

EXHIBIT G

From: [Rodrigues, Ruben J.](#)
To: [Karim Oussayef](#); [Peterman, Chad](#)
Cc: [BOST - F - Philips - Fitbit](#); [Philips - Fitbit](#); [Fitbit Philips DC Service](#)
Subject: RE: Philips v. Fitbit (D. Mass) - Contentions
Date: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 12:45:37 PM

Hi Karim,

I don't think we've yet received a response with respect to the scope of disputed issues on the motions to amend contentions. Would it be helpful to discuss?

Regards,

-Ruben

From: Rodrigues, Ruben J.
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2021 11:08 AM
To: Karim Oussayef <KOussayef@desmaraisllp.com>; Peterman, Chad <chadpeterman@paulhastings.com>
Cc: BOST - F - Philips - Fitbit <BOSTFPhilipsFitbit@foley.com>; Philips - Fitbit <Philips-Fitbit@paulhastings.com>; Fitbit Philips DC Service <FitbitPhilipsDCService@desmaraisllp.com>
Subject: RE: Philips v. Fitbit (D. Mass) - Contentions

Hi Karem,

The discussion on amending contentions began quite a while ago and concerns amendments that both Fitbit and Philips intend to make to their respective contentions. I've attached the various back and forth so that you can familiarize yourself with the history. On December 14, 2021, and after having raise the issue at an earlier deposition, I reached out with regards to the proposed amendments to Philips's contentions and John Custer followed up with charts specifically detailing the amendments on December 18th. Fitbit then disclosed its intention to amend its contentions on December 18th as well via an e-mail from Mr. Okano. The parties proceeded to engage in back-and-forth discussions to see whether we could narrow the scope of what we might need to brief before the Court. We came close to an across-the-board agreement that neither side would object on the basis of diligence/timeliness to the other side's proposed amendments but for exceptions that my most recent correspondence attempted to do away with (e.g. wiht respect to the Charge 4 and the Gaukel prior art reference). Fitbit has maintained that it objects to Philips's proposed amendments because it asserts that the '377 Patent expired before these products were released. As reflected in the correspondence, we disagree with that assertion, and also don't believe it is a proper basis for not denying the amendment since it merely reflects a dispute that the parties have.

Let me know if you'd like to discuss once you've had a chance to digest the prior history on this issue.

Regards,

-Ruben

From: Karim Oussayef <KOussayef@desmaraisllp.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2021 1:17 PM
To: Rodrigues, Ruben J. <RRodrigues@foley.com>; Peterman, Chad <chadpeterman@paulhastings.com>
Cc: BOST - F - Philips - Fitbit <BOSTFPhilipsFitbit@foley.com>; Philips - Fitbit <Philips-Fitbit@paulhastings.com>; Fitbit Philips DC Service <FitbitPhilipsDCService@desmaraisllp.com>
Subject: RE: Philips v. Fitbit (D. Mass) - Contentions

**** EXTERNAL EMAIL MESSAGE ****

Hi Ruben,

We are days away from the close of fact discovery. Could you please confirm what amendments you would like to make to Philips's infringement contentions?

And do you have any specific proposals for what limits you would propose for narrowing contentions? Happy to discuss.

Thanks,
Karim

Karim Z. Oussayef

DESMARAIS LLP

230 Park Avenue

New York, NY 10169

T: (212) 351-3427 | F: (212) 351-3401

From: RRodrigues@foley.com <RRodrigues@foley.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:37 PM
To: Peterman, Chad <chadpeterman@paulhastings.com>
Cc: BOSTFPhilipsFitbit@foley.com; Philips - Fitbit <Philips-Fitbit@paulhastings.com>; Fitbit Philips DC Service <FitbitPhilipsDCService@desmaraisllp.com>
Subject: [Ext] RE: Philips v. Fitbit (D. Mass) - Contentions

****EXTERNAL EMAIL** This email originated from outside the company. Do not click on any link unless you recognize the sender and have confidence the content is safe.**

Hi Chad,

I wanted to follow-up on the below, which I don't think we ever received a response on. We'd like to move ahead with a motion to amend Philips's infringement contentions, but, want to make sure we're on the same page with respect to the scope of the motion (and to the extent possible, would

like to narrow the scope of the dispute). Let me know if we can reach agreement on #1 below. As for #2, perhaps we can agree to some bounds for narrowing each sides' contentions after claim construction, but prior to the service of expert reports.

Let me know if you'd like to discuss.

Regards,

-Ruben

From: Rodrigues, Ruben J.

Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 4:31 PM

To: Peterman, Chad <chadpeterman@paulhastings.com>

Cc: BOST - F - Philips - Fitbit <BOSTFPhilipsFitbit@foley.com>; Philips - Fitbit <Philips-Fitbit@paulhastings.com>

Subject: RE: Philips v. Fitbit (D. Mass) - Contentions

Hi Chad,

Thanks, for providing a counterproposal. Here our current thoughts, let us know if we might have an agreement on some or all of this:

1.) We won't agree to not to include the Charge 4 product in the amendment, which was released just after Philips finalized its original contentions. The Charge 4 products infringes for the same reasons as all the other accused products and there is no prejudice to Fitbit in adding it to the contentions. That said, if we can reach agreement that Fitbit would not object on the basis of diligence with respect to Charge 4, we would not object to the proposed amendments concerning Gaukel.

2.) We are open to narrowing the asserted claims as part of an overall agreement to limit prior art. We think, however, that this limiting exercise should occur prior to the service of expert reports. If we agree to an overall extension of the schedule as proposed in my earlier e-mail, perhaps sit makes sense to include some deadlines for narrowing prior art and asserted claims prior to the service of expert reports? Is this something we should discuss?

Regards,

-Ruben

From: Peterman, Chad <chadpeterman@paulhastings.com>

Sent: Friday, January 15, 2021 1:15 PM

To: Rodrigues, Ruben J. <RRodrigues@foley.com>

Cc: BOST - F - Philips - Fitbit <BOSTFPhilipsFitbit@foley.com>; Philips - Fitbit <Philips-Fitbit@paulhastings.com>

Subject: RE: Philips v. Fitbit (D. Mass) - Contentions

**** EXTERNAL EMAIL MESSAGE ****

Ruben –

Thanks for your email. We offer the following in response:

- 1) We would agree that neither party shall object to any amendment on the basis of timeliness/diligence, except for Philips' attempt to add the Charge 4 product. The Charge 4 launched in April 2020 and Philips has not provided any justifiable reason for delay. If Philips agrees to the foregoing, we would also agree to withdraw the proposed amendment with respect to Gaukel.
- 2) We do not agree to your proposal for limiting the prior art. At a minimum, it is premature. Notably, there are pending motions and claim constructions that may impact the scope of the case and the parties' positions. These motions must be resolved before we could consider potential narrowing. Further, we could not possibly consider narrowing prior art positions without Philips narrowing the number of asserted claims in each patent.

Please let us know your positions in response.

Regards,
Chad

From: RRodrigues@foley.com <RRodrigues@foley.com>
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2021 10:47 AM
To: Peterman, Chad <chadpeterman@paulhastings.com>
Cc: BOSTFPhilipsFitbit@foley.com; Philips - Fitbit <Philips-Fitbit@paulhastings.com>
Subject: [EXT] Philips v. Fitbit (D. Mass) - Contentions

Hi Chad,

In order to move the ball forward with respect to both Philips's and Fitbit's proposed amendments to the contentions, Philips proposes that both parties agree that neither party shall object to any amendment on the basis of timeliness/diligence. After all, the materials Fitbit seeks to add to the invalidity contentions at this stage are all publicly available materials that it could have been identified earlier.

If agreement can be reached on that front, and assuming Fitbit agrees to additionally withdraw the proposed amendment with respect to Gaukel, a reference Fitbit had when it served its original contentions, Philips would further agree not to oppose the proposed amendments with respect to the Icon Health and Fitness charts.

That would leave the issue of Fitbit's proposed amendment with regards to the Teller, Maeda,

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.