

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-IT

Oral argument requested

**FITBIT, INC.'S MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PARTIAL
SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND	1
III.	LEGAL STANDARD.....	4
	A. Definiteness requirement for claims invoking 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6	5
	B. Computer-implemented means-plus-function limitations	7
IV.	ARGUMENT	9
	A. The “means for computing athletic performance data from the series of time-stamped waypoints obtained by said GPS receiver” recites a computer-implemented function invoking 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6, and therefore the corresponding structure is a special-purpose processor programmed to perform an algorithm disclosed in the specification, not a generic CPU or processor	9
	B. There is no algorithm in the specification clearly linked to performance of the function corresponding to the “means for computing athletic performance data from the series of time-stamped waypoints obtained by said GPS receiver” by either the device’s CPU, the GPS module’s processing unit, or the two processors in tandem	12
V.	CONCLUSION.....	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Aristocrat Techs. Australia Pty. Ltd. v. Int’l Game Tech.</i> , 521 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	8, 9, 12, 13
<i>Atmel Corp. v. Info. Storage Devs., Inc.</i> , 198 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	7
<i>Augme Techs., Inc. v. Yahoo! Inc.</i> , 755 F. 3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	8, 13
<i>B. Braun Med., Inc. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 124 F.3d 1419 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	6
<i>Blackboard, Inc. v. Desire2Learn, Inc.</i> , 574 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	6, 7, 8, 10
<i>Default Proof Credit Card System, Inc. v. Home Depot U.S.A.</i> , 412 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	6, 7
<i>In re Donaldson Co.</i> , 16 F.3d 1189 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (en banc).....	6
<i>ePlus, Inc. v. Lawson Software, Inc.</i> , 700 F.3d 509 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	15
<i>EON Corp. IP Holdings LLC v. AT&T Mobility LLC</i> , 785 F.3d 616 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	9, 10
<i>Finisar Corp. v. DirectTV Group, Inc.</i> , 522 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	8, 15
<i>Function Media, LLC v. Google, Inc.</i> , 708 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	8, 9
<i>Harris Corp. v. Ericsson Inc.</i> , 417 F.3d 1241 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	8
<i>Ibormeith IP, LLC v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC</i> , 732 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	15
<i>In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig.</i> , 639 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	10

<i>MobileMedia Ideas LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , 780 F.3d 1159 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	6, 11
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	10
<i>Omega Eng’g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.</i> , 334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	7, 12
<i>Personalized Media Commc’ns LLC v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 161 F.3d 696 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	5
<i>Saffran v. Johnson & Johnson</i> , 712 F.3d 549 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	7
<i>Triton Tech of Tex., LLC v. Nintendo of Am., Inc.</i> , 753 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	6, 8, 12
<i>Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC</i> , 792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (en banc).....	5, 9
<i>WMS Gaming, Inc. v. Int’l Game Tech.</i> , 184 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	7, 8
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 112.....	<i>passim</i>
September 16, 2012, the pre-America Invents Act.....	1
Other Authorities	
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 56	1

I. INTRODUCTION

Fitbit Inc.’s (“Fitbit”) motion requests the Court to make three legal determinations: (1) the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,013,007 (“the ’007 patent”) recite a “means-plus-function” limitation invoking 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6¹; (2) the specification indicates a general-purpose processor or computer is used to perform the claimed function; and (3) the specification does not disclose or describe an “algorithm” in form of a step-by-step procedure the processor or computer would use to perform the claimed function—whether described as a mathematical formula, in prose, as a flow chart, or any other manner that provides sufficient disclosure of an algorithm. Importantly, the Federal Circuit has repeatedly instructed that expert testimony cannot be used to replace disclosure of such an algorithm in the specification, meaning there is no need to wait until after fact or expert discovery closes to rule on this motion.

Based on these three discrete legal determinations, the asserted claims of the ’007 patent are invalid as indefinite as a matter of law under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2. Fitbit thus moves the Court pursuant to Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for an order of partial summary judgement that asserted claims 7 and 21–29 of the ’007 patent are invalid as indefinite.

II. BACKGROUND

The ’007 patent is directed to a GPS-based system for computing and comparing outdoor athletic performance. The patent contends that known GPS devices were not designed for use by an outdoor athlete and “do not include real-time athletic performance algorithms” to compute athletic performance feedback. ’007 patent, 1:46–48. The patent seeks to address this shortcoming by disclosing a “GPS-based performance monitor” device that includes a “central processing unit (CPU)” that “controls the operation of the device.” *Id.* at 5:36–40. Connected to

¹ Because the ’007 patent was filed before September 16, 2012, the pre-America Invents Act version of 35 U.S.C. § 112(f) applies.

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.