	Case 5:15-cv-02008-EJD Document 93 F	Filed 05/04/16 Page 1 of 16		
1	GEORGE A. RILEY (S.B. #118304)			
2	griley@omm.com LUANN L. SIMMONS (S.B. #203526)			
3	lsimmons@omm.com MELODY DRUMMOND HANSEN (S.B. #27878	86)		
4	mdrummondhansen@omm.com O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP			
5	Two Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor			
6	San Francisco, California 94111-3823 Telephone: (415) 984-8700			
7	Facsimile: (415) 984-8701			
8	RYAN K. YAGURA (S.B. #197619) ryagura@omm.com			
9	XIN-YI ZHOU (S.B. #251969)			
10	vzhou@omm.com BRIAN M. COOK (S.B. #266181)			
11	bcook@omm.com KEVIN MURRAY (S.B. #275186)			
12	kmurray2@omm.com O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP			
13	400 South Hope Street Los Angeles, California 90071-2899			
14	Telephone: (213) 430-6000			
15	Facsimile: (213) 430-6407			
16	Attorneys for Defendant Apple, Inc.			
17	UNITED STATES D	ISTRICT COURT		
18	NORTHERN DISTRIC	T OF CALIFORNIA		
19 20	SAN J	OSE		
20				
21 22	OpenTV, Inc., Nagravision, SA, and Nagra France S.A.S.,	Case No. 5:15-CV-02008-EJD		
22	Plaintiffs,	DEFENDANT'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO PRECLUDE		
23 24	V.	RELIANCE ON CERTAIN INVENTION DATES AND TO STRIKE		
24 25	Apple, Inc.,	CERTAIN ALLEGATIONS		
23 26	Defendant.	Judge: Honorable Nathanael Cousins Hearing Time: 1:00 p.m.		
20		Hearing Date: June 1, 2016 Courtroom: San Jose Courtroom 7		
27		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
20				

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

1		TABLE OF CONTENTS
2		
3	I.	INTRODUCTION
4	II.	OPENTV DID NOT COMPLY WITH PATENT L.R. 3-1(F) OR 3-2(B)
5		A. OpenTV's interpretation of Patent L.R. 3-1(f) and 3-2(b) is wrong
6		1. <i>Thought</i> and <i>Harvatek</i> interpret Patent L.R. 3-1(f) to require the patentee to disclose alleged conception dates
7		2. OpenTV's alleged distinction between conception dates and priority dates is wrong
8		3. Judge Gilliam's oral ruling has been superseded by persuasive written decisions
9		B. OpenTV establishes no diligence to support its assertion of a September 14, 1995 conception date for the '736 Patent
10		C. It is too late for OpenTV to demonstrate diligence to produce documents supporting its alleged June 2001 conception date for the '169 Patent
11 12		 D. OpenTV Should Be Precluded From Changing Its Conception Date Allegation For The '740 Patent
12		E. OpenTV has not complied with its discovery obligations and therefore its
14		interrogatory responses should be struck to the extent they provide late conception dates
15	III.	APPLE WILL BE PREJUDICED IF OPENTV IS NOT REQUIRED TO COMPLY WITH PATENT L.R. 3-1(f) AND 3-2(b)
16		A. OpenTV's arguments regarding prejudice are unsupported and wrong
17		B. OpenTV's discussion of the impact of OpenTV's conception dates on Apple's invalidity defenses supports granting this Motion
18	IV.	CONCLUSION
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
25 26		
20 27		
28		

	Case 5:15-cv-02008-EJD Document 93 Filed 05/04/16 Page 3 of 16
1	
2	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
3	Page(s)
4	Cases
5	Burroughs Wellcome Co. v. Barr Labs., 40 F.3d 1223 (Fed. Cir. 1994)
6 7	Harvatek Corp. v. Cree, Inc., No. 14-5353, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 93388 (N.D. Cal. July 17, 2015) passim
8	Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604 (9th Cir. 1992)
10	In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 132104 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 3, 2009)10
11	Mahurkar v. CR Bard, Inc.,
12	79 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996)4
13	<i>Thought, Inc. v. Oracle Corp.,</i> No. 12-5601, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 137113 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 7, 2015) passim
14	
15	Statutes
16	35 U.S.C. § 1024
17	Other Authorities
18	Fed. R. Civ. P. 26
19	Patent L.R. 3-1 and 3-2 passim
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	RM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u> .

1

I. INTRODUCTION

OpenTV's Opposition ("Opp.") interprets the word "priority date" in Patent L.R. 3-1(f) to 2 only include filing dates of patents, not conception dates. That interpretation of Patent L.R. 3-1(f) 3 has been explicitly rejected by this Court in multiple cases. And the distinction OpenTV attempts 4 to draw between the term "conception date" and the term "priority date" implicitly conflicts with 5 the use of those terms in the statutes written by Congress and the interpretation of those statutes 6 by the Federal Circuit. Apple's Motion ("Mot."), in contrast, correctly relies on the *Thought, Inc.* 7 v. Oracle Corp., No. 12-5601, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 137113 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 7, 2015), and 8 9 Harvatek Corp. v. Cree, Inc., No. 14-5353, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 93388 (N.D. Cal. July 17, 2015), opinions that interpret this Court's Patent Local Rules and apply those rules in nearly 10 identical circumstances. OpenTV's lengthy Opposition buries its short discussion of those cases 11 and fails to offer any meaningful distinctions. Instead, OpenTV relies on an oral ruling by Judge 12 Gilliam in a separate case. To the extent Judge Gilliam's ruling conflicts with *Thought* and 13 *Harvatek*, this Court should adhere to *Thought* and *Harvatek* because they are more persuasive, 14 they explicitly reject OpenTV's arguments, and they involve nearly identical factual 15 circumstances. 16

Rather than provide a reasoned application of law to facts, OpenTV's motion provides
hyperbole, calling Apple's motion "extreme," "unwarranted," and "disingenuous," and alleges
that Apple's motion presents a "parade of horribles." OpenTV's hyperbole and refusal to
meaningfully address *Thought, Harvatek*, and the other cases cited in Apple's motion signals the
weakness of OpenTV's position.

In its opening brief, Apple argued OpenTV could not demonstrate diligence at this late hour to support good cause to amend its Patent Local Rule 3-1(f) and 3-2(b) disclosures. In response, OpenTV chose to make no attempt to demonstrate any diligence. Because OpenTV implicitly concedes it cannot demonstrate diligence, Apple's motion should be granted. The conception events in question occurred over ten years ago, and OpenTV has presented no reason why it could not have provided information about those events by the October 15, 2015 deadline.

28

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

1

A.

1.

7

6

8 9

10

- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22 23

24

25

26

27

his remarks at oral argument did not address the purpose of Patent L.R. 3-1(f). OpenTV's second distinction has two parts, and the first does not have any apparent relevance. OpenTV incorrectly argues that the patentee's documents (*i.e.*, evidence) in *Thought* did not or could not *prove* the patentee's alleged conception date (*i.e.*, a fact). Opp. at 11:12–:14. That argument reflects a misunderstanding of civil procedure. *Thought* resulted from a pretrial motion to preclude, not a summary judgment motion or bench trial. No facts could have been proven or disproven in *Thought*, and the court had no reason to consider those issues. *See* 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 137113 at *13–*17. In the next part, OpenTV argues that the patentee in *Thought* failed to seek leave to amend, whereas OpenTV claims that it will seek leave to amend

28

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

eventually, if necessary. Opp. at 11:14-:24. But OpenTV will never seek leave to amend its

II. OPENTV DID NOT COMPLY WITH PATENT L.R. 3-1(F) OR 3-2(B)

OpenTV's interpretation of Patent L.R. 3-1(f) and 3-2(b) is wrong

patentee to disclose alleged conception dates

OpenTV boldly argues that "none of the cases Apple cites requires disclosure of

conception dates in response to Patent L.R. 3-1(f)." Opp. at 10:14-:15. To the contrary, Apple's

patent holder to assert a *specific date of conception*, not a date range, " *Thought*, 2015 U.S.

Dist. LEXIS 137113 at *14 (citing Harvatek, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 137113 at *5) (emphasis

added). Thus, these cases explicitly require disclosure of conception dates. Mot. at 3:16–:18.

OpenTV makes two thin attempts to distinguish *Thought*. First, OpenTV argues that

Thought "chose to follow the reasoning in *Harvatek*" because the patentee "had not cited any case

to show that *Harvatek* was incorrect." Opp. at 11:3–:11. But *Thought* followed *Harvatek* not

based on a lack of precedent to the contrary, but instead based on the purpose of Patent L.R. 3-

1(f), as explained in *Harvatek* and expanded upon and endorsed by *Thought*. See Thought, 2015

U.S. Dist. LEXIS 137113 at *13–*17. *Thought* explained that the purpose of the rule was to

allow the parties to crystallize their theories early in litigation and avoid gamesmanship. *Id.* at

*16. The mere fact that Judge Gilliam reached a different conclusion is unpersuasive considering

Motion quotes *Thought* and *Harvatek*, which state: "Patent L.R. 3-1(f) particularly requires a

Thought and *Harvatek* interpret Patent L.R. 3-1(f) to require the

DOCKET A L A R M



Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.