

EXHIBIT I

Westlaw.

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d

Page 1

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2004 WL 2346152 (S.D.N.Y.)

(Cite as: 2004 WL 2346152 (S.D.N.Y.))

▷

Motions, Pleadings and Filings

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court,
S.D. New York.
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC., Plaintiff,
v.
MICROMUSE, INC., Defendant.
No. 04 Civ. 3090(RWS).

Oct. 19, 2004.

Christian & Barton, Richmond, VA, By: Michael W. Smith, Craig T. Merritt, R. Braxton Hill, for Plaintiff, of counsel.

Gray Cary Ware & Freidenrich, San Diego, CA, By: Edward H. Sikorski, John Allcock, Sean C. Cunningham, Megan Whyman Olesek, for Plaintiff.

Brown Raysman Millstein Felder & Steiner, New York, NY, By: Seth Ostrow, Jeffrey P. Weingart, Eric C. Osterberg, for Defendant, of counsel.

Willcox & Savage, Norfolk, VA, By: Michael R. Katchmark, Gary A. Bryant, for Defendant, of counsel.

OPINION

SWEET, J.

*1 Defendant Micromuse, Inc. ("Micromuse") has moved pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), to dismiss the complaint of plaintiff Agilent Technologies, Inc. ("Agilent") alleging patent infringement, and, in the alternative, for a more definite statement pursuant to Rule 12(e), and to add Hewlett Packard Company ("H-P") as a necessary party under Rules 12(b)(7) and 19(a) of those same Rules. Micromuse has also moved to disqualify Gray Cary Ware & Freidenrich, LLP ("Gray Cary") from representing Agilent in this action, Gray Cary having previously represented NetWork Harmoni, Inc. ("Network Harmoni"), an entity acquired by Micromuse prior to the filing of this action. Agilent has cross-moved for

leave to file a supplemental declaration in opposition to Micromuse's motion to disqualify Gray Cary. For the reasons set forth below, Micromuse's motion to dismiss is denied, the motion for a more definite statement is granted, the motion to add H-P as a party is denied at this time with leave granted to renew, and the motion to disqualify is denied at this time with leave granted to renew. Agilent's cross-motion for leave to file a supplemental declaration is granted.

Prior Proceedings

The complaint in this patent infringement action was filed in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Norfolk Division, on November 10, 2003.

On December 17, 2003, Micromuse filed the instant motions in the Eastern District of Virginia as well as a motion to transfer the action to this district, which latter motion was granted by order of the Honorable Raymond A. Jackson filed on April 16, 2004. The action was transferred to this district on April 22, 2004.

The remaining motions were argued and marked fully submitted on May 19, 2004.

The Complaint

The following facts are drawn from Agilent's complaint and do not constitute findings of fact by the Court.

According to the complaint, Agilent is a Delaware corporation having its headquarters in Palo Alto, California, and significant operations in Fort Collins, Colorado. It is alleged that Micromuse is a Delaware Corporation with headquarters in San Francisco, California, and significant operations in Northern Virginia, Georgia, Illinois, Texas, New York, London, and other overseas destinations. Subject matter jurisdiction is alleged under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338.

With regard to the factual background of the complaint, it is alleged that:

6. Agilent is a leading provider of components,

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d

Page 2

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2004 WL 2346152 (S.D.N.Y.)

(Cite as: 2004 WL 2346152 (S.D.N.Y.))

test, measurement, monitoring and management solutions for the communications industry. Agilent's broad set of solutions and services includes, among other technologies, optical, wireless, Internet and broadband technologies that span the entire communications life cycle. Having invested substantial resources in the development of these technologies, Agilent maintains a portfolio of patents covering its inventions, including the patents at issue.

*2 7. On October 24, 2000, United States Patent No. 6,138,122 ("the '122 Patent"), entitled "Modeling of Internet Services," was duly and legally issued to Mark D. Smith, Deborah L. Caswell and Srinivas Ramanathan. All rights, title and interest in the '122 Patent were assigned to Agilent, which remains the sole owner of the '122 Patent....

8. On January 1, 2002, United States Patent No. 6,336,138 ("the '138 Patent"), entitled "Template-Driven Approach For Generating Models On Network Services," was duly and legally issued to Deborah L. Caswell, Srinivas Ramanathan, James D. Hunter, Scott S. Neal, Frederick A. Sicker and Mark D. Smith. All rights, title and interest in the '138 Patent were assigned to Hewlett-Packard Company. Agilent and Hewlett-Packard Company now jointly own the '138 Patent, and Agilent has the exclusive right to enforce the '138 Patent against Micromuse....

(Compl. at ¶¶ 6-8.) It is further alleged that Micromuse "makes, sells, or offers products for sale in this district that infringe Agilent's patents." (Compl. at ¶ 4.)

The complaint contains two counts and Micromuse's liability is alleged as follows:

COUNT ONE

Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,138,122

9. Agilent realleges the foregoing paragraphs.

10. Agilent is informed and believes that Micromuse has directly infringed and continues to infringe, has induced and continues to induce, and/or has committed and continues to commit acts of contributory infringement of, one or more claims of the '122 Patent.

11. Agilent is informed and believes that Micromuse's acts of patent infringement are and continue

to be willful and deliberate.

12. As a result of Micromuse's patent infringement, Agilent has suffered damages in an amount not yet determined, and will continue to suffer damages in the future.

13. Unless an injunction is issued enjoining Micromuse and its agents, servants, employees, attorneys, representatives, and all others acting on their behalf from infringing the '122 Patent, Agilent will be greatly and irreparably harmed.

COUNT TWO

Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,336,138

14. Agilent realleges the foregoing paragraphs.

15. Agilent is informed and believes that Micromuse has directly infringed and continues to infringe, has induced and continues to induce, and/or has committed and continues to commit acts of contributory infringement of, one or more claims of the '138 Patent.

16. Agilent is informed and believes that Micromuse's acts of patent infringement are and continue to be willful and deliberate.

17. As a result of Micromuse's patent infringement, Agilent has suffered damages in an amount not yet determined, and will continue to suffer damages in the future.

18. Unless an injunction is issued enjoining Micromuse and its agents, servants, employees, attorneys, representatives, and all others acting on its behalf from infringing the '138 Patent, Agilent will be greatly and irreparably harmed.

*3 (Compl. at ¶¶ 9-18.)

Discussion

I. Micromuse's Motion To Dismiss Is Denied

Micromuse has moved to dismiss Agilent's Complaint pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on the grounds that the complaint fails to meet the notice requirements of Rule 8(a) of those same Rules.

In considering a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6), the court should construe the complaint liberally, "accepting all factual allegations in the complaint as true, and drawing all reasonable inferences

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d

Page 3

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2004 WL 2346152 (S.D.N.Y.)

(Cite as: 2004 WL 2346152 (S.D.N.Y.))

in the plaintiff's favor," *Chambers v. Time Warner, Inc.*, 282 F.3d 147, 152 (2d Cir.2002) (citing *Gregory v. Daly*, 243 F.3d 687, 691 (2d Cir.2001)), although "mere conclusions of law or unwarranted deductions" need not be accepted. *First Nationwide Bank v. Gelf Funding Corp.*, 27 F.3d 763, 771 (2d Cir.1994). "The issue is not whether a plaintiff will ultimately prevail but whether the claimant is entitled to offer evidence to support the claims." *Villager Pond, Inc. v. Town of Darien*, 56 F.3d 375, 378 (2d Cir.1995) (quoting *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974)). In other words, "the office of a motion to dismiss is merely to assess the legal feasibility of the complaint, not to assay the weight of the evidence which might be offered in support thereof." *Eternity Global Master Fund Ltd. v. Morgan Guar. Trust Co. of New York*, 375 F.3d 168, 176 (2d Cir.2004) (quoting *Geisler v. Petrocelli*, 616 F.2d 636, 639 (2d Cir.1980)). Dismissal is only appropriate when "it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts which would entitle him or her to relief." *Sweet v. Sheahan*, 235 F.3d 80, 83 (2d Cir.2000); accord *Eternity Global Master Fund*, 375 F.3d at 176-77.

"The indulgent standard evident in these precedents is codified in Rule 8, which requires no more than 'a short and plain statement of [a] claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.'" *Id.* at 177 (quoting Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a)(2)) (alteration in original); see also *Wynder v. McMahon*, 360 F.3d 73, 76-77 & n. 5 (2d Cir.2004) (referring to the "bare-bones standards of Rule 8" and noting that "Rule 8 pleading is extremely permissive"). The Supreme Court has interpreted Rule 8 "not to require a claimant to set out in detail the facts upon which he bases his claim." *Leatherman v. Tarrant County Narcotics Intelligence & Coordination Unit*, 507 U.S. 163, 168 (1993) (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)). Indeed,

The federal rules require (with irrelevant exceptions) only that the complaint state a claim, not that it plead the facts that if true would establish (subject to any defenses) that the claim was valid.... All that need be specified is the bare minimum facts necessary to put the defendant on notice of the claim so that he can file an answer.

Higgs v. Carver, 286 F.3d 437, 439 (7th Cir.2002); see also *Scutti Enters., LLC v. Park Place Entm't*

Corp., 322 F.3d 211, 215 (2d Cir.2003) ("More extensive pleading of fact is not required because the Federal Rules of Procedure provide other devices besides pleadings that will serve to define the facts and issues and to dispose of unmeritorious claims.") (quoting 2 James Wm. Moore, et al., *Moore's Federal Practice* § 8.04[1] (3d ed.1999) (citation omitted)). Whether a complaint satisfies Rule 8(a)(2) is determined by whether the pleading provides fair notice to the opposing party. See *Conley*, 355 U.S. at 47; see also *Wynder*, 360 F.3d at 79 ("The key to Rule 8(a)'s requirements is whether adequate notice is given."). Accordingly, dismissal for failure to comply with the requirements of Rule 8 "is usually reserved for those cases in which the complaint is so confused, ambiguous, vague, or otherwise unintelligible that its true substance, if any, is well disguised." *Simmons v. Abruzzo*, 49 F.3d 83, 86 (2d Cir.1995) (quoting *Salahuddin v. Cuomo*, 861 F.2d 40, 42 (2d Cir.1988)).

*4 Here, Agilent's complaint establishes the jurisdiction of this Court, sets forth the ownership of the patents in suit and alleges that Micromuse makes, sells, or offers products for sale that infringe Agilent's patents. The complaint further alleges that Micromuse is liable for direct infringement, contributory infringement and infringement by inducement. Agilent has provided a "short and plain statement" of its claims against Micromuse and the nature of those claims is discernible. Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a)(2). Indeed, it would be difficult to frame a more skeletal pleading.

Micromuse nonetheless argues that dismissal of Agilent's complaint is appropriate because the complaint fails to specify any allegedly infringing product, fails to identify any allegedly infringing conduct, and fails to set forth any of the other actors implicated by the allegations that Micromuse has contributed to and induced patent infringement. The absence of allegations such as those described does not demonstrate that the harsh sanction of dismissal is appropriate here, as this absence does not make it "appear[] beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts which would entitle him or her to relief," *Sweet*, 235 F.3d at 83, nor that the complaint is "so confused, ambiguous, vague, or otherwise unintelligible that its true substance, if any, is well disguised." *Simmons*, 49 F.3d at 86 (quoting *Salahuddin*, 861 F.2d at 42);

see generally Glus v. Brooklyn E. Dist. Terminal, 359 U.S. 231, 235 (1959) ("It may well be that petitioner's complaint as now drawn is too vague, but that is no ground for dismissing his action.").

Where, as here, a pleading is sufficient to provide notice of the claim but does not contain sufficient information to allow a responsive pleading to be framed without risk of prejudice, the proper remedy is a motion for a more definite statement under Rule 12(e), Fed.R.Civ.P. See, e.g., Scott v. City of Chicago, 195 F.3d 950, 952 (7th Cir.1999); Sisk v. Texas Parks & Wildlife Dep't, 644 F.2d 1056, 1059 (5th Cir.1981); Harman v. Nat'l Bank of Arizona, 339 F.2d 564, 567 (9th Cir.1964); but compare Ondeo Nalco Co. v. Eka Chems., Inc., No. 01 Civ. 537(SLR), 2002 WL 1458853, at *1-2 (D. Del. June 10, 2002) (dismissing defendant's counterclaims where it was unclear which products were being accused, concluding that the pleading was "too vague to provide plaintiff with fair notice," and granting leave to amend).

II. Micromuse's Motion For A More Definite Statement Is Granted

Rule 12(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides in pertinent part that "[i]f a pleading to which a responsive pleading is permitted is so vague or ambiguous that a party cannot reasonably be required to frame a responsive pleading, the party may move for a more definite statement before interposing a responsive pleading." Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(e). Rule 12(e) applies only in limited circumstances:

*5 [T]he pleading must be sufficiently intelligible for the district court to be able to make out one or more potentially viable legal theories on which the claimant might proceed; in other words the pleading must be sufficient to survive a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss. At the same time, the pleading also must be so vague or ambiguous that the opposing party cannot respond to it, even with a simple denial as permitted by Rule 8(b), with a pleading that can be interposed in good faith or without prejudice to himself.

5C Charles Alan Wright & Arthur R. Miller, Federal Practice & Procedure § 1376 at 311 (3d ed.2004) (footnote omitted); see Humpherys v. Nager, 962

F.Supp. 347, 352-53 (E.D.N.Y.1997) ("A 12(b)(6) motion is one made for a failure to state a claim, while a 12(e) motion is proper when a complaint pleads a viable legal theory, but is so unclear that the opposing party cannot respond to the complaint."); but compare Home & Nature Inc. v. Sherman Speciality Co., 322 F.Supp.2d 260, 265 (E.D.N.Y.2004) ("Rule 12(e) motion should be denied if a complaint comports with the liberal pleading requirements of Rule 8(a).") (collecting cases).

Although motions pursuant to Rule 12(e) are generally disfavored where prompt resort to discovery may provide an adequate means for ascertaining relevant facts, see *id.*, courts have considered Rule 12(e) relief appropriate in patent infringement cases where a plaintiff has failed to identify any allegedly infringing product or products. See, e.g., In re Papst Licensing GmbH Patent Litig., Nos. MDL 1298 & 99 Civ. 3118, 2001 WL 179926, at *2 (E.D.La. Feb. 22, 2001) (concluding that the plaintiff's complaint must be amended to specifically identify which of the defendant's products are alleged to have infringed the plaintiff's patents); cf. In re Independent Serv. Org. Antitrust Litig., 85 F.Supp.2d 1130, 1169 (D.Kan.2000) (denying the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment on a defendant's counterclaim where the plaintiff argued that it did not have adequate notice of which of its devices allegedly infringed the defendant's patents, observing that the plaintiff had already answered the counterclaim and that, if the plaintiff "did not truly know which parts were covered by the patents identified, it could have filed a motion for a more definite statement under Rule 12(e)"). The cases cited by Agilent in opposition to Micromuse's motion do not suggest that a contrary result is required here, as they stand for the propositions that a pleading need not identify every infringing product where some other limiting parameter has been set forth or at least one purportedly infringing product has been identified. See Symbol Tech., Inc. v. Hand Held Prods., Inc., No. 03 Civ. 102(SLR), 2003 WL 22750145, at *3 (D.Del. Nov. 14, 2003) (denying a Rule 12(e) motion where there was a "finite" set of potentially infringing products under identified patents held by the defendant); Oki Elec. Indus. Co. v. LG Semicon Co., No. 97 Civ.

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d

Page 5

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2004 WL 2346152 (S.D.N.Y.)

(Cite as: 2004 WL 2346152 (S.D.N.Y.))

20310(SW), 1998 WL 101737, at *3 (N.D.Cal. Feb. 25, 1998) (denying a motion to dismiss where the plaintiff identified infringing products by specifying that the products concerned were "devices that embody the patented methods, including 4 megabit and higher density DRAMs") (internal quotation marks omitted), *aff'd*, 243 F.3d 559 (Fed.Cir.2000).

*6 Agilent's complaint does not specify which products infringed plaintiff's patents; it merely states that the alleged infringements occurred as a result of the fact that Micromuse "makes, sells, or offers products for sale ... that infringe Agilent's patents." (Compl. at ¶ 4.) Although Agilent's papers submitted in opposition to Micromuse's various motions suggest that Micromuse possesses at least four infringing products, those products have not been formally accused. Under these circumstances, Micromuse is entitled to know which of its products or services are alleged to have infringed Agilent's patents and a more definite statement setting forth that information is appropriate.

Micromuse has also argued that Agilent's complaint fails to identify the primary infringer with respect to the contributory and inducement claims. Micromuse has cited to a single unpublished authority in support of its argument that such identification is required to render a pleading answerable, and this authority, *Net Moneyin, Inc. v. Mellon Fin. Corp.*, No. 01 Civ. 441(TUC)(RCC), slip op. (D.Ariz. July 30, 2003), itself cites no other case law directly on point. Micromuse has accordingly failed to establish that relief under Rule 12(e) with respect to the identity of any primary infringers is appropriate.

Where a motion made under Rule 12(e) has been granted, the order of the court to provide a more definite statement must be obeyed within ten days after notice of the order "or within such other time as the court may fix." Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(e). Agilent is directed to comply with the grant of Micromuse's motion for a more definite statement by filing and serving an amended complaint within thirty (30) days of entry of this order and opinion.

III. *H-P Will Not Be Deemed A Necessary Party At This Time*

Micromuse argues that, if Agilent's complaint is not dismissed, H-P, as co-owner of the '138 Patent', should be joined as a necessary party to this lawsuit, pursuant to Rule 19(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. In addition, Micromuse asserts that if H-P is not so joined, the case should be dismissed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(7).

"Fed.R.Civ.P. 19 sets forth a two-step test for determining whether the court must dismiss an action for failure to join an indispensable party. First, the court must determine whether an absent party belongs in the suit, *i.e.*, whether the party qualifies as a 'necessary' party under Rule 19(a)." *Viacom Int'l, Inc. v. Kearney*, 212 F.3d 721, 724 (2d. Cir.2000). Rule 19(a) provides in relevant part that,

A person who is subject to service of process and whose joinder will not deprive the court of jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action shall be joined as a party in the action if (1) in the person's absence complete relief cannot be accorded among those already parties, or (2) the person claims an interest relating to the subject of the action and is so situated that the disposition of the action in the person's absence may (i) as a practical matter impair or impede the person's ability to protect that interest or (ii) leave any of the persons already parties subject to a substantial risk of incurring double, multiple, or otherwise inconsistent obligations by reason of the claimed interest. If the person has not been so joined, the court shall order that the person be made a party.

*7 Fed.R.Civ.P. 19(a). Second, if a party is deemed necessary, it then must be determined whether the party's absence warrants dismissal pursuant to Rule 19(b), Fed.R.Civ.P. See *Viacom Int'l*, 212 F.3d at 725. "If a party does not qualify as necessary under Rule 19(a), then the court need not decide whether its absence warrants dismissal under Rule 19(b)." *Id.* at 724 (citing *Associated Dry Goods Corp. v. Towers Fin. Corp.*, 920 F.2d 1121, 1123 (2d Cir.1990)).

As a general matter, "United States patent law ... requires that all co-owners normally must join as plaintiffs in an infringement suit." *Int'l Nutrition Co. v. Horphag Research Ltd.*, 257 F.3d 1324, 1331 (Fed.Cir.2001); see also *Ethicon, Inc. v. United States Surgical Corp.*, 135 F.3d 1456, 1468

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d

Page 6

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2004 WL 2346152 (S.D.N.Y.)

(Cite as: 2004 WL 2346152 (S.D.N.Y.))

(Fed.Cir.1998) (stating that, "as a matter of substantive patent law, all co-owners must ordinarily consent to join as plaintiff in an infringement suit") (footnote omitted); see generally *Waterman v. MacKenzie*, 138 U.S. 252, 255- 56 (1891). As one court has explained, since " 'all co-owners have standing to sue for infringement, if all the co-owners are not joined in an infringement suit, there may be a risk that the defendant will be subject to multiple suits.' " *E.Z. Bowz, L.L.C. v. Prof'l Prod. Research Co.*, No. 00 Civ. 8670(LTS)(GWG), 2003 WL 22064257, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 5, 2003) (quoting *Int'l Bus. Machs. Corp. v. Conner Peripherals, Inc.*, No. 93 Civ. 20591(RMW), 1994 WL 409493, at *3 (N.D.Cal. Jan. 28, 1994)); see also *Union Trust Nat'l Bank v. Audio Devices, Inc.*, 295 F.Supp. 25, 27 (S.D.N.Y.1969) ("That all co-owners be parties to a suit is a necessary requirement if conflicting decisions about the same patent (for example, its validity) are to be avoided."); cf. *Vaupel Textilmaschinen KG v. Meccanica Euro Italia S.P.A.*, 944 F.2d 870, 875 (Fed.Cir.1991) ("The policy underlying the requirement to join the owner when an exclusive licensee brings suit is to prevent the possibility of two suits on the same patent against a single infringer.").

"Since the introduction of Fed.R.Civ.P. 19 and the 1966 amendments to the rule, however, 'courts are less concerned with abstract characterizations of the parties and more concerned with whether the rights of the parties can be fairly adjudicated absent joinder of the patent co-owner.' " *E.Z. Bowz*, 2003 WL 22064257, at *3 (quoting *Michaels of Oregon Co. v. Mil-Tech, Inc.*, No. 95 Civ. 908(MA), 1995 WL 852122, at *1 (D.Or. Oct. 17, 1995)); cf. *Howes v. Med. Components, Inc.*, 698 F.Supp. 574, 576 (E.D. Pa.1988) ("[T]he adoption of the 1966 amendments to Rule 19 'makes inappropriate any contention that patent co-owners are *per se* indispensable in infringement suits.' ") (quoting *Catanzaro v. Int'l Tel. & Tel. Corp.*, 378 F.Supp. 203, 205 (D.Del.1974)).

Thus, where the co-owner of a patent or other entity or individual whose interest in a patent might be directly affected by litigation has specifically disclaimed all interest in pursuing litigation related to the patent in favor of the party who has brought the suit, courts have held that joinder of the co-owner or other entity

or individual is not necessary. See *Vaupel Textilmaschinen*, 944 F.2d at 875-76 (concluding that the policy to join an owner when an exclusive licensee bring suit in order to preclude the possibility of duplicative lawsuits was not undercut where, pursuant to express agreements, the right to sue rested solely with the licensee and denying the defendant's Rule 19 motion); *E-Z Bowz*, 2003 WL 22064257, at *4-5 (holding that the defendant would not be subject to a substantial risk of incurring inconsistent obligations where the former co-owner of certain patents had relinquished her interest in the patents as well as any rights of action relating to the patents and concluding that the rights of the parties could be fairly adjudicated without joinder of the absent former co-owner); *Michaels of Oregon*, 1995 WL 852122, at *2-3 (determining that an absent co-owner of certain patents was not a necessary party where that absent co-owner had entered into an agreement with the plaintiff providing that only the plaintiff might file actions for patent infringement); compare *Parkson Corp. v. Andritz Sprout-Bauer, Inc.*, 866 F.Supp. 773, 775 (S.D.N.Y.1995) (concluding that it was not possible to determine whether an owner was a necessary party to an action brought by an exclusive licensee where the licensing agreement did not unambiguously give the licensee control over whether infringement claims should be brought); *Howes*, 698 F.Supp. at 577 (concluding that an absent patent co-owner was a necessary party where the defendants might face the risk of relitigation by that co-owner).

*8 Although the complaint alleges that Agilent and H-P jointly own the '138 Patent, it further alleges that Agilent enjoys the exclusive right to enforce the '138 Patent against Micromuse. In opposition to Micromuse's motion, Agilent has submitted a redacted version of an August 22, 2003 agreement between Agilent and H-P (the "August Agreement") regarding their respective rights concerning the enforcement of the '138 Patent. According to the August Agreement, H-P grants to Agilent "the exclusive right to license the ['138] Patent to Micromuse." (Declaration of Megan Whyman Olesek, dated Jan. 15, 2004 ("Olesek Decl."), Exh. X at ¶ 1.) H-P further grants to Agilent "the exclusive right to enforce the ['138] Patent to and against Micromuse" including by "filing

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d

Page 7

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2004 WL 2346152 (S.D.N.Y.)

(Cite as: 2004 WL 2346152 (S.D.N.Y.))

and prosecuting the Agilent Patent Suit to final judgment, including appeals." [FN1] (*Id.*) H-P has also agreed that

[FN1]. The "Agilent Patent Suit" is defined as "a patent infringement lawsuit against Micromuse." (Olesek Decl., Exh. X, preamble.)

[A]s between the parties, Agilent shall have the full power and authority to control the Agilent Patent Suit and any settlement thereof and shall retain one hundred percent (100%) of any damages or compensation received in connection with the Agilent Patent Suit or settlement thereof.

(*Id.* at ¶ 3.)

Based on the terms of the August Agreement, it does not appear that H-P's absence from this lawsuit will subject Micromuse to any "substantial risk of incurring double, multiple, or otherwise inconsistent obligations," Fed.R.Civ.P. 19(a), because H-P has no independent capacity to file a patent infringement action against Micromuse based on the '138 Patent, having expressly disclaimed any interest in pursuing a claim against Micromuse with respect to the '138 Patent. In light of the broad contractual language by which H-P has granted Agilent the exclusive right to enforce the '138 Patent against Micromuse, the absence of any provision in the August Agreement stating that H-P agrees to be bound by the outcome of this litigation is not determinative here. Likewise, the absence of an affirmative representation that H-P has relinquished its right to sue Micromuse for any purported past infringement does not, contrary to the argument advanced by Micromuse, require joinder of H-P. On the facts now available, it thus appears that complete relief can be accorded among those already parties.

Micromuse has noted, however, that the August Agreement makes explicit reference to the existence of a Master Patent Ownership and License Agreement and that the August Agreement is an agreement among Agilent and H-P "together with Hewlett Packard Development Company, L.P." (Olesek Decl., Exh. X, preamble), an entity that, according to Micromuse, may also have an interest in the '138 Patent. Micromuse has further observed that the redacted form of the August Agreement does not set forth its

effective term or termination provisions and suggests that the absence of such provisions raises questions of whether H-P enjoys a reversion, termination, or expiration interest in the '138 Patent, questions which may, in turn, affect any determination as to whether H-P is a necessary party here. See, e.g., Moore U.S.A. Inc. v. Standard Register Co., 60 F.Supp.2d 104, 109-110 (W.D.N.Y.1999) (concluding that a licensor was a necessary party to a patent infringement action despite the existence of an agreement with the plaintiff licensee granting the licensee sole and exclusive rights to sue for infringement where the agreement was of fixed term and where the licensor retained a reversionary interest in the patent).

*9 Although the facts presently available do not establish that H-P is a necessary party, Micromuse's observations suggest that developments resulting from discovery may cause the issue of H-P's joinder to be revisited. Accordingly, Micromuse's motion to join H-P is denied at this time and leave is hereby granted to renew the motion after further discovery.

IV. Gray Cary Will Not Be Disqualified At This Time

Micromuse has moved to disqualify Gray Cary from representing Agilent in this matter on the grounds that, for many years, Gray Cary provided extensive legal representation to Network Harmoni, a company acquired by Micromuse in August 2003. Micromuse argues that Network Harmoni's suite of proprietary intelligent software agents is now part of Micromuse's product offerings and, under the current complaint, potentially the target of Agilent's patent infringement claims. Micromuse asserts that Gray Cary thus formerly represented Network Harmoni in matters substantially related to the subject matter of this action and must be disqualified from representing Agilent as a result. Agilent opposes Micromuse's motion, arguing that in its representation of Network Harmoni Gray Cary was at all times in an adverse relationship to Micromuse and that Gray Cary's prior representation of Network Harmoni involved no confidential information about the product or products at issue in the present action. [FN2]

[FN2]. Following briefing on Micromuse's

motion, Agilent moved for leave to submit a supplemental declaration, claiming the need to respond to certain contentions in Micromuse's reply papers, and Micromuse opposed the motion. Agilent's motion for leave to submit the supplemental declaration is granted. Although submission of supplemental papers is often more of a hindrance than a help, the issues addressed in the supplemental papers presented here are carefully cabined and respond to arguably new contentions contained in reply papers on the underlying motion. Where this is true, and where, as here, the opposing party has disclaimed any prejudice resulting from the submission of the supplemental papers, there is no evidence of bad faith by the party seeking to submit the supplemental papers, and "the parties will be best served by the Court's deciding the ... issue presented to it on the most complete factual basis possible," Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co. v. BP Amoco P.L.C., No. 03 Civ. 200(GEL), 2003 WL 1618534, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 27, 2003), leave to submit supplemental papers is appropriately granted.

Motions to disqualify counsel have long been disfavored in this Circuit. See, e.g., Evans v. Artek Sys. Corp., 715 F.2d 788, 791-92 (2d Cir.1983) (enumerating the reasons for which disqualification motions are disfavored); Bennett Silvershein Assoc. v. Furman, 776 F.Supp. 800, 802 (S.D.N.Y.1991) ("The Second Circuit has indeed been loathe to separate a client from his chosen attorney") (collecting cases). "Disqualification motions are often made for tactical reasons, and thereby unduly interfere with a party's right to employ counsel of his choice." Skidmore v. Warburg Dillon Read LLC, No. 99 Civ. 10525(NRB), 2001 WL 504876, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. May 11, 2001) (citing Board of Educ. v. Nyquist, 590 F.2d 1241, 1246 (2d Cir.1979)). Moreover, disqualification motions, "even when made in the best of faith ... inevitably cause delay." Evans, 715 F.2d at 792 (quoting Nyquist, 590 F.2d at 1246). A "high standard of proof" is therefore required from one who moves to disqualify counsel. *Id.* at 791 (quoting Gov-

ernment of India v. Cook Industries, Inc., 569 F.2d 737, 739 (2d Cir.1978)). The appearance of impropriety alone does not warrant disqualification. See Nyquist, 590 F.2d at 1246-47.

In determining whether an attorney can oppose his former client, courts evaluate whether the new matter is substantially related to the subject matter of the prior representation. An attorney may be disqualified from representing a client in a particular case if:

(1) the moving party is a former client of the adverse party's counsel;

*10 (2) there is a substantial relationship between the subject matter of the counsel's prior representation of the moving party and the issues in the present lawsuit; and

(3) the attorney whose disqualification is sought had access to, or was likely to have had access to, relevant privileged information in the course of his prior representation of the client.

Id. at 791. "Under this standard, proof of substantial similarity must be 'patently clear' to warrant disqualification." Decora Inc. v. DW Wallcovering, Inc., 899 F.Supp. 132, 136 (S.D.N.Y.1995) (quoting Government of India, 569 F.2d at 739-40) (additional citations omitted). A "substantial relationship" exists where facts pertinent to the problems underlying the prior representation are relevant to the subsequent representation. See U.S. Football League v. Nat'l Football League, 605 F.Supp. 1448, 1459-60 & n. 25 (S.D.N.Y.1985) ("It is the congruence of *factual* matters, rather than areas of law, that establishes a substantial relationship between representations for disqualification purposes.") (emphasis in original).

According to Micromuse, Network Harmoni evolved from a research project in network visualization software conducted at Curtin University in Perth, Australia. In 1996, the founders of the project formed NDG Software, Inc., and in November 1998 the company received its first venture funding and moved its headquarters from Australia to San Diego, California. It is alleged that Gray Cary initially provided advice, counsel and representation in establishing and structuring this U.S.-based company and its operations, and served as outside counsel. Subsequently, NDG Software, Inc., changed its name to Network Harmoni, Inc.

During the time of Gray Cary's representation, Network Harmoni developed and licensed to its customers, including Agilent and Micromuse, proprietary intelligent software agents designed to provide users with information on the status and security of computer networks, systems and applications. Micromuse contends that Gray Cary, during its five-year relationship with Network Harmoni, represented Network Harmoni in its corporate affairs, employment issues, in prosecuting its patents and trademarks and handling other patent and trademark-related matters, in evaluating third-party patents, and in drafting and negotiating licensing agreements, financing instruments and other corporate-related documents.

Over the course of its representation of Network Harmoni, Gray Cary is alleged to have drafted and filed several patent applications with the United States Patent and Trademark Office relating to certain aspects of Network Harmoni's software products and was informed of virtually all attributes and potential uses of Network Harmoni's suite of proprietary intelligent software agents, as well as the company's plans for future software applications and services.

According to Micromuse, Gray Cary represented Network Harmoni in its negotiations to be purchased by Micromuse, and Network Harmoni and Micromuse executed a non-disclosure agreement to assure that the parties could have full and complete discussions without the use of such information for non-acquisition purposes.

*11 It is further alleged that in three rounds of financing, Gray Cary was allowed to participate on the same basis as the initial preferred investors and became a shareholder of Network Harmoni, and until September 1999, one of its lawyers served as a member of its board of directors. Gray Cary sold its stock in connection with Network Harmoni's acquisition by Micromuse.

In opposition to Micromuse's motion it is alleged that Gray Cary first became aware of a potential claim against Micromuse by Agilent on September 19, 2003, when Agilent approached Gray Cary about the possibility of Gray Cary handling the matter for Agilent. It is also alleged that on December 8, 2003, an

ethical wall was established to isolate all attorneys working on Agilent matters from any and all information related to any matter in which Network Harmoni had been a client for the firm.

Agilent asserts that Gray Cary never had an attorney-client relationship with Micromuse and that such a relationship may not be inferred from Micromuse's disclosure of confidential business information to Network Harmoni and its then-counsel Gray Cary during negotiations for the acquisition of Network Harmoni. At present, however, there appears to be no dispute that Micromuse is entitled to seek Gray Cary's disqualification based on Gray Cary's prior representation of Micromuse's wholly owned subsidiary, Network Harmoni. *See generally Harford Accident & Indem. Co. v. RJR Nabisco, Inc.*, 721 F.Supp. 534, 539-40 (S.D.N.Y.1989) (concluding that the plaintiff's law firm would be deemed to have previously represented the defendant where the plaintiff's law firm had previously represented the defendant corporation's subsidiary and the defendant corporation had taken in active role with regard to the law firm's representation of its subsidiary); *cf. Decora*, 899 F.Supp. at 137 (concluding that the plaintiff could properly seek disqualification of the defendant's attorney in a patent infringement action where the attorney had previously represented the plaintiff's parent corporation, thereby learning certain of the plaintiff's trade secrets).

Assuming without deciding that the first prong of the test set forth in *Evans* has therefore been satisfied, Micromuse's motion for disqualification is denied nonetheless, since, to date, Micromuse has not met its burden of proof with respect to establishing a "substantial relationship" between Gray Cary's former representation of Network Harmoni and its current representation of Agilent. It has not been shown that Gray Cary gave Network Harmoni advice on the validity of the patents in suit, including whether there was infringement by Network Harmoni of the patents in suit. All that has been established is that Gray Cary advised Network Harmoni on corporate governance issues, employment matters, original equipment manufacturer ("OEM") agreements, patent and trademark filings, and financing instruments. Prior general business representation by the plaintiff's law firm of an

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d

Page 10

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2004 WL 2346152 (S.D.N.Y.)

(Cite as: 2004 WL 2346152 (S.D.N.Y.))

entity related to the defendant on matters unrelated to the lawsuit at issue does not meet the high burden of establishing a conflict. *See, e.g., In re Maritima Aragua, S.A.*, 847 F.Supp. 1177, 1182-83 (S.D.N.Y.1994).

*12 The Micromuse products and services alleged to be violative of the Agilent patent will be identified as a consequence of the granting of Micromuse's motion for a more definite statement. Thereafter, discovery may be sought with respect to the knowledge and participation of Gray Cary in the development of any such accused products or services. Should this discovery yield additional facts establishing that the prior representation of Network Harmoni by Gray Cary dealt with issues presented in this action, leave is granted to Micromuse to renew its disqualification motion, which motion is denied at this time.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, Micromuse's motion to dismiss the complaint is denied and its motion for a more definite statement is granted. Agilent is directed to comply with the grant of Micromuse's motion for a more definite statement by filing and serving an amended complaint within thirty (30) days of entry of this order and opinion. In addition, Micromuse's motions to add HP as a party and to disqualify Gray Cary are denied at this time with leave to renew. Agilent's motion to file a supplemental declaration is granted.

It is so ordered.

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2004 WL 2346152 (S.D.N.Y.)

Motions, Pleadings and Filings [\(Back to top\)](#)

- [2005 WL 2841222](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Micromuse Inc.'s Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Motion of Agilent Technologies, Inc., for Entry of Protective Order (Apr. 20, 2005)Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2005 WL 2841221](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Plaintiff Agilent Technologies,

Inc.'s Opposition to Defendant Micromuse Inc.'s Motion to Consolidate (Mar. 21, 2005)Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2005 WL 2841220](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion of Micromuse Inc. to Consolidate (Mar. 7, 2005)
- [2005 WL 2841219](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Reply of Micromuse Inc. to Counterclaims of Agilent Technologies, Inc. (Jan. 3, 2005)Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2004 WL 3567814](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Palintiff Agilent Technologies, Inc.'s Reply to Counterclaims of Micromuse, Inc. (Dec. 14, 2004)
- [2004 WL 3567813](#) (Trial Pleading) Amended Answer and Counterclaims of Micromuse Inc. Inc Response to First Amended Complaint of Agilent Technologies, Inc. (Dec. 7, 2004)Original Image of this Document with Appendix (PDF)
- [2004 WL 3567812](#) (Trial Pleading) Answer and Counterclaims of Micromuse Inc. in Response to First Amended Complaint of Agilent Technologies, Inc. (Nov. 30, 2004)
- [2004 WL 3567811](#) (Trial Pleading) First Amended Complaint for Patent Infringement (Nov. 12, 2004)Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2004 WL 3717668](#) (Trial Pleading) First Amended Complaint for Patent Infringement (Nov. 12, 2004)
- [1:04cv03090](#) (Docket) (Apr. 22, 2004)
- [2004 WL 3567815](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion of Micromuse Inc. to Consolidate (2004)
- [2004 WL 3567816](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Agilent Technologies, Inc.'s Motion for Entry of Protective Order (2004)Original Image of this Document (PDF)

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d

Page 11

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2004 WL 2346152 (S.D.N.Y.)

(Cite as: **2004 WL 2346152 (S.D.N.Y.)**)

- 2004 WL 3567817 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Reply Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Agilent Technologies, Inc.'s Motion for Entry of Protective Order, (2004)Original Image of this Document (PDF)

END OF DOCUMENT