

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
ATEMEL CORPORATION, et al.,  
  
Defendants.

CASE NO. C20-1216JLR  
  
ORDER GRANTING IN PART  
AND DENYING IN PART  
ATEMEL’S MOTION TO DISMISS  
  
PROVISIONALLY FILED  
UNDER SEAL

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Before the court is Defendants Atmel Corporation and Atmel Global Sales Ltd.’s (collectively, “Atmel”) motion to dismiss Plaintiff Microsoft Corporation’s (“Microsoft”) complaint. (MTD (Dkt. # 29); *see also* Reply (Dkt. ## 57 (sealed), 64 (redacted)).) Microsoft opposes Atmel’s motion. (Resp. (Dkt. ## 52 (sealed), 62 (redacted)).) Having considered the motion, the parties’ submissions regarding the motion, the relevant

//  
//

1 portions of the record, and the applicable law,<sup>1</sup> the court GRANTS in part and DENIES  
2 in part Atmel’s motion to dismiss.

## 3 II. BACKGROUND

### 4 A. Factual Background<sup>2</sup>

5 This breach of contract case stems from a component purchase agreement (the  
6 “CPA”) executed between Microsoft and Atmel on August 12, 2011. (Compl. (Dkt. ## 1  
7 (sealed), 22 (redacted)) ¶ 10.) The CPA governs the sale of certain Atmel components  
8 for incorporation into Microsoft hardware products. (*Id.* ¶¶ 10-12; 9/28/20 Ohlert Decl.  
9 (Dkt. # 45) ¶ 3, Ex. 1 (Dkt. ## 43 (redacted), 46 (sealed)) (“CPA”).) Exhibit A of the  
10 CPA is used to list which components are governed by the agreement, and the parties  
11 have amended Exhibit A to include more components as Microsoft has purchased them to  
12 be incorporated into new devices. (Compl. ¶ 12.)

13 The CPA includes a covenant not to sue (the “CNS”), which states that Atmel will  
14 “not assert against Microsoft . . . a claim of direct or indirect patent infringement arising  
15 from the manufacture, sale, import, use, distribution, or other disposal of the Microsoft  
16 Device[.]” (*Id.* ¶ 13; CPA at 6.) The CNS states that it shall last until at least four years  
17 from the first delivery of an Atmel component, or two years after the expiration or  
18

---

19 <sup>1</sup> Microsoft and Atmel both request oral argument. (*See* MTD at 1; Resp. at 1.) But the  
20 court finds oral argument would not be helpful to the disposition of this motion and therefore  
declines to hold oral argument. *See* Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(b)(4).

21 <sup>2</sup> For the purposes of a motion to dismiss, the court accepts all well-pleaded allegations in  
22 the complaint as true and draws all reasonable inferences in favor of the plaintiff. *Wylter Summit  
P’ship v. Turner Broad. Sys., Inc.*, 135 F.3d 658, 661 (9th Cir. 1998).

1 termination of the CPA, whichever is later. (*Id.*) In 2014, Atmel and Microsoft agreed  
2 that the CPA would extend until August 12, 2016, and would be automatically extended  
3 on a yearly basis after that, unless either party terminated the agreement. (Compl. ¶ 16.)  
4 Under the CPA, Atmel also agreed to defend and indemnify Microsoft against all claims  
5 that, if true, would establish that an Atmel component infringes on or contributes to  
6 infringement of a third party’s intellectual property right if that component is part of a  
7 covered Microsoft device. (*Id.* ¶ 19.)

8 In 2016, Atmel was acquired by Microchip Technology Incorporated  
9 (“Microchip”), which maintains Atmel as a wholly owned subsidiary. (*Id.* ¶ 5.) In  
10 December of 2018, Neodron Ltd.<sup>3</sup> (“Neodron”), Atmel, and Microchip entered into a  
11 patent sale and assignment agreement (“PSA”). (*Id.* ¶ 17.) Through the PSA, Neodron  
12 acquired the right to a number of Atmel’s patents. (*Id.*) As of August 10, 2020, Neodron  
13 had sued Microsoft nine times in four jurisdictions for infringing patents that previously  
14 belonged to Atmel. (*Id.* ¶ 18.) All nine of these suits involved alleged infringement  
15 arising from Microsoft’s sale and import of devices that incorporate Atmel components  
16 purchased under the CPA. (*Id.*)

## 17 **B. Procedural Background**

18 On August 10, 2020, Microsoft filed its complaint against Atmel and Neodron.  
19 (*See* Compl.) Microsoft brings claims against Atmel for breaching the covenant not to  
20 sue, (*id.* ¶¶ 29-31); the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, (*id.* ¶¶ 32-36); the duty to

---

21  
22 <sup>3</sup> While Microsoft initially named Neodron as a Defendant, it has since dismissed all  
claims against Neodron with prejudice. (Not. of Dismissal (Dkt. # 67).)

1 defend Microsoft, (*id.* ¶¶ 37-41); and the duty to indemnify Microsoft, (*id.* ¶¶ 42-45).

2 Atmel filed its motion to dismiss on September 29, 2020. (*See* MTD.) On January 28,  
3 2021, Microsoft dismissed all claims against Neodron with prejudice. (Not. of  
4 Dismissal.)

### 5 **III. ANALYSIS**

6 Atmel moves to dismiss all claims brought by Microsoft. (*See generally* MTD.) It  
7 also argues that Microsoft’s response to its motion includes new allegations and  
8 improperly relies on documents not included with Microsoft’s complaint. (*See* Reply at  
9 2-4.) The court first lays out the appropriate legal standard before addressing which  
10 documents it will consider when evaluating Atmel’s motion to dismiss. It then turns to  
11 the merits of Atmel’s motion.

#### 12 **A. Legal Standard**

13 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) provides for dismissal for “failure to  
14 state a claim upon which relief can be granted.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). When  
15 considering a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6), the court construes the complaint in  
16 the light most favorable to the nonmoving party. *Livid Holdings Ltd. v. Salomon Smith*  
17 *Barney, Inc.*, 416 F.3d 940, 946 (9th Cir. 2005). The court must accept all well-pleaded  
18 facts as true and draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the plaintiff. *Wylor Summit*  
19 *P’ship v. Turner Broad. Sys., Inc.*, 135 F.3d 658, 661 (9th Cir. 1998). The court,  
20 however, is not required “to accept as true allegations that are merely conclusory,  
21 unwarranted deductions of fact, or unreasonable inferences.” *Sprewell v. Golden State*  
22 *Warriors*, 266 F.3d 979, 988 (9th Cir. 2001). “To survive a motion to dismiss, a

1 | complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to  
2 | relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting  
3 | *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)); *see also Telesaurus VPC, LLC v.*  
4 | *Power*, 623 F.3d 998, 1003 (9th Cir. 2010). “A claim has facial plausibility when the  
5 | plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that  
6 | the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 677-78. Dismissal  
7 | under Rule 12(b)(6) can be based on the lack of a cognizable legal theory or the absence  
8 | of sufficient facts alleged under a cognizable legal theory. *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police*  
9 | *Dep’t*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990).

10 | **B. Documents and Allegations Considered**

11 | As a threshold matter, the court must determine what, if any, documents outside  
12 | the complaint it will consider in evaluating the motion to dismiss. Atmel contends that  
13 | Microsoft improperly raises new arguments and inappropriately relies on 13 attached  
14 | documents.” (*See Reply at 2-4; see also 10/7/20 Ohlert Decl. (Dkt. # 54 (sealed))*  
15 | (*authenticating 13 exhibits; Dunn Decl. (Dkt. # 53 (sealed)), Exs. 1-13.*)

16 | Although the scope of review on a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim is  
17 | generally limited to the complaint, a court may consider evidence on which the complaint  
18 | “necessarily relies” if: (1) the complaint refers to the document; (2) the document is  
19 | central to the plaintiff’s claim; and (3) no party questions the authenticity of the  
20 | document. *Daniels-Hall v. Nat’l Educ. Ass’n*, 629 F.3d 992, 998 (9th Cir. 2010) (quoting  
21 | *Marder v. Lopez*, 450 F.3d 445, 448 (9th Cir. 2006)).

22 | //

1 In its opposition, Microsoft contends only that its complaint relies on and refers to  
2 the five exhibits that are letters from Microsoft to Atmel tendering claims for defense and  
3 indemnification. (*See* Resp. at 13 (citing Compl. ¶¶ 20, 39; Dunn. Decl., Exs. 7-11).)  
4 Atmel does not dispute the authenticity of these documents (*see generally* Reply), and so  
5 the court will consider them.<sup>4</sup> But Microsoft does not submit that its complaint refers to  
6 or relies on the remaining eight exhibits. (*See generally* Resp.; *compare* Dunn Decl.,  
7 Exs. 1-6, 12-13, *with* Compl.) Thus, the court will not consider these eight exhibits while  
8 ruling on Atmel’s motion to dismiss. *See Daniels-Hall*, 639 F.3d at 998. Similarly, the  
9 court will not consider new allegations raised in Microsoft’s response that have no basis  
10 in the complaint.<sup>5</sup> *See Schneider v. Cal. Dep’t of Corr.*, 151 F.3d 1194, 1197 n.1 (9th  
11 Cir. 1998) (“In determining the propriety of a Rule 12(b)(6) dismissal, a court may not  
12 look beyond the complaint to a plaintiff’s moving papers, such as a memorandum in  
13 opposition to a defendant’s motion to dismiss.”). Thus, the court will only consider  
14 Exhibits 7-11 filed with Microsoft’s response. (*See* Dunn. Decl., Exs. 7-11)

---

17  
18 <sup>4</sup> Atmel argues that the court may not consider these documents because they were not attached  
19 to the complaint. (Reply at 2-3 (citing *Akhtar v. Mesa*, 698 F.3d 1202, 1212 (9th Cir. 2012)  
20 (“When reviewing a motion to dismiss, we consider only allegations contained in the pleadings,  
21 exhibits attached to the complaint, and matters properly subject to judicial notice.”)).) But  
neither Atmel’s quoted portion of *Akhtar* nor other case law suggests a bright line rule that the  
document must be attached to the complaint. *See Daniels-Hall*, 639 F.3d at 998 (considering  
document referenced by, but not attached to, complaint); *Del Vecchio v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, No.  
C11-0366RSL, 2012 WL 1997697, at \*7 (W.D. Wash. June 1, 2012) (same).

22 <sup>5</sup> To the extent these new allegations merit further comment from the court, they are  
discussed in its analysis below.

1 **C. Breach of Covenant Not to Sue**

2 Atmel contends that it cannot have breached the CNS because it has not sued  
3 Microsoft. (MTD at 3-4.) Atmel also argues that, as a matter of law, it “could not have  
4 breached a covenant not to sue by simply selling patents because when the patents were  
5 sold, they were sold to Neodron with all restrictions and encumbrances, known or  
6 unknown.” (*Id.* at 4 (citing *Datatreasury Corp. v. Wells Fargo & Co.*, 522 F.3d 1368,  
7 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (“[B]ecause the owner of a patent cannot transfer an interest  
8 greater than that which it possesses, an assignee takes a patent subject to the legal  
9 encumbrances thereon.”))).)

10 Microsoft responds that Atmel’s contention that the sale of the patents breached  
11 the CNS is a “strawman” of Atmel’s own construction. (Resp. at 1.) Microsoft argues  
12 that Atmel not only sold a significant portion of its patent portfolio to Neodron but also  
13 provided confidential information and technical support to Neodron to assist in  
14 developing theories of infringement and gave Neodron a \$3 million loan to ensure that  
15 Neodron’s suit would succeed. (*Id.* at 1, 3-4.) In support of its claim, Microsoft cites  
16 cases where courts have found that a party violated a CNS by providing financial support  
17 for a third party to sue in its stead. (*Id.* at 6 (collecting cases).)

18 But Microsoft’s theory of lawsuit-by-proxy exists only in its response to Atmel’s  
19 motion, and its complaint makes no factual allegations to support such a theory.  
20 (*Compare* Resp., *with* Compl.) Microsoft’s complaint does not mention any confidential  
21 information, technical support, or financial support Atmel provided to Neodron to ensure  
22 the patent litigations occurred. (*See generally* Compl.) The only allegation in the

1 complaint resembling this theory is that “Atmel sold its patents to Neodron to enable  
2 Neodron [to assert a claim for patent infringement against Microsoft].” (*Id.* ¶ 30.)  
3 Microsoft has failed to plead sufficient factual content such that the court may draw a  
4 reasonable inference that Atmel is liable for violating the CNS. *See Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at  
5 677-78. Therefore, the court DISMISSES Microsoft’s claim based on breach of a  
6 covenant not to sue without prejudice and with leave to amend. *See Lopez v. Smith*, 203  
7 F.3d 1122, 1127 (9th Cir. 2000) (where claims are dismissed under Rule 12(b)(6), the  
8 court “should grant leave to amend . . . unless it determines that the pleading could not  
9 possibly be cured by the allegation of other facts”).

#### 10 **D. Breach of Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing**

11 Microsoft’s claim based on a breach of a covenant of good faith and fair dealing is  
12 also deficient. Microsoft contends that it is not the sale of the patents that breached the  
13 covenant, but “Atmel’s breach of the CPA’s CNS provision and its attempt to circumvent  
14 the spirit of the contract.” (Resp. at 9.) According to Microsoft, “Atmel’s actions of  
15 actively seeking out, enabling, and financially benefitting from Neodron’s patent  
16 infringement lawsuits” are contrary to its reasonable and justified expectations under  
17 their contract and frustrates the contract’s purpose. (*Id.* at 10.) Once again, however,  
18 none of Microsoft’s detailed allegations against Atmel regarding its violation of the  
19 covenant are contained in its complaint. (*See generally* Compl.) Microsoft’s complaint  
20 alleges that “Atmel orchestrate[d] the sale of its patent to Neodron for the purpose of  
21 enabling and encouraging Neodron to sue Microsoft.” (*Id.* ¶ 34.) It provides no  
22 allegations of how Atmel “actively [sought] out, enable[ed], or financially benefit[ed]”



1 from these suits. (*See generally id.*) The court is not obligated to accept conclusory  
2 allegations, bereft of any supporting details, as true. *See Sprewell* 266 F.3d at 988. Thus,  
3 the court DISMISSES Microsoft’s claim based on breach of a covenant of good faith and  
4 fair dealing without prejudice and with leave to amend.

5 **E. Breach of Duties to Defend and Indemnify**

6 Microsoft also brings claims that Atmel breached its duties to defend and  
7 indemnify Microsoft under the CPA. (Compl. ¶¶ 37-45). Atmel contends that  
8 Microsoft’s allegations for these claims are conclusory and provide insufficient notice of  
9 the alleged conduct that breached the duties. (MTD at 7.) Specifically, Atmel argues that  
10 the complaint fails to identify which Microsoft devices Neodron accused of infringement  
11 and which Atmel components were used in those devices. (*Id.*)

12 Microsoft’s complaint, however, goes further than Atmel suggests. It alleges that  
13 Microsoft provided Atmel with reasonable notice and tendered its defense and  
14 indemnification obligations to Atmel for nine patent infringement lawsuits filed by  
15 Neodron. (Compl. ¶¶ 19-20, 38-40, 43-45.) Microsoft also identifies the patents at issue  
16 in the infringement suits brought by Neodron. (*Id.* ¶ 18.) Even if this were insufficient,  
17 the court has determined that it will consider Microsoft’s communications tendering its  
18 defense and indemnification obligations to Atmel. *See supra* § III.B; (Dunn Decl., Exs.  
19 7-11.) These communications put Atmel on notice of the conduct that Microsoft alleges  
20 breached the duties of defense and indemnification. One communication provides the  
21 exact list of Atmel components used in Microsoft devices that Atmel argues is necessary  
22 for a valid claim. (*See* MTD at 8; Dunn Decl. Ex. 8 at 3 (containing list of “Microchip

1 and Atmel products currently used in the accused Microsoft products”).) Atmel  
2 contends, with no support, that the components on this list are not accused of  
3 infringement in the Neodron litigation. But at this stage, the court only determines if  
4 Microsoft’s claim is facially plausible. *See Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 677-78. Microsoft’s  
5 claims for breach of duties to defend and indemnify meet this threshold. Thus, for these  
6 claims, Atmel’s motion is DENIED.

7 **F. Sealing**

8 Because this order relies on materials filed under seal, the court DIRECTS the  
9 Clerk to provisionally file this order under seal. The court ORDERS counsel for the  
10 parties meet and confer regarding which, if any, portions of this order they seek to redact.  
11 Counsel must then submit one joint statement or, if they cannot agree on a joint  
12 statement, competing statements indicating the portions of the order they seek to have  
13 redacted and on what basis. *See Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172,  
14 1179-80 (9th Cir. 2006). The statement or statements must attach a proposed redacted  
15 order that incorporates the redactions requested in the corresponding statement. The  
16 parties must file any such statement within 14 days of the date of the filing date of this  
17 order. The court will consider the parties’ redaction requests, if any, and then file the  
18 order on the docket with any necessary redactions.

19 **IV. CONCLUSION**

20 For the foregoing reasons, the court GRANTS in part and DENIES in part Atmel’s  
21 motion to dismiss (Dkt. # 29).

22 //

1           1.       The court GRANTS Atmel's motion to dismiss Microsoft's claim that  
2 Atmel violated the covenant not to sue. This claim is DISMISSED without prejudice and  
3 with leave to amend.


4           2.       The court GRANTS Atmel's motion to dismiss Microsoft's claim that  
5 Atmel violated the covenant of good faith and fair dealing. This claim is DISMISSED  
6 without prejudice and with leave to amend.

7           3.       The court DENIES Atmel's motion to dismiss Microsoft's claim that Atmel  
8 breached the duty to defend.

9           4.       The court DENIES Atmel's motion to dismiss Microsoft's claim that Atmel  
10 breached the duty to indemnify.

11           Microsoft shall file an amended complaint, if any, alleging facts that resolve the  
12 issues stated herein, no later than 14 days from the filing date of this order.

13           Dated this 12th day of February, 2021.

14  
15 

16 JAMES L. ROBART  
17 United States District Judge  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22