

GlaserWeil

1 LAWRENCE M. HADLEY - State Bar No. 157,728  
[lhadley@glaserweil.com](mailto:lhadley@glaserweil.com)

2 STEPHEN E. UNDERWOOD - State Bar No. 320,303  
[sunderwood@glaserweil.com](mailto:sunderwood@glaserweil.com)

3 GLASER WEIL FINK HOWARD  
4 AVCHEN & SHAPIRO LLP  
5 10250 Constellation Boulevard, 19th Floor  
6 Los Angeles, California 90067  
7 Telephone: (310) 553-3000  
8 Facsimile: (310) 556-2920

9 LAWRENCE R. LAPORTE, State Bar No. 130,003  
10 [Lawrence.LaPorte@lewisbrisbois.com](mailto:Lawrence.LaPorte@lewisbrisbois.com)

11 LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP  
12 633 West 5th Street, Suite 4000  
13 Los Angeles, California 90071  
14 Telephone: 213.250.1800  
15 Facsimile: 213.250.7900

16 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
17 Core Optical Technologies, LLC

18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
19 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

20 CORE OPTICAL TECHNOLOGIES,  
21 LLC,

22 Plaintiff,

23 v.

24 CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., and DOES 1  
25 through 10, inclusive,

26 Defendants.

CASE NO: 8:20-cv-01468-JAK-RAO  
**PLAINTIFF CORE OPTICAL  
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC'S NOTICE  
OF APPEAL**

GlaserWeil

1 Notice is hereby given that Plaintiff Core Optical Technologies, LLC  
 2 (“Plaintiff” or “Core”) in the above-captioned case hereby appeals to the United  
 3 States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit from: (i) the judgment entered in this  
 4 case on September 14, 2022 (Dkt. 116) (the “Judgment”); (ii) the August 4, 2022  
 5 order granting Defendant Cisco Systems, Inc’s (“Cisco’s”) motion for summary  
 6 judgment (Dkt. 111) (the “Order”); and (iii) each and every interlocutory order,  
 7 decision, judgment or ruling that merged into the Judgment or the Order, including,  
 8 without limitation, the district court’s conclusions (1) that the patent-in-suit, U.S.  
 9 Patent No. 6,782,211 (the “’211 Patent”), is not a Non-TRW Invention under  
 10 Dr. Core’s Invention Agreement with TRW, (2) that Dr. Core’s rights in the ’211  
 11 Patent were automatically assigned under the Invention Agreement to TRW, and (3)  
 12 that Plaintiff Core Optical Technologies, LLC lacks standing to assert the ’211 Patent.

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

DATED: September 28, 2022

GLASER WEIL FINK HOWARD  
AVCHEN & SHAPIRO LLP

By: /s/Lawrence M. Hadley  
LAWRENCE M. HADLEY  
STEPHEN E. UNDERWOOD

LAWRENCE R. LAPORTE  
LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Core Optical Technologies, LLC