extent that it accuses the sale of remanufactured cartridges, which cartridges were first sold out side of the United States, as infringing cartridges. Lexmark bases its case on the *Jazz Photo* decision of the Federal Circuit, which held that first sale extinguishment of patent rights only applies if the first sale occurs within the United States. That was a decision which was on shaky grounds when it was decided. The recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the *Kirtsaeng v*. *John Wiley and Sons, Inc.,* 133 S. Ct. 1351 (2012), made it very clear that there was no legal basis for continuing to uphold *Jazz Photo*.

In its opposition to that motion to dismiss, Lexmark informed this Court and that it was not only pursuing remanufactured cartridges, which cartridges were initially sold outside of the United States, but that it was also pursuing cartridges under its pre-bate program. Lexmark cited this Court to a decision of the Sixth Circuit, *Static Control Components, Inc. v. Lexmark International, Inc.,* 697 F.3d 387 (6th Cir. 2012), wherein the Sixth Circuit declined to decide the validity of the pre-bate program. The pre-bate program restricts purchasers of its cartridges from buying refurbished or replacement cartridges from anyone but *Lexmark. Quanta v. LG Electronics,* 553 U.S. 617; 125 S. Ct. 2109 (June 2008), prohibits patentees from restricting use of patented products once sold.

Impression, in its reply brief, cited this Court to the initial decision by the District Court in *Static Control Components, Inc. v. Lexmark International, Inc.*, 615 F. Supp. 2d 575, 588 (E.D. KY, March 2009).

The District Court had originally upheld the validity of the pre-bate program, but, after the United States Supreme Court entered its decision in *Quanta*, the Court determined that

3

Case: 1:10-cv-00564-MRB Doc #: 395 Filed: 09/16/13 Page: 4 of 9 PAGEID #: 8997

Quanta effectively established that the pre-bate program was invalid as a matter of patent law. To date, that is the only decision regarding the validity of the pre-bate program, subsequent to the Supreme Court's decision in *Quanta*.

Impression agrees with the decision of the District Court which held that the pre-bate program is invalid in light of *Quanta*. Since Lexmark has specifically raised that issue, in its opposition to Impression's previous motion, it has placed that issue front and center before this Court.

Accordingly, Impression respectfully requests that, in addition to dismissing Lexmark's case regarding remanufactured products first sold outside of the United States, it also dismiss Lexmark's case regarding its pre-bate cartridges.

Finally, as a matter of editorial comment, the illegal Lexmark pre-bate program and the *Jazz Photo* decision have served to undermine the responsible efforts of those who are attempting to recycle cartridges in this industry. As a result of the overreaching by Lexmark in this case, those two issues are ripe for their elimination.

Respectfully submitted,

<u>/s/ Edward F. O'Connor</u> Edward F. O'Connor ADMITTED PRO HAC VICE THE ECLIPSE GROUP LLP 2020 Main Street, Suite 600 Irvine, California 92614 Phone: (619) 239-4340 Fax: (619) 239-0116 Email: <u>efo@eclipsegrp.com</u>

and

4

Case: 1:10-cv-00564-MRB Doc #: 395 Filed: 09/16/13 Page: 5 of 9 PAGEID #: 8998

Crystal I. Maluchnik (0077875) George H. Carr (0069372) JANIK L.L.P. 3200 South Hill Blvd., Suite 300 Cleveland, Ohio 44147 440.838.7600 Fax: 440.838.7601 crystal.maluchnik@janiklaw.com george.carr@janiklaw.com

Attorneys for Defendant Impression Products, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to confirm that a copy of the foregoing was electronically filed on September 16, 2013. A true and accurate copy of the foregoing will be served electronically to designated CM/ECF participant counsel through the Court's electronic filing system, or delivered via U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, as indicated below:

Via ECF Notice:

P. Douglas Barr
Steven B. Loy
Anthony J. Phelps
STOLL KEENON OGDEN PLLC
300 West Vine Street, Suite 2100
Lexington, KY 40507

William J. Hunter, Jr. STOLL KEENON OGDEN PLLC 2000 PNC Plaza 500 West Jefferson Street Louisville, KY 40202

Timothy C. Meece V. Bryan Medlock Jason S. Shull Audra C. Eidem Heinze BANNER & WITCOFF LTD. 10 South Wacker Drive, Suite 3000 Chicago, Illinois 60606

Attorneys for Plaintiff, Lexmark International, Inc.

David G. Kern Roetzel & Andress, LPA 310 Chiquita Center 250 East Fifth Street, Ste. 310 Cincinnati, OH 45202 Attorney for Ninestar Image Co. Ltd., Ninestar Image International, Ltd., Seine Image International Co. Ltd., Ninestar Technology Company, Ltd., Ziprint Image Corporation, Nano Pacific Corporation, IJSS Inc., Direct Billing International, Inc., Quality Cartridges, Inc., ACM Technologies, Inc., Chung Pal Shin and Acecom Inc. — San Antonio

Case: 1:10-cv-00564-MRB Doc #: 395 Filed: 09/16/13 Page: 7 of 9 PAGEID #: 9000

Michael P. Foley RENDIGS, FRY, KIELY & DENNIS, LLP 600 Vine Street, Suite 2650 Cincinnati, OH 45202 Attorney for Copy Technologies, Inc., Jahwa Electronics Co., Ltd., Huizhou Jahwa Electronics Co., Ltd., Laser Toner Technology, Inc., C&R Services, Incorporated, Green Project, Inc., and Wal Group LLC

David A. Shough Law Office of David A. Shough 853 Dayton Oxford Rd. Carlisle, OH 45005-3412 *Attorney for Ink Technologies Printer Supplies, LLC*

Glenn Dean Bellamy Wood, Herron & Evans, LLP 2700 Carew Tower 441 Vine Street Cincinnati, OH 45202-2917 *Attorney for Virtual Imaging Products, Inc. and Blue Trading, LLC*

Gary M. Hnath Mayer Brown LLP 1999 K. Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20006 202-263-3040 202-263-5340 (fax) ghnath@mayerbrown.com *Attorney for Quality Cartridges, Inc.*

Jeffrey C. Lowe Mayer Brown LLP 1999 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006-1101 Attorney for Ninestar Image Co. Ltd., Ninestar Image International, Ltd., Seine Image International Co. Ltd., Ninestar Technology Company, Ltd., Ziprint Image Corporation, Nano Pacific Corporation, IJSS Inc., Direct Billing International, Inc., Quality Cartridges, Inc., ACM Technologies Inc., Chung Pal Shin and Acecom Inc. — San Antonio Wm. T. Robinson III
Frost Brown Todd LLC
2200 PNC Center
201 East Fifth Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202-4182
Attorney for Defendants Print-Rite Holdings Ltd. and Union Technology International (M.C.O.) Co. Ltd.

Jon E. Hokanson Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith, LLP 221 North Figueroa Street, Suite 1200 Los Angeles, CA 90012-2601 213-680-5050 213-250-7900 (fax) hokanson@lbbslaw.com Attorney for Defendant IJSS Inc., d/b/a Tonerzone.com and Inkjetsuperstore.com

Thomas S. Kidde Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith LLP 221 North Figueroa Street, Suite 1200 Los Angeles, CA 90012-2601 Attorney for Defendant IJSS Inc., d/b/a Tonerzone.com and Inkjetsuperstore.com

Stephen Spraul Schmidt Roetzel & Andress, LPA 250 E. Fifth Street Suite 310 Cincinnati, OH 45202 513-361-8298 513-361-0200 (fax) sschmidt@ralaw.com Attorney for IJSS, Inc.

James David Liles Porter Wright Morris & Arthur LLP 250 East Fifth Street Suite 2200 Cincinnati, OH 45202-5118 513-369-4209 513/421-0991 (fax) jliles@porterwright.com Attorney for FBA Holding, Inc. Ian Walsworth SHERIDAN ROSS PC 1560 Broadway, Suite 1200 Denver, CO 80202 Attorney for Defendant OutOfTonercom

William A. Nolan (0041891)
Barnes & Thornburg LLP
21 East State Street, Suite 1850
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 628-0096
(614) 628-1433 (facsimile)
Attorney for Defendant OutOfTonercom

Andre Gibson, Chartered 115 NW 167th St, Suite 201 North Miami Beach, FL 33169 *Attorney for Blue Trading, LLC*

Richard L. Stroup Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP 901 New York Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001-4413 *Attorney for Copy Technologies, Inc., Jahwa Electronics Co., Ltd., Huizhou Jahwa Electronics Co, Ltd., Laser Toner Technology, Inc. and C&R Services, Incorporated*

Charles H. Suh Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP 901 New York Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001-4413 Attorney for Copy Technologies, Inc., Jahwa Electronics Co., Ltd., Huizhou Jahwa Electronics Co, Ltd., Laser Toner Technology, Inc. and C&R Services, Incorporated

> <u>/s/ Edward F. O'Connor</u> Attorney for Impression Products, Inc.