
EXHIBIT A

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

GODO KAISHA IP BRIDGE 1,

Plaintiff,

v.

OMNIVISION TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:16-cv-00290-SLR

**DEFENDANT’S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO
PLAINTIFF’S FIRST SET OF REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS RELATING TO VENUE**

Pursuant to Rule 36 of the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure and the parties’ Stipulation and Order for Extension of Time and Venue Discovery (D.I. 16), Defendant OmniVision Technologies, Inc. (“Defendant” or “OmniVision”), by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby responds to Plaintiff Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1’s (“Plaintiff” or “IP Bridge”) First Set of Request For Admissions Relating to Venue as follows:

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

OmniVision makes the following objections, whether or not separately set forth in any specific response to Plaintiff’s First Set of Request For Admissions Relating to Venue, to each and every Instruction, Definition, and Request:

1. OmniVision objects to each Instruction, Definition and Request as unduly burdensome and oppressive to the extent that it purports to require OmniVision to search OmniVision’s facilities and inquire of OmniVision’s employees other than those facilities and employees that would reasonably be expected to have responsive information. OmniVision’s responses are based upon: (1) a reasonable search, given the time allocated to OmniVision to respond to the Requests; and (2) inquiries of OmniVision’s employees and/or representatives who could reasonably be expected to possess responsive information.

2. OmniVision objects to each Instruction, Definition and Request to the extent that it purports to impose any requirement or discovery obligation on OmniVision other than those set forth in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the applicable rules and orders of this Court, and stipulations among the parties to this litigation.

3. OmniVision objects to each Instruction, Definition and Request to the extent it seeks information and/or documents protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the common interest doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity. Such information and/or documents shall not be provided in response to any Request and any inadvertent disclosure or production thereof shall not be deemed a waiver of any privilege with respect to such information and/or documents, or of any work product protection, which may attach thereto.

4. OmniVision objects to each Instruction, Definition and Request to the extent it seeks information and/or documents concerning, and the disclosure of, proprietary and highly confidential information and/or trade secrets. If and to the extent OmniVision agrees to provide any information or documents, it will do so only subject to the protections of an appropriate protective order and/or a mutually acceptable supplemental protective order to address OmniVision's confidentiality concerns.

5. OmniVision objects to each Instruction, Definition and Request to the extent that it purports to require OmniVision to produce or disclose information in violation of a legal or contractual obligation of nondisclosure to a third party. OmniVision will not produce such documents without either the consent of the relevant third party or an order by this Court compelling disclosure or production.

6. OmniVision objects to each Instruction, Definition, and Request to the extent it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, seeks information that is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, or seeks information that is not related to any claim or defense or the subject matter involved in this action.

7. OmniVision objects to each Request to the extent it seeks information that is not known to OmniVision and is outside OmniVision's possession, custody and control.

8. OmniVision objects to each Request to the extent that it seeks information that is available from public sources, more conveniently or less expensively obtained from another source, or otherwise just as available to Plaintiff as it is to OmniVision.

9. OmniVision objects to each Instruction, Definition, and Request to the extent it seeks information from sources that are not reasonably accessible.

10. OmniVision objects to each Request as premature to the extent it calls for information in advance of the applicable deadlines set by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court, any applicable local rules or agreed to by the parties in this action.

11. OmniVision objects to each Request to the extent it calls for information that can be derived or ascertained from records OmniVision has produced or will produce in this action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34.

12. OmniVision objects to each Instruction, Definition and Request to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.

13. OmniVision objects to each Instruction, Definition and Request to the extent it calls for information more properly the subject of expert testimony.

14. OmniVision objects to each Request as vague, overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent that it fails to specify a relevant time period, or specify a time period beyond the scope of this litigation.

15. OmniVision objects to each Request as vague, overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent that it fails to specify a relevant geographic scope, seeks information relating to activity outside the United States, or otherwise specifies a location beyond the geographic scope of this litigation.

16. OmniVision objects to each Request to the extent it assumes a disputed fact or legal conclusion in defining the information requested. OmniVision denies any such disputed

facts or legal conclusions assumed by each Request, and any response or objection to any Request is without prejudice to this objection.

17. OmniVision objects to each Request as unreasonably cumulative or duplicative to the extent that it seeks the same information as other discovery requests in this litigation, including but not limited to Plaintiff's First Set of Request For Production Relating to Venue and Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories to Defendant Relating to Venue.

18. OmniVision objects to the definition of "Defendant," "OmniVision," "you," and "your" as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Unless called out separately, OmniVision will understand the terms "Defendant," "OmniVision," "you," and "your" to refer to OmniVision Technologies, Inc.

19. OmniVision objects to terms "Accused Product" and "Accused Products" as vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. OmniVision will understand the terms "Accused Product" and "Accused Products" to refer to those OmniVision image sensors identified in Plaintiff's Complaint.

20. OmniVision objects to the terms "communication" and "communications" as vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome.

21. OmniVision objects to the terms "document" and "documents" as vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome.

22. OmniVision objects to the term "electronically stored information" as vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome.

23. OmniVision objects to the terms "Affiliate" and "Affiliates" as vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome.

24. OmniVision objects to the terms "employee" and "employees" as vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome.

25. OmniVision objects to the terms "person" and "persons" as vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome.

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.