

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
WACO DIVISION

PARKERVISION, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

INTEL CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Case No. 6:20-cv-00562-ADA

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**PLAINTIFF PARKERVISION, INC.'S ANSWER
TO DEFENDANT INTEL CORPORATION'S COUNTERCLAIMS
TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

Plaintiff ParkerVision, Inc. ("ParkerVision") hereby answers the counterclaims asserted by Defendant Intel Corporation ("Intel") on June 10, 2021 (D.I. 51), in Intel's Answer, Affirmative Defenses and Counterclaims to Second Amended Complaint for Patent Infringement.

GENERAL DENIAL

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(b)(3), ParkerVision denies all allegations in Intel's counterclaims except for those specifically admitted below.

THE PARTIES

1. Admitted.
2. Denied. ParkerVision is a Florida corporation with its principal place of business at 4446-1A Hendricks Avenue, Suite 354, Jacksonville, Florida 32207.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. ParkerVision admits that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Intel's counterclaims.

4. Admitted.

5. ParkerVision admits that venue is proper in this district.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

6. Admitted.

7. Admitted.

8. ParkerVision admits that Intel denied ParkerVision's infringement allegations, but otherwise denies the allegations in this paragraph.

9. ParkerVision admits that an actual and justiciable controversy exists between ParkerVision and Intel with regard to the validity and infringement of the '706, '508, and '108 patents.

10. Denied.

FIRST COUNTERCLAIM

(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,049,706)

11. ParkerVision incorporates by reference its responses to the preceding paragraphs of its Answer to Defendant's counterclaims as if fully set forth here.

12. Admitted.

13. Admitted.

14. ParkerVision admits that an actual controversy exists between ParkerVision and Intel by virtue of the allegations in ParkerVision's Second Amended Complaint and Intel's Answer as to the validity and infringement of the '706 patent.

15. Denied.

16. Denied.

17. Denied.

18. Denied.

19. Denied.

SECOND COUNTERCLAIM

(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of U.S. Patent No. 6,049,706)

20. ParkerVision incorporates by reference its responses to the preceding paragraphs of its Answer to Defendant's counterclaims as if fully set forth here.

21. Admitted.

22. Admitted.

23. ParkerVision admits that an actual controversy exists between ParkerVision and Intel by virtue of the allegations in ParkerVision's Second Amended Complaint and Intel's Answer as to the validity and infringement of the '706 patent.

24. Denied.

25. Denied.

26. Denied.

27. Denied.

THIRD COUNTERCLAIM

(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8,190,108)

28. ParkerVision incorporates by reference its responses to the preceding paragraphs of its Answer to Defendant's counterclaims as if fully set forth here.

29. Admitted.

30. Admitted.

31. ParkerVision admits that an actual controversy exists between ParkerVision and Intel by virtue of the allegations in ParkerVision's Second Amended Complaint and Intel's Answer as to the validity and infringement of the '108 patent.

32. Denied.

33. Denied.

34. Denied.

35. Denied.

FOURTH COUNTERCLAIM

(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of U.S. Patent No. 8,190,108)

36. ParkerVision incorporates by reference its responses to the preceding paragraphs of its Answer to Defendant's counterclaims as if fully set forth here.

37. Admitted.

38. Admitted.

39. ParkerVision admits that an actual controversy exists between ParkerVision and Intel by virtue of the allegations in ParkerVision's Second Amended Complaint and Intel's Answer as to the validity and infringement of the '108 patent.

40. Denied.

41. Denied.

42. Denied.

FIFTH COUNTERCLAIM

(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7,050,508)

43. ParkerVision incorporates by reference its responses to the preceding paragraphs of its Answer to Defendant's counterclaims as if fully set forth here.

44. Admitted.

45. Admitted.

46. ParkerVision admits that an actual controversy exists between ParkerVision and Intel by virtue of the allegations in ParkerVision's Second Amended Complaint and Intel's Answer as to the validity and infringement of the '508 patent.

47. Denied.

48. Denied.

49. Denied.

50. Denied.

SIXTH COUNTERCLAIM

(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of U.S. Patent No. 7,050,508)

51. ParkerVision incorporates by reference its responses to the preceding paragraphs of its Answer to Defendant's counterclaims as if fully set forth here.

52. Admitted.

53. Admitted.

54. ParkerVision admits that an actual controversy exists between ParkerVision and Intel by virtue of the allegations in ParkerVision's Second Amended Complaint and Intel's Answer as to the validity and infringement of the '508 patent.

55. Denied.

56. Denied.

57. Denied.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, ParkerVision prays for judgment in its favor and against Defendant as follows:

- a. That Defendant takes nothing by its counterclaims;
- b. That the Court enters judgment against Defendant and in favor of Parkervision and that the Defendant's counterclaims be dismissed in their entirety, with prejudice;
- c. That the Court declares that Defendant does infringe and has infringed the claims of the '706, '508, and '108 patents;
- d. That the Court declares that the claims of the '706, '508, and '108 patents are valid;
- e. A declaratory judgment that the patents-in-suit are enforceable;
- f. That the Court deems this an exceptional case under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and award ParkerVision its costs and reasonable attorneys' fees;
- g. That the Court grants ParkerVision the relief requested in ParkerVision's Second Amended Complaint for Patent Infringement; and

h. That the Court grants ParkerVision any and all other further relief that the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: June 30, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

THE MORT LAW FIRM, PLLC

OF COUNSEL:

/s/ Raymond W. Mort, III

Ronald M. Daignault*
Chandran B. Iyer
Jason S. Charkow*
Stephanie R. Mandir
DAIGNAULT IYER LLP
rdaignault@daignaultiyer.com
cbiyer@daignaultiyer.com
jcharkow@daignaultiyer.com
smandir@daignaultiyer.com
8618 Westwood Center Drive, Suite 150
Vienna, Virginia 22182
**Not Admitted in Virginia*

Raymond W. Mort, III
Texas State Bar No. 00791308
raymort@austinlaw.com
100 Congress Avenue, Suite 2000
Austin, Texas 78701
Tel/Fax: 512-865-7950

Attorneys for Plaintiff ParkerVision, Inc.