

1 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
Sarah J. Guske, Bar No. 232467  
2 sarah.guske@morganlewis.com  
One Market Street, Spear Street Tower  
3 San Francisco, CA 94105-1596  
Tel: +1.415.442.1000  
4 Fax: +1.415.442.1001

5 Dion M. Bregman, Bar No. 208393  
dion.bregman@morganlewis.com  
6 Michael J. Lyons, Bar No. 202284  
michael.lyons@morganlewis.com  
7 1400 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1124  
8 Tel: +1.650.843.7507  
9 Fax: +1.650.843.4001

10 Amanda S. Williamson (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)  
amanda.williamson@morganlewis.com  
11 Michael T. Sikora (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)  
michael.sikora@morganlewis.com  
12 110 North Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60606-1511  
13 Tel: +1.312.324.1000  
Fax: +1.312.324.1001

14 (*additional counsel on following page*)

15 Attorneys for Declaratory Judgment Plaintiff, Resonac Hard  
16 Disk Corporation and Resonac America, Inc.

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

19 RESONAC HARD DISK  
20 CORPORATION and RESONAC  
AMERICA, INC.,

21 Declaratory Judgment  
22 Plaintiffs,

23 vs.

24 MR TECHNOLOGIES GMBH,

25 Declaratory Judgment  
26 Defendant.

Case No. 5:25-cv-8631

**COMPLAINT FOR  
DECLARATORY JUDGMENT  
OF NON-INFRINGEMENT**

1 (additional counsel on preceding page)

2 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
3 Mark Liang, Bar No. 278487  
4 mliang@omm.com  
5 Amy K. Liang, Bar No. 291910  
6 aliang@omm.com  
7 Two Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor  
8 San Francisco, CA 94111  
9 Tel: +1 415 984 8700

10 Attorneys for Declaratory Judgment Plaintiff, Resonac Hard  
11 Disk Corporation and Resonac America, Inc.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 Resonac Hard Disk Corporation and Resonac America, Inc. (collectively  
2 “Resonac” or “Plaintiffs”) by and through their undersigned attorneys, allege as  
3 follows for their Complaint for Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement against  
4 Defendant MR Technologies GmbH (“MRT” or “Defendant”).

5 **Nature of the Action**

6 1. Resonac asserts claims for declaratory judgment of non-infringement of  
7 United States Patent Nos. 9,928,864 (“the ’864 Patent”); 11,138,997 (“the ’997  
8 Patent”); and 12,020,734 (“the ’734 Patent”) (collectively, the “Asserted Patents”).

9 **Parties**

10 2. Resonac Hard Disk Corporation (“RHDC”) is a Japanese corporation  
11 with its principal place of business located at 5-1, Yawata kaigan dori, Ichihara,  
12 Chiba 290-0067, Japan.

13 3. Resonac America, Inc. (“REA”) is a California corporation with its  
14 principal place of business located at 2150 North First Street, Suite 350, San Jose,  
15 California 95131, United States of America.

16 4. RHDC and REA specialize in producing and distributing products for  
17 high-technology devices, including magnetic recording media used in hard disk  
18 drives (“HDDs”).

19 5. Upon information and belief, MRT is a privately held company, having  
20 its principal place of business at Nibelungengasse 11/4, 1010 Vienna, Austria.

21 **Jurisdiction and Venue**

22 6. Resonac’s claims for declaratory judgment of non-infringement of the  
23 Asserted Patents arise under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1 et  
24 seq. and under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 et seq.

25 7. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over these claims under 28  
26 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a), 2201, and 2202. In particular, Resonac requests a  
27 declaration that Resonac and Resonac’s technology do not infringe the Asserted  
28 Patents because, as detailed below in the **Factual Background**, MRT has asserted

1 unfounded claims of patent infringement of the Asserted Patents against Resonac and  
2 Resonac’s technology. These claims are being asserted by MRT in at least one  
3 ongoing lawsuit against one of Resonac’s customers and partners, Toshiba, which  
4 appears premised on Toshiba’s use of magnetic recording media that is supplied by  
5 Resonac.

6 8. MRT’s infringement claims, asserted in related ongoing actions against  
7 Resonac’s customers, threaten actual and imminent injury to Resonac that can only  
8 be redressed by judicial relief and warrants the issue of a declaratory judgment, under  
9 the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 et seq.

10 9. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action based on a  
11 real, immediate, and ongoing controversy between Resonac and MRT regarding  
12 whether Resonac’s technology infringes the Asserted Patents.

13 10. The Court has specific personal jurisdiction over MRT at least because  
14 MRT has purposefully availed itself of the privilege of conducting activities relating  
15 to the subject matter of Resonac’s claims in the state of California. In particular,  
16 MRT has repeatedly and deliberately sought to assert and to enforce its alleged rights  
17 to the Asserted Patents in California and against companies based in or with  
18 significant operations in California, including as to products manufactured and sold  
19 by Resonac as detailed in the “Factual Background” section below.

20 11. On August 26, 2022, MRT filed Case No. 8-22-cv-01599 in the United  
21 States District Court for the Central District of California alleging infringement of,  
22 among others, the ’864 and ’997 Patents by HDDs sold by Western Digital  
23 Technologies, Inc. (“Western Digital”). Western Digital’s principal place of business  
24 is in San Jose, California, which is in this District. Upon information and belief,  
25 MRT continued to litigate that case in California until approximately May 2025.

26 12. On August 22, 2024, MRT filed Case No. 8-24-cv-01848 in the United  
27 States District Court for the Central District of California alleging infringement of  
28 the ’734 Patent by HDDs sold by Western Digital. Upon information and belief,

MRT Technologies GmbH  
Ex. 2021, IPR2026-00016

1 MRT continued to litigate that case in California until approximately May 2025.

2 13. On April 15, 2025, MRT filed Case No. 8-25-cv-00786 (the “Toshiba  
3 Action”) in the United States District Court for the Central District of California  
4 alleging infringement of all three Asserted Patents by HDDs sold by Toshiba  
5 America Electronic Components, Inc. and Toshiba Electronic Devices and Storage  
6 Corporation (collectively, “Toshiba”). Upon information and belief, as of the filing  
7 of this Complaint, MRT is continuing to litigate that case in California. As detailed  
8 in the Factual Background section below, in the “Toshiba Action,” the accused  
9 components of Toshiba’s HDDs are manufactured and supplied by Resonac.

10 14. Alternatively, because MRT’s principal place of business is in Vienna,  
11 Austria, personal jurisdiction would also be appropriate under Federal Rule of Civil  
12 Procedure 4(k).

13 15. The exercise of personal jurisdiction over MRT in the Court comports  
14 with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. MRT has not only  
15 consented to having disputes relating to the Asserted Patents heard in California, but  
16 it has specifically brought infringement allegations in California that relate to both  
17 the Asserted Patents and Resonac products (as incorporated into Toshiba end-user  
18 products, as discussed more fully below in the Factual Background section).

19 16. Venue for Resonac’s declaratory judgment claims is proper in this Court  
20 under 28 U.S.C. § 1391. *See, e.g., VE Holding Corp. v. Johnson Gas Appliance Co.*,  
21 917 F.2d 1574, 1583 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (“It has long been held that a declaratory  
22 judgment action alleging that a patent is invalid and not infringed—the mirror image  
23 of a suit for patent infringement—is governed by the general venue statutes, not by  
24 § 1400(b).”). Because MRT is a foreign entity that does not reside in the United  
25 States, venue over it is proper in any federal district. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c)(3).

26 17. REA is resident and conducts business in this District, including  
27 business related to magnetic recording media. A substantial part of the events or  
28 omissions giving rise to Resonac’s claims also occurred in this District. REA has

1 imported, stored, and sold certain magnetic recording media in the United States.

2 18. REA has also provided services from its offices in San Jose, California  
 3 related to RHDC's business of selling magnetic recording media to customers. Such  
 4 services have included (a) providing certain technical support in qualifying Resonac  
 5 magnetic recording media for customers' new programs; (b) identifying certain  
 6 customer product specifications, requirements, and projected volumes; (c) creating  
 7 certain product brochures and product specifications; and (d) contacting certain  
 8 potential magnetic recording media customers to facilitate entry into procurement  
 9 agreement(s) with RHDC.

10 19. Further, third-party information potentially relevant to the subject  
 11 matter of this litigation is located in this District. In other litigations, MRT has  
 12 accused HDDs sold by Seagate Technology LLC ("Seagate")<sup>1</sup> and Western Digital  
 13 of embodying the claimed technology of the Asserted Patents. Upon information and  
 14 belief, information relating to such third-party products is located in this District. For  
 15 example, upon information and belief, such information relating to Seagate's  
 16 products is located at Seagate's facility at 47488 Kato Road, Fremont, California  
 17 94538. Additionally, upon information and belief, such information relating to  
 18 Western Digital's products is located at Western Digital's facility at 5601 Great Oaks  
 19 Parkway, San Jose, California 95119.

20 20. Alternatively, should the Court conclude that a substantial part of the  
 21 events or omissions giving rise to Resonac's claims did not occur in this District,  
 22 venue would still be proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(3) because  
 23 MRT is subject to the Court's personal jurisdiction.

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
 25 <sup>1</sup> On April 15, 2025, MRT filed Case No. 0-25-cv-01460 in the United States District  
 26 Court for the District of Minnesota alleging infringement of all three Asserted Patents  
 27 by Seagate Technology LLC, Seagate Technology International, Seagate Technology  
 28 (Thailand), Ltd., Seagate Singapore International Headquarters PTE. Ltd., and  
 Seagate Technology (Netherlands) B.V. Upon information and belief, MRT  
 continues to litigate the case as of the filing of this Complaint. On information and  
 belief, the Seagate defendants are collectively subsidiaries of Seagate Technology  
 Holdings plc, which has its principal place of business in Fremont, California, which  
 is in this District.

**Intradistrict Assignment**

21. Pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-2(c) and 3-5(b), this is an Intellectual Property Rights Action subject to assignment on a district-wide basis.

**Factual Background**

22. In the Toshiba Action, MRT purports to be “the owner and assignee of the ’864 Patent with full rights to pursue recovery of royalties for damages for infringement, including full rights to recover past and future damages.” *Id.* ¶ 23.

23. In the Toshiba Action, MRT purports to be “the owner and assignee of the ’997 Patent with full rights to pursue recovery of royalties for damages for infringement, including full rights to recover past and future damages.” *Id.* ¶ 55.

24. In the Toshiba Action, MRT purports to be “the owner and assignee of the ’734 Patent with full rights to pursue recovery of royalties for damages for infringement, including full rights to recover past and future damages.” *Id.* ¶ 73.

25. Independent claim 1 of the ’864 Patent relates to “[a] magnetic recording medium . . . .” ’864 Patent, cl. 1. Independent claim 1 of the ’977 Patent relates to “[a] magnetic recording system, comprising . . . a disk, including a magnetic recording medium.” ’977 Patent, cl. 1. Independent claim 7 of the ’977 Patent relates to “[a] magnetic recording medium . . . .” *Id.*, cl. 7. And independent claim 1 of the ’734 Patent relates to “[a] magnetic recording system, comprising . . . a disk, including a magnetic recording medium.” ’734 Patent, cl. 1.

26. MRT filed the Toshiba Action, alleging that certain Toshiba-branded HDDs products infringe claim 1 of each of U.S. Patent Nos. 9,928,864, 11,138,997, and 12,020,734. Case No. 8-25-cv-00786, Dkt. 1 (“MRT Compl.”), ¶¶ 23-24, 34 (’864 Patent), 55-56, 66 (’997 Patent), 73-74, 85 (’734 Patent). In relevant part, paragraph 24 of MRT’s complaint states as follows:

The Accused Products include, without limitation, all HDD products listed on Defendants’ HDD webpages—including any OEM-branded versions or variations bearing different model names:

MR Technologies GmbH  
Ex. 2021, IPR2026-00016

- 1 • <https://storage.toshiba.com/consumer-hdd/internal> (e.g., S300 / S300
- 2 Pro, N300 / N300 Pro, X300 / X300 Pro, P300, and L200 Series
- 3 HDDs)
- 4 • <https://storage.toshiba.com/consumer-hdd/external> (e.g., Canvio Flex,
- 5 Canvio Gaming, Canvio Slim, Canvio Advance, Canvio Advance Plus,
- 6 Canvio Ready, and Canvio Basics Series HDDs)
- 7 • <https://storage.toshiba.com/enterprise-hdd> (e.g., MG11, MG10F,
- 8 MG10, MG10-D, MG09, MG08, MG08-D, MG07, MG04, AL14SX,
- 9 and AL15SE Series HDDs)
- 10 • <https://storage.toshiba.com/internal-specialty-hdd> (e.g., MD04-V,
- 11 DT02-VH, DT02-V, NAS MN, MD07ACA, MD04, DT02, DT01,
- 12 MQ04, MQ01ABD, MQ01ABF, MQ01ABU-W, MQ01ABU-BW,
- 13 MQ01ACF, and MQ04-V Series HDDs)

14 27. Toshiba relies upon Resonac to supply most (if not all) of the magnetic  
 15 recording media for these HDD products. Toshiba and Resonac entities have  
 16 contracted for Resonac to supply magnetic recording media to Toshiba. Upon  
 17 information and belief, magnetic recording media designed, manufactured, and sold  
 18 by Resonac has been embedded as the principle technical component of the accused  
 19 HDD products in the Toshiba Action.

20 28. Thus, upon information and belief, MRT's infringement allegations  
 21 relating to the Asserted Patents directly target Resonac's products, and Resonac and  
 22 MRT have a genuine case and controversy regarding the non-infringement of the  
 23 Asserted Patents by Resonac's products. In fact, Toshiba has already requested that,  
 24 pursuant to the terms of a supply agreement relating to Resonac's accused magnetic  
 25 recording media, Resonac indemnify and defend Toshiba with respect to MRT's  
 26 infringement claims against that magnetic recording media.

## COUNT I

### Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of

MRT Technologies GmbH  
 Ex. 2021, IPR2026-00016

6

Page 8 of 14

Case No. 5:25-cv-8631

**U.S. Patent No. 9,928,864 (“the ’864 Patent”)**

29. Resonac hereby restates and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 28 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

30. In the Toshiba Action, MRT alleges that Toshiba infringes the ’864 Patent based on Resonac’s magnetic recording media supplied to Toshiba.

31. The ’864 Patent has only one independent claim—claim 1—which recites as follows:

1. A magnetic recording medium, comprising:

an essentially non-magnetic substrate;

an underlayer formed on the non-magnetic substrate; and

an exchange coupled magnetic multilayer structure, including

a hard magnetic storage layer, having a first coercive field  $H_s > 0.5$  T, formed on the underlayer; and

a nucleation host, having a second coercive field  $H_n$  without the hard magnetic storage layer, lower than the first coercive field,  $H_n < H_s$ ,

wherein said nucleation host is formed on the hard magnetic storage layer such that the hard magnetic storage layer is between the nucleation host and the non-magnetic substrate, is exchange coupled to the hard magnetic storage layer, and comprises ferromagnetic layers with increasing anisotropy constant  $K$  from layer to layer.

32. No Resonac magnetic recording media meets each and every limitation of independent claim 1 literally or by equivalents. As one example, Resonac’s products do not comprise a “nucleation host” that “comprises ferromagnetic layers with increasing anisotropy constant  $K$  from layer to layer,” within the meaning the ’864 Patent, claim 1.

33. For at least this reason, Resonac’s products do not directly or indirectly infringe any claim of the ’864 Patent, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, and Resonac is entitled to declaratory judgment of non-infringement as to the ’864

1 Patent.

2 **COUNT II**

3 **Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of**

4 **U.S. Patent No. 11,138,997 (“the ’997 Patent”)**

5 34. Resonac hereby restates and incorporates by reference the allegations  
6 set forth in paragraphs 1 through 33 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

7 35. In the Toshiba Action, MRT alleges that Toshiba infringes the ’997  
8 Patent based on Resonac’s magnetic recording media supplied to Toshiba.

9 36. The ’997 Patent has only two independent claims—claims 1 and 7—  
10 which recite as follows:

- 11 1. A magnetic recording system, comprising:
  - 12 a writing head; and
  - 13 a disk, including a magnetic recording medium, comprising
  - 14 an essentially non-magnetic substrate
  - 15 an underlayer formed on the non-magnetic substrate; and
  - 16 an exchange coupled magnetic multilayer structure, including
  - 17 a hard magnetic storage layer, having a first coercive field  $H_s > 0.5$  T,
  - 18 formed on the underlayer; and
  - 19 a nucleation host, having a second coercive field  $H_n$  without the hard
  - 20 magnetic storage layer, lower than the first coercive field,  $H_n < H_s$ ,
  - 21 wherein said nucleation host is formed on the hard magnetic storage
  - 22 layer such that the hard magnetic storage layer is between the nucleation host
  - 23 and the non-magnetic substrate, is exchange coupled to the hard magnetic
  - 24 storage layer, and comprises ferromagnetic layers with increasing anisotropy
  - 25 constant  $K$  from layer to layer.

26 \* \* \*

- 27 7. A magnetic recording medium, comprising:
  - 28 an essentially non-magnetic substrate;

1 an underlayer formed on the non-magnetic substrate; and  
 2 an exchange coupled magnetic multilayer structure, including a hard  
 3 magnetic storage layer, having a first coercive field  $H_s > 0.5$  T, formed on the  
 4 underlayer; and  
 5 a nucleation host, having a second coercive field  $H_n$  without the hard  
 6 magnetic storage layer, lower than the first coercive field,  $H_n < H_s$ ,  
 7 wherein said nucleation host is formed on the hard magnetic storage  
 8 layer such that the hard magnetic storage layer is between the nucleation host  
 9 and the non-magnetic substrate, is exchange coupled to the hard magnetic  
 10 storage layer, and comprises ferromagnetic layers with increasing anisotropy  
 11 constant  $K$  from layer to layer, wherein at least two of the ferromagnetic layers  
 12 are coupled with a thin exchange coupling layer.

13 37. No Resonac magnetic recording media meets each and every limitation  
 14 of independent claim 1 or independent claim 7 literally or by equivalents. As one  
 15 example, Resonac’s products do not comprise a “nucleation host” that “comprises  
 16 ferromagnetic layers with increasing anisotropy constant  $K$  from layer to layer,”  
 17 within the meaning of the ’997 Patent, claim 1 or claim 7.

18 38. For at least this reason, Resonac’s products do not directly or indirectly  
 19 infringe any claim of the ’997 Patent, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents,  
 20 and Resonac is entitled to declaratory judgment of non-infringement as to the ’997  
 21 Patent.

22 **COUNT III**

23 **Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of**  
 24 **U.S. Patent No. 12,020,734 (“the ’734 Patent”)**

25 39. Resonac hereby restates and incorporates by reference the allegations  
 26 set forth in paragraphs 1 through 38 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

27 40. In the Toshiba Action, MRT alleges that Toshiba infringes the ’734  
 28 Patent based on Resonac’s magnetic recording media supplied to Toshiba.

1 41. The '734 Patent has only one independent claim—claim 1—which  
2 recites as follows:

3 1. A magnetic recording system, comprising:

4 a writing head; and

5 a disk, including a magnetic recording medium, comprising

6 an essentially non-magnetic substrate;

7 an underlayer; and

8 an exchange coupled magnetic multilayer structure, including

9 a hard magnetic storage layer, formed from a perpendicular anisotropy  
10 material, having a first coercive field  $H_s > 0.5$  T, formed such that the  
11 underlayer is between the non-magnetic substrate and the hard magnetic  
12 storage layer; and

13 a nucleation host, having a second coercive field  $H_n$  without the hard  
14 magnetic storage layer, lower than the first coercive field,  $H_n < H_s$ ,

15 wherein said nucleation host is formed on the hard magnetic storage  
16 layer such that the hard magnetic storage layer is between the nucleation host  
17 and the non-magnetic substrate, is exchange coupled to the hard magnetic  
18 storage layer, and comprises at least a first ferromagnetic layer with an  
19 anisotropy constant  $K_1$  and a second ferromagnetic layer between the first  
20 ferromagnetic layer and the hard magnetic storage layer with an increased  
21 anisotropy constant  $K_2$  greater than  $K_1$ ;

22 wherein the first and second ferromagnetic layers are exchange coupled  
23 with an exchange coupling layer.

24 42. No Resonac magnetic recording media meets each and every limitation  
25 of independent claim 1 literally or by equivalents. As one example, Resonac's  
26 products do not comprise a "nucleation host" that "comprises at least a first  
27 ferromagnetic layer with an anisotropy constant  $K_1$  and a second ferromagnetic layer  
28 between the first ferromagnetic layer and the hard magnetic storage layer with an

1 increased anisotropy constant K2 greater than K1,” within the meaning the ’734  
2 Patent, claim 1.

3 43. For at least this reason, Resonac’s products do not directly or indirectly  
4 infringe any claim of the ’734 Patent, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents,  
5 and Resonac is entitled to declaratory judgment of non-infringement as to the ’734  
6 Patent.

7 **Prayer For Relief**

8 WHEREFORE, Resonac prays for judgment against Defendant MRT, and  
9 respectfully requests the following relief:

- 10 A. A judgment that Resonac does not direct or indirectly infringe any  
11 claims of the Asserted Patents, literally or under the doctrine of  
12 equivalents;
- 13 B. A judgment in favor of Resonac and against MRT on each of Resonac’s  
14 claims;
- 15 B. A judgment that this is an exceptional case and that Resonac be awarded  
16 its attorneys’ fees incurred in this action pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285;
- 17 C. Fees, costs, and expenses in this action; and
- 18 D. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and appropriate.

19 **Jury Demand**

20 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38 and Civil Local Rule 3-6,  
21 Resonac demands a jury trial on all issues and claims so triable.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Dated: October 9, 2025

By: /s/ Sarah J. Guske

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
Sarah J. Guske  
Dion M. Bregman  
Michael J. Lyons  
Amanda S. Williamson  
Michael T. Sikora

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
Mark Liang  
Amy K. Liang

Attorneys for Declaratory Judgment  
Plaintiffs Resonac Hard Disk  
Corporation and Resonac America, Inc.