

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

PHILIPS NORTH AMERICA LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

FITBIT, INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 1:19-cv-11586-FDS

**DEFENDANT FITBIT INC.'S MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF ITS
MOTION TO COMPEL THE PRODUCTION OF
CERTAIN OF MR. ARIE TOL'S EMAIL COMMUNICATIONS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
FACTUAL BACKGROUND & DISCOVERY SOUGHT	2
LEGAL STANDARDS	5
ARGUMENT	6
I. A PATENT AGENT’S ADVICE THAT DOES NOT PERTAIN TO MATTERS BEFORE A PATENT OFFICE IS NOT PROTECTED BY ATTORNEY- CLIENT PRIVILEGE.....	6
1. Patent Agent Communications Concerning Purported Pre-Suit Investigations And Litigation Are Not Privileged Under U.S. Law.....	7
2. Patent Agent Communications Concerning Purported Pre-Suit Investigations And Litigation Are Not Privileged Under Dutch Law.	9
II. COMMUNICATIONS CONVEYING PRIMARILY BUSINESS ADVICE ARE NOT ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED OR WORK PRODUCT PROTECTED.	12
III. THE REQUESTED COMMUNICATIONS ARE NOT PROTECTED UNDER THE WORK PRODUCT DOCTRINE.....	15
CONCLUSION.....	18

;

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<u>CASES</u>	
<i>Anwar v. Fairfield Greenwich Ltd.</i> , 982 F. Supp. 2d 260 (S.D.N.Y. 2013).....	6, 8, 11
<i>Atchison Casting Corp. v. Marsh, Inc.</i> , 216 F.R.D. 225 (D. Mass. 2003).....	5
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Rhone-Poulenc Rorer, Inc.</i> , No. 95 CIV. 8833 (RPP), 1998 WL 158958 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 2, 1998).....	12
<i>Columbia Data Prod., Inc. v. Autonomy Corp.</i> , No. CIV.A. 11-12077-NMG, 2012 WL 6212898 (D. Mass. Dec. 12, 2012).....	16
<i>E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. MacDermid, Inc.</i> , No. CIV. A. 06-3383 MLC, 2009 WL 3048421 (D.N.J. Sept. 17, 2009)	9
<i>Gucci Am., Inc. v. Guess?, Inc.</i> , 271 F.R.D. 58 (S.D.N.Y. 2010)	8
<i>Hickman v. Taylor</i> , 329 U.S. 495 (1947).....	5
<i>In re Google Inc.</i> , 462 F. App'x 975 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	12
<i>In re Grand Jury Subpoena</i> , 273 F. Supp. 3d 296 (D. Mass. 2017)	6
<i>In re IPCom GmbH & Co., KG</i> , 428 F. App'x 984 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	9, 10
<i>In re Queen's University at Kingston</i> , 820 F.3d 1287 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	6, 7, 8
<i>In re Rivastigimine Pat. Litig.</i> , 239 F.R.D. 351 (S.D.N.Y. 2006)	11
<i>Intell. Ventures I, LLC v. Lenovo Grp. Ltd.</i> , No. 16-CV-10860-PBS, 2019 WL 9096048 (D. Mass. Dec. 6, 2019)	12, 14, 15, 16, 17
<i>Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary v. QLT Phototherapeutics, Inc.</i> , No. 00-CV-0783 (JLT), 2001 WL 1180694 (D. Mass. Sept. 25, 2001).....	16
<i>Micronics Filtration Holdings, Inc. v. Miller</i> , No. 18-CV-303-JL, 2019 WL 9104172 (D.N.H. Nov. 5, 2019).....	18

Organon, Inc. v. Mylan Pharms., Inc.,
303 F.Supp.2d 546 (D. N.J. 2004) 9

PersonalWeb Techs., LLC v. Google Inc.,
No. 13-C-01317-EJD, 2014 WL 4088201 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 19, 2014).....17

SanDisk Corp. v. Round Rock Rsch. LLC,
No. 11-CV-05243-RS (JSC), 2014 WL 691565 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 21, 2014)..... 15, 18

Tulip Computers International B.V. v. Dell Computer Corp.,
2002 WL 31556497 (Nov. 15, 2002 D. Del.) 9

U.S. v. McLellan,
No. 16-CR-10094-LTS, 2018 WL 9439896 (D. Mass. Jan. 19, 2018)..... 5

U.S. v. Textron Inc. & Subsidiaries,
577 F.3d 21 (1st Cir. 2009)..... 16, 18

VLT Corp. v. Unitride Corp.,
194 F.R.D. 8 (D. Mass. 2000)..... 5, 6

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Bruil v. Tital International,
Rechtbank Zutphen [District Court of Zutphen], 1 May 1988,
ECLI:NL:RBZUT:1988:AB8996 (Neth.)..... 9, 10

Rijkswet van 15 december 1994 [Dutch Patent Act], Articles 23, 80, and 82, *available at*
https://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0007118/2020-04-01#Hoofdstuk6_Artikel82..... 10, 11

The EU Single Market Regulated Professions Database: Octrooigemachtigde
(Netherlands), *available at* [https://ec.europa.eu/growth/tools-](https://ec.europa.eu/growth/tools-databases/regprof/index.cfm?action=regprof&id_regprof=834&tab=general)
[databases/regprof/index.cfm?action=regprof&id_regprof=834&tab=general](https://ec.europa.eu/growth/tools-databases/regprof/index.cfm?action=regprof&id_regprof=834&tab=general) 11

RULES

Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1)..... 5

Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(3)..... 16

Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(3)(A)..... 16

Fed. R. Evid. 501 5

INTRODUCTION

Defendant Fitbit, Inc. (“Fitbit”) moves to compel Plaintiff Philips North America LLC (“Philips”) to produce email communications Philips improperly withheld for privilege. Specifically, Fitbit seeks to compel production of emails of Mr. Arie Tol, a Dutch patent agent employed by Philips’s parent, Koninklijke Philips N.V., in its intellectual property licensing division, Philips Intellectual Property and Standards (“Philips IP&S”). Mr. Tol has first-hand knowledge regarding Philips’s licensing practices and policies, both generally and as they relate to the litigation against Fitbit—matters relevant to Fitbit’s defenses. Nonetheless, both during Mr. Tol’s deposition and in response to Fitbit’s subsequent requests for Mr. Tol’s relevant emails, Philips prevented Fitbit from obtaining this relevant discovery by improperly invoking attorney-client privilege and work product protection. Accordingly, Fitbit moves to compel certain entries on Mr. Tol’s email privilege log (attached as Exhibit A (April 16 Privilege Log)) for three reasons.

First, Philips’s invocation of attorney-client privilege for communications exclusively between Dutch patent agents and other non-attorney employees who were not acting at the direction and control of a licensed attorney, and related to matters other than representation before a patent office, has no basis in U.S. or Dutch law. Patent agent privilege extends only to matters before a patent office, such as patent prosecution. As such, Philips’s claims of attorney-client privilege over communications between patent agents related to the post-issuance assertion of patents it acquired from third-parties and did not prosecute, is improper under U.S. law. Additionally, to the extent Dutch law applies—and Fitbit contends that it does not—these communications are not privileged because, like the U.S., the Netherlands does not recognize a patent agent privilege for matters other than proceedings before the Netherlands Patent Office.

Second, regardless of the communicants, Philips improperly invokes attorney-client privilege for communications that appear to deal primarily with business—rather than legal—

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.