

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

LONGITUDE LICENSING LIMITED and
138 EAST LCD ADVANCEMENTS
LIMITED,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BOE TECHNOLOGY GROUP CO., LTD.,
and LG ELECTRONICS INC.,

Defendants.

No. 2:25-CV-00440-JRG-RSP

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**LG ELECTRONICS INC.'S ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS TO
PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

Defendant LG Electronics, Inc. ("LGE") submits this Answer, Affirmative Defenses, and Counterclaims to Plaintiffs Longitude Licensing Limited's ("Longitude") and 138 East LCD Advancements Limited's ("138 East") (Longitude and 138 collectively, "Plaintiffs") Complaint, in like-numbered paragraphs.

The headings and subheadings in this Answer are used solely for purposes of convenience and organization to mirror those appearing in the Complaint. To the extent not specifically admitted herein, the allegations of Plaintiffs' Complaint are denied.

INTRODUCTION

1. Paragraph 1 of the Complaint contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE admits that the Complaint purports to state an action for infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,636,146 ("the '146 patent"), 8,319,512 ("the '512 patent"), and 8,391,020 ("the '020 patent") (collectively, the "Longitude Patents"). LGE denies

that it has infringed or is infringing any claim of the Longitude Patents. LGE denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 1 of the Complaint.

2. Paragraph 2 of the Complaint contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE admits that the Longitude Patents purport to relate to liquid crystal display (“LCD”) technologies. LGE denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 2 of the Complaint.

3. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 3 of the Complaint.

4. LGE denies the allegations in Paragraph 4 of the Complaint.

5. LGE admits that the Complaint purports to seek damages and other relief. LGE denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 5 of the Complaint and denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief that they seek.

[ALLEGED] PARTIES

6. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 6 of the Complaint.

7. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 7 of the Complaint.

8. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 8 of the Complaint.

9. LGE admits it is a corporation organized under the laws of Republic of Korea, with a principal place of business at LG Twin Towers, 128 Yeoui-daero, Yeongdeungpo-gu, Seoul, 07336, Republic of Korea.

[ALLEGED] JURISDICTION AND VENUE

10. Paragraph 10 of the Complaint contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE does not contest that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the present action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

11. Paragraph 11 of the Complaint contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies that venue is proper or convenient in this District for this matter. LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 11 of the Complaint.

I. BOE

12. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 12 of the Complaint.

13. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 13 of the Complaint

14. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 14 of the Complaint

15. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 15 of the Complaint

II. LG

16. Paragraph 16 of the Complaint contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the court has general or specific personal jurisdiction over LGE. LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 16 of the Complaint

17. LGE denies the allegations in Paragraph 17 of the Complaint.

18. LGE denies the allegations in Paragraph 18 of the Complaint.

19. Paragraph 19 of the Complaint contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the allegations in Paragraph 19 of the Complaint.

[ALLEGED] FACTUAL BACKGROUND

I. The Longitude Patents

20. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth in Paragraph 20 of the Complaint and therefore denies them.

21. Paragraph 21 of the Complaint contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE admits the face of the '146 patent lists the title "Electro-Optical Panel, System with Terminals Having Different Corresponding Characteristics," and bears a filing date of August 6, 2004, and an issue date of December 22, 2009. LGE further admits that the face of the '146 patent identifies Shin Fujita as the sole named inventor and purports to claim priority to foreign Japanese Patent Application Nos. 2003-290650 and 2004-193515. LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 21 of the Complaint.

22. Paragraph 22 of the Complaint contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE admits the face of the '512 patent lists the title "Flexible Substrate Including Inspection Electrode for Outputting Signal Processed in Integrated Circuit, Electro-Optical Device, and Electronic Device," and bears a filing date of March 12, 2010, and an issue date of November 27, 2012. LGE further admits that the face of the '512 patent identifies Katsutosi Ueno as the sole named inventor and purports to claim priority to foreign Japanese Patent Application No. 2009-069825. LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 22 of the Complaint.

23. Paragraph 23 of the Complaint contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE admits the face of the '020 patent lists the title "Electro-Optical Device, Electro-Optical Panel, and Electronic Apparatus," and bears a filing date of December 1, 2010, and an issue date of March 5, 2013. LGE further admits that the face of the '020 patent identifies Munehide Saimen as the sole named inventor and purports to claim priority to foreign Japanese Patent Application Nos. 2009-275218 and 2010-214838. LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 23 of the Complaint.

24. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 24 of the Complaint.

25. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 25 of the Complaint.

26. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 26 of the Complaint.

II. The Inventors

27. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 27 of the Complaint.

III. BOE

28. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 28 of the Complaint.

29. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 29 of the Complaint.

30. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 30 of the Complaint.

31. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 31 of the Complaint.

32. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 32 of the Complaint.

33. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 33 of the Complaint.

IV. LG

34. LGE admits it manufactures and distributes electronic display products. LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 34 of the Complaint.

35. LGE admits its financial statements speak for themselves. LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 35 of the Complaint.

36. LGE admits its “corporate filings” speak for themselves. LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 36 of the Complaint.

37. LGE admits that the news article cited at <https://www.businesskorea.co.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=217480> speaks for itself. LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 37 of the Complaint.

38. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 38 of the Complaint

V. Heading Omitted¹

39. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 39 of the Complaint.

40. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 40 of the Complaint.

¹ For ease of reference, a placeholder is used throughout this Answer instead of Plaintiffs’ argumentative headings contained in the Complaint. Although LGE believes that no response is required to such headings, to the extent a response is required and to the extent these headings and titles are construed to contain factual allegations, LGE denies those allegations.

41. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 41 of the Complaint.

42. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 42 of the Complaint.

VI. Heading Omitted

43. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 43 of the Complaint.

44. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 44 of the Complaint.

45. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 45 of the Complaint.

VII. Heading Omitted

46. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 46 of the Complaint.

47. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 47 of the Complaint.

48. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 48 of the Complaint.

49. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 49 of the Complaint.

50. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 50 of the Complaint.

51. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 51 of the Complaint.

52. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 52 of the Complaint.

53. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 53 of the Complaint.

54. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 54 of the Complaint.

VIII. Heading Omitted

55. Paragraph 55 of the Complaint contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the allegations in Paragraph 55 of the Complaint.

56. Paragraph 56 of the Complaint contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. LGE admits that the complaint in this matter reflects Plaintiff's allegations regarding the '512 patent. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 56 of the Complaint.

57. Paragraph 57 of the Complaint contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. LGE admits that the complaint in this matter reflects Plaintiff's allegations regarding the '020 patent. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 57 of the Complaint.

58. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 58 of the Complaint.

IX. Heading Omitted

59. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 59 of the Complaint.

60. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 60 of the Complaint.

61. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 61 of the Complaint.

62. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 62 of the Complaint.

63. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 63 of the Complaint.

64. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 64 of the Complaint.

65. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 65 of the Complaint.

X. Heading Omitted

66. Paragraph 66 of the Complaint contains conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies all remaining allegations of Paragraph 66 of the Complaint.

67. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 67 of the Complaint.

68. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 68 of the Complaint.

69. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 69 of the Complaint.

70. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 70 of the Complaint.

COUNT I: [ALLEGATIONS REGARDING] U.S. PATENT NO. 7,636,146

71. Paragraph 71 of the Complaint contains a statement of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE admits that 35 U.S.C. § 282 speaks for itself.

72. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 72 of the Complaint.

73. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 73 of the Complaint

74. Paragraph 74 contains an introductory statement to which no response is required.

To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the allegations in Paragraph 74 of the Complaint.

75. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 75 of the Complaint

76. LGE admits that the panel appearing in Paragraph 76 of the Complaint appears to contain the BOE and LG logos. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 76 of the Complaint.

77. Paragraph 77 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 77 of the Complaint.

78. Paragraph 78 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 78 of the Complaint.

79. Paragraph 79 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 79 of the Complaint.

80. Paragraph 80 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is

required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 80 of the Complaint.

81. Paragraph 81 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 81 of the Complaint.

82. Paragraph 82 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 82 of the Complaint.

83. Paragraph 83 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 83 of the Complaint.

84. Paragraph 84 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 84 of the Complaint.

85. Paragraph 85 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 85 of the Complaint.

86. Paragraph 86 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 86 of the Complaint.

87. Paragraph 87 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 87 of the Complaint.

88. Paragraph 88 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 88 of the Complaint.

89. Paragraph 89 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 89 of the Complaint.

90. Paragraph 90 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 90 of the Complaint.

91. Paragraph 91 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is

required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 91 of the Complaint.

92. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 92 of the Complaint.

93. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding third parties in Paragraph 93 of the Complaint. LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 93 of the Complaint.

94. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 94 of the Complaint.

95. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 95 of the Complaint as stated.

96. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding third parties in Paragraph 96 of the Complaint. LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 96 of the Complaint.

97. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 97 of the Complaint as stated.

98. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 98 of the Complaint.

99. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 99 of the Complaint.

100. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 100 of the Complaint.

101. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 101 of the Complaint.

102. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 102 of the Complaint as to LGE's alleged conduct. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding BOE in Paragraph 102.

103. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 103 of the Complaint.

COUNT II: [ALLEGATIONS REGARDING] U.S. PATENT NO. 8,319,512

104. Paragraph 104 of the Complaint contains a statement of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE admits that 35 U.S.C. § 282 speaks for itself.

105. LGE denies the allegations in Paragraph 105 of the Complaint.

106. Paragraph 106 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 106 of the Complaint.

107. Paragraph 107 contains an introductory statement to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 107 of the Complaint.

108. Paragraph 108 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 108 of the Complaint.

109. LGE admits that the panel appearing in Paragraph 109 of the Complaint appears to contain the BOE and LG logos. LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 109 of the Complaint.

110. Paragraph 110 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 110 of the Complaint.

111. Paragraph 111 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 111 of the Complaint.

112. Paragraph 112 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 112 of the Complaint.

113. Paragraph 113 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegation of Paragraph 113 of the Complaint.

114. Paragraph 114 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 114 of the Complaint.

115. Paragraph 115 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the allegation of Paragraph 115 of the Complaint.

116. Paragraph 116 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is

required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the allegation of Paragraph 116 of the Complaint.

117. Paragraph 117 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 117 of the Complaint.

118. Paragraph 118 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 118 of the Complaint.

119. Paragraph 119 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 119 of the Complaint.

120. Paragraph 120 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 120 of the Complaint.

121. LGE denies the allegations in Paragraph 121 of the Complaint.

122. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding third parties in Paragraph 122 of the Complaint. LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 122 of the Complaint.

123. LGE denies the allegations in Paragraph 123 of the Complaint.

124. LGE denies the allegations in Paragraph 124 of the Complaint as to LGE.

125. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding third parties in Paragraph 125 of the Complaint. LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 125 of the Complaint.

126. LGE denies the allegations in Paragraph 126 of the Complaint.

127. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 127 of the Complaint.

128. LGE denies the allegations in Paragraph 128 of the Complaint

129. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 129 of the Complaint.

130. LGE denies the allegations in Paragraph 130 of the Complaint as to LGE.

131. LGE denies the allegations in Paragraph 131 of the Complaint.

132. LGE denies the allegations in Paragraph 132 of the Complaint as to LGE. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations concerning BOE in Paragraph 132 of the Complaint.

133. LGE denies the allegations in Paragraph 133 of the Complaint.

COUNT III: [ALLEGATIONS REGARDING] U.S. PATENT NO. 8,391,020

134. Paragraph 134 of the Complaint contains a statement of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE admits that 35 U.S.C. § 282 speaks for itself.

135. LGE denies the allegations in Paragraph 135 of the Complaint.

136. Paragraph 136 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is

required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 136 of the Complaint.

137. Paragraph 137 contains an introductory statement that requires no response. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 137 of the Complaint.

138. Paragraph 138 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 138 of the Complaint.

139. LGE admits that the panel appearing in Paragraph 139 of the Complaint appears to contain the BOE and LGE logos. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 139 of the Complaint.

140. Paragraph 140 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 140 of the Complaint.

141. Paragraph 141 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 141 of the Complaint.

142. Paragraph 142 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 142 of the Complaint.

143. Paragraph 143 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 143 of the Complaint.

144. Paragraph 144 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 144 of the Complaint.

145. Paragraph 145 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 145 of the Complaint.

146. Paragraph 146 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 146 of the Complaint.

147. Paragraph 147 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 147 of the Complaint.

148. Paragraph 148 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is

required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 148 of the Complaint.

149. Paragraph 149 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 149 of the Complaint.

150. Paragraph 150 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 150 of the Complaint.

151. Paragraph 151 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 151 of the Complaint.

152. Paragraph 152 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 152 of the Complaint.

153. Paragraph 153 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 153 of the Complaint.

154. Paragraph 154 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 154 of the Complaint.

155. Paragraph 155 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 155 of the Complaint.

156. Paragraph 156 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 156 of the Complaint.

157. Paragraph 157 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 157 of the Complaint.

158. Paragraph 158 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 158 of the Complaint.

159. Paragraph 159 of the Complaint uses terminology that may be the subject of claim construction by the Court and, accordingly, presents a legal conclusion to which no response is

required. To the extent a response is required, LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 159 of the Complaint.

160. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 160 of the Complaint.

161. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding third parties in Paragraph 161 of the Complaint. LGE denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 161 of the Complaint..

162. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 162 of the Complaint.

163. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 163 of the Complaint as applied to LGE.

164. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 164 of the Complaint as applied to LGE.

165. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 165 of the Complaint.

166. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 166 of the Complaint.

167. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 167 of the Complaint.

168. LGE is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 168 of the Complaint.

169. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 169 of the Complaint as applied to LGE.

170. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 170 of the Complaint.

171. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 171 of the Complaint as applied to LGE.

172. LGE denies the allegations of Paragraph 172 of the Complaint.

JURY DEMAND

173. LGE admits that Paragraph 173 of the Complaint contains Plaintiffs' demand for a jury trial on all claims and issues so triable. LGE denies the remainder of Paragraph 173 of the Complaint.

RESPONSES TO PRAYER FOR RELIEF

LGE denies all remaining allegations not specifically admitted herein. LGE denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to any judgment or relief against LGE and specifically denies paragraphs (A) through (E) of Plaintiffs' Prayer for Relief.

GENERAL DENIAL AND NON-WAIVER

LGE further denies each and every allegation in the Complaint that is not specifically admitted, denied or otherwise responded to in this Answer. The failure to deny a specific allegation, or assert a specific defense, shall not be deemed an admission of an allegation or a waiver of a defense.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

Without prejudice to the denials set forth in its Answer, and without admitting any allegation of the Complaint not expressly admitted herein, LGE asserts the following separate defenses to the Complaint without assuming the burden of proof on any such defense that would otherwise rest with Plaintiffs. LGE expressly reserves its rights to assert additional defenses that discovery may reveal.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

1. Plaintiffs have failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted because, *inter alia*, they have not alleged plausible allegations of infringement.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

2. One or more claims of the Longitude Patents are invalid for failure to comply with the requirements of Title 35, United States Code, including at least §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

3. LGE has not infringed and does not infringe any claim of the Longitude Patents under any theory of infringement.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

4. LGE has not willfully infringed any claim of the Longitude Patents.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

5. Plaintiffs' claim for damages is limited by 35 U.S.C. § 286.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

6. Plaintiffs are barred in whole or in part from recovering damages under 35 U.S.C. § 287 to the extent Plaintiffs or their licensees have failed to provide proper notice of any alleged infringement.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

7. Plaintiffs are barred in whole or in part from recovering their costs under 35 U.S.C. § 288.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

8. Plaintiffs' claims are barred by one or more of the doctrines of waiver, acquiescence, estoppel (including without limitation, equitable estoppel and prosecution history estoppel), patent misuse, and unclean hands.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

9. Plaintiffs are not entitled to injunctive relief. Among other things, Plaintiffs are not able to meet the standards for such relief as set forth in *eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, LLC*, 547 U.S. 388 (2006).

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

10. To the extent Plaintiffs do not own, exclusively license and/or hold all substantial rights of the Longitude Patents, they lack standing to bring the present litigation.

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

11. Plaintiffs are barred in whole or in part from recovering damages under 35 U.S.C. § 271 to the extent LGE is licensed to make, use, offer for sale, or sell the alleged inventions of the Longitude Patents.

RESERVATION OF AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

12. LGE reserves all defenses available under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Patent Laws of the United States, and any other defenses or counterclaims that may now or in the future be available based on discovery or any other factual investigation concerning this case, including that Plaintiffs have failed to aver any facts supporting the conclusion that they have suffered any irreparable injury or harm under 35 U.S.C. § 283, and that Plaintiffs have failed to aver any facts supporting that this is an exceptional case and/or an award of attorney’s fees under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

COUNTERCLAIMS

For its counterclaims against Longitude Licensing Limited (“Longitude”) and 138 East LCD Advancements Limited (“138 East”) (collectively, “Counterclaim-Defendants”), Counterclaim-Plaintiff LGE Group Co., Ltd. (“Counterclaim-Defendant” or “LGE”) states as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. Counterclaim-Plaintiff LGE is a corporation organized under the laws of the Republic of Korea with a principal place of business at LG Twin Towers, 128 Yeoui-daero, Yeongdeungpo-gu, Seoul, 07336, Republic of Korea.

2. Upon information and belief, and based on paragraph 6 of the Complaint as pled by Plaintiffs, Counterclaim-Defendant Longitude is a company registered in the Republic of Ireland with its principal place of business at Plaza 255, Suite 2A, Blanchardstown Corporate Park 2, Dublin 15, D15 YH6H, Ireland.

3. Upon information and belief, and based on paragraph 7 of the Complaint as pled by Plaintiffs, Counterclaim-Defendant 138 East is a company registered in the Republic of Ireland with its principal place of business at Plaza 255, Suite 2A, Blanchardstown Corporate Park 2, Dublin 15, D15 YH6H, Ireland.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. LGE's Counterclaims arise under the Patent Laws of the United States and the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

5. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of LGE's Counterclaims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a) and the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Counterclaim-Defendants because Counterclaim-Defendants have availed themselves of the rights and privileges of this forum by bringing this civil action in this judicial district.

7. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. §§1391(b) and 1391(c) at least because Counterclaim-Defendants Longitude and 138 East filed this civil action in this judicial district.

8. An actual, substantial, and continuing justiciable controversy exists between Counterclaim-Defendants and LGE at least because Counterclaim-Defendants Longitude and 138 East have filed a Complaint against LGE alleging infringement of the Longitude Patents. Specifically, the controversy concerns the noninfringement and invalidity of the Longitude Patents and the right of Counterclaim-Defendants to maintain suit for alleged infringement of the Longitude Patents.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

9. On April 25, 2025 Longitude and 138 East sued LGE alleging infringement of the Longitude Patents (U.S. Patent Nos. 7,636,146; 8,319,512; and 8,391,020).

10. Consequently, there is an actual case or controversy between the parties over the Asserted Patents.

COUNT ONE: (DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,636,146)

11. LGE restates and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs in its Counterclaims.

12. Upon information and belief, on or about December 22, 2009, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) issued U.S. Patent No. 7,636,146 (“the ’146 patent”) titled “Electro-Optical Panel, System with Terminals Having Different Corresponding Characteristics.” In this action, 138 East has pled it is the owner of the ’146 patent and Longitude has pled that it is the exclusive licensee of the ’146 patent.

13. Counterclaim-Defendants allege that the manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale or importation of LGE's products infringe the '146 patent, directly and indirectly.

14. By asserting claims against LGE for infringement of the '146 patent, Counterclaim-Defendants have created an actual, substantial, and continuing justiciable case or controversy regarding the infringement of the claims of the '146 patent.

15. LGE has not infringed, does not infringe, would not infringe, directly or indirectly, any valid or enforceable claim of the '146 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

16. Under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, Counterclaim-Plaintiff is entitled to a declaratory judgment that it has not infringed any valid and enforceable claim of the '146 patent.

COUNT TWO: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY OF THE '146 PATENT

17. LGE restates and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs in its Counterclaims.

18. Counterclaim-Defendants allege that the manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale or importation of LGE's products infringe the '146 patent, directly and indirectly. By asserting claims against LGE for infringement of the '146 patent,

19. Counterclaim-Defendants have created an actual, substantial, and continuing justiciable case or controversy regarding the infringement of the claims of the '146 patent.

20. One or more of the claims of the '146 patent is invalid for failure to comply with one or more of the requirements for patentability set forth in Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

21. Under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, Counterclaim-Plaintiff is entitled to declaratory judgment that the claims of the '146 patent are invalid for failure to comply with one

or more of the requirements for patentability set forth in Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

**COUNT THREE:
(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO.
8,319,512)**

22. LGE restates and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs in its Counterclaims.

23. Upon information and belief, on or about November 27, 2012, the USPTO issued U.S. Patent No. 8,319,512 (“the ’512 patent”) titled “Flexible Substrate Including Inspection Electrode for Outputting Signal Processed in Integrated Circuit, Electro-Optical Device, and Electronic Device.” In this action, 138 East has pled it is the owner of the ’512 patent and Longitude has pled that it is the exclusive licensee of the ’512 patent.

24. Counterclaim-Defendants allege that the manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale or importation of LGE's products infringe the ’512 patent, directly and indirectly.

25. By asserting claims against LGE for infringement of the ’512 patent, Counterclaim-Defendants have created an actual, substantial, and continuing justiciable case or controversy regarding the infringement of the claims of the ’512 patent.

26. LGE has not infringed, does not infringe, would not infringe, directly or indirectly, any valid or enforceable claim of the ’512 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

27. Under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, Counterclaim-Plaintiff is entitled to a declaratory judgment that it has not infringed any valid and enforceable claim of the ’512 patent.

**COUNT FOUR:
(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY OF THE '512 PATENT)**

28. LGE restates and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs in its Counterclaims.

29. Counterclaim-Defendants allege that the manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale or importation of LGE's products infringe the '512 patent, directly and indirectly.

30. By asserting claims against LGE for infringement of the '512 patent, Counterclaim-Defendants have created an actual, substantial, and continuing justiciable case or controversy regarding the infringement of the claims of the '512 patent.

31. One or more of the claims of the '512 patent is invalid for failure to comply with one or more of the requirements for patentability set forth in Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

32. Under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, Counterclaim-Plaintiff is entitled to declaratory judgment that the claims of the '512 patent are invalid for failure to comply with one or more of the requirements for patentability set forth in Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

**COUNT FIVE:
(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,391,020)**

33. LGE restates and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs in its Counterclaims.

34. Upon information and belief, on or about March 5, 2013, the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") issued U.S. Patent No. 8,391,020 ("the '020 patent") titled "Electro-Optical Device, Electro-Optical Panel, and Electronic Apparatus." In this action, 138

East has pled it is the owner of the '020 patent and Longitude has pled that it is the exclusive licensee of the '020 patent.

35. Counterclaim-Defendants allege that the manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale or importation of LGE's products infringe the '020 patent, directly and indirectly.

36. By asserting claims against LGE for infringement of the '020 patent, Counterclaim-Defendants have created an actual, substantial, and continuing justiciable case or controversy regarding the infringement of the claims of the '020 patent.

37. LGE has not infringed, does not infringe, would not infringe, directly or indirectly, any valid or enforceable claim of the '020 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

38. Under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, Counterclaim-Plaintiff is entitled to a declaratory judgment that it has not infringed any valid and enforceable claim of the '020 patent.

**COUNT SIX:
(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY OF THE '020 PATENT)**

39. LGE restates and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs in its Counterclaims.

40. Counterclaim-Defendants allege that the manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale or importation of LGE's products infringe the '020 patent, directly and indirectly.

41. By asserting claims against LGE for infringement of the '020 patent, Counterclaim-Defendants have created an actual, substantial, and continuing justiciable case or controversy regarding the infringement of the claims of the '020 patent.

42. One or more of the claims of the '020 patent is invalid for failure to comply with one or more of the requirements for patentability set forth in Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

43. Under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, Counterclaim-Plaintiff is entitled to declaratory judgment that the claims of the '020 patent are invalid for failure to comply with one or more of the requirements for patentability set forth in Title 35 of the U.S. Code, including §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, LGE respectfully requests that judgment be entered in its favor as follows:

A. For the Complaint to be dismissed, with prejudice, and Plaintiffs' requests for relief be denied entirely.

B. For a declaration that the claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,636,146; 8,319,512; and 8,391,020 are invalid, unenforceable and/or not infringed.

C. For the Plaintiffs to be preliminarily and permanently enjoined from asserting that LGE, or its officers, agents, representatives, stockholders, and/or customers, have infringed or are infringing any of the claims of the Longitude Patents.

D. For Plaintiffs to be preliminarily and permanently enjoined from bringing suit against LGE, or their officers, agents, representatives, stockholders, and/or customers, for infringement of any of the Longitude Patents.

E. For a declaration that this case is an exceptional case under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and that LGE be awarded its attorneys' fees, costs, and other expenses incurred in this action.

F. For LGE to be awarded such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38, LGE demands a trial by jury on all issues triable of right by a jury.

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

In filing these Counterclaims, LGE has no knowingly or intentionally waived any applicable defenses. LGE reserves the right to assert and rely upon any other applicable counterclaims or defenses that may become available or apparent during the course of this action. LGE reserves the right to amend or seek to amend its Answer, Affirmative Defenses, and Counterclaims.

Dated: September 8, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kristopher L. Reed

Kristopher L. Reed
State Bar No. 24130416
kris.reed@hkllaw.com
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP
One Arts Plaza
1722 Routh Street, Suite 1500
Dallas, Texas 75201
214.969.1700
214.969.1751 (fax)

Kenneth S. Chang
ken.chang@hkllaw.com
Edward J. Mayle
edward.mayle@hkllaw.com
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP
1801 California Street, Suite 5000
Denver, Colorado 80202
303.974.6660
303.974.6659x)

Melissa Richards Smith (SBN 24001351)
GILLAM & SMITH LLP
303 South Washington Avenue
Marshall, TX 75670
Tel: (903) 934-8450
Fax: (903) 934-9257
Email: melissa@gillamsmithlaw.com

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT, LG
ELECTRONICS INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing Answer to Complaint was served on all counsel of record via ECF on September 8, 2025.

/s/ Melissa R. Smith

Melissa R. Smith