

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

PHILIPS NORTH AMERICA LLC	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	C.A. No. 1:19-cv-11586-IT
v.	)	
	)	
FITBIT, INC.,	)	<b>JURY TRIAL DEMANDED</b>
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	

**PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. PHILIPS’S POSITIONS ON CLAIM CONSTRUCTION SHOULD BE ADOPTED .....1

A. ’007 Patent: “means for computing athletic performance feedback data from the series of time-stamped waypoints obtained by said GPS receiver” .....1

    i. “Athletic performance feedback data” does not include calories burned .....1

    ii. The claim does not require that all items that would constitute “athletic performance feedback data” be computed to infringe .....3

    iii. The term is not indefinite.....4

B. ’007 Patent: “means for suspending and resuming operation of said means for computing when a speed of the athlete falls below a predetermined threshold” (Claim 7) .....8

C. ’958 Patent: “in the event of an interruption of the wireless connection . . . configured to store the health parameter [or visual data] . . . in a memory or on [a/the] removable memory device” .....9

D. ’958 Patent: “memory” .....10

E. ’958 Patent: “internet-enabled wireless web device” .....11

F. ’958 Patent: “health parameter [or visual data] [indicative/corresponding to] of a disease state or condition of a patient” .....12

G. ’233 Patent: “governing information transmitted between the first personal device and the second device” .....13

H. ’233 Patent: “first personal device” .....15

I. ’233 Patent: “wireless communication” .....17

J. ’377 Patent: “indicating a physiological status of a subject” (Claims 1, 12).....18

III. CONCLUSION.....19

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<i>Alfred E. Mann Found. for Sci. Research v. Cochlear Corp.</i> , 841 F.3d 1334, 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	6
<i>Am. Calcar, Inc. v. Am. Honda Motor Co.</i> , 651 F.3d 1318, 1329, 1339-40 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	9
<i>Asyst Tech., Inc. v. Empak, Inc.</i> , 268 F.3d 1364, 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	7
<i>Chiuminatta Concrete Concepts, Inc v. Cardinal Indus., Inc.</i> , 145 F.3d 1303, 1308-09 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	7
<i>Ecolab USA Inc. v. Diversey, Inc.</i> , No. 12-CV-1984 (SRN/JJG), 2014 WL 258570 at *21 (D. Minn. January 23, 2014) .....	13
<i>Finisair Corp. v. DirecTV Grp., Inc.</i> , 523 F.3d 1323, 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	6
<i>Gemalto S.A. v. HTC Corp.</i> , No. 6:10-CV-561 LED-JDL, 2012 WL 2505745 at *23-24 (E.D. Tex. June 28, 2012) .....	5
<i>In re Schreiber</i> , 128 F.3d 1473, 1477 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	16
<i>JVW Enters., Inc. v. Interact Accessories, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1324, 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	4
<i>Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Space Sys./Loral, Inc.</i> , 324 F.3d 1308, 1318-19 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	4
<i>Signal IP v. Am. Honda Motor Co.</i> , No. LA CV14-02454 JAK (JEMx), 2015 WL 5768344.....	5
<i>Typemock, Ltd. v. Telerik, Inc.</i> , No. 17-10274-RGS, 2018 WL 4189692 at *8 (D. Mass. Aug. 31, 2018) .....	5
<i>Ventana Med. Sys., Inc. v. Biogenex Labs., Inc.</i> , 473 F.3d 1173, 1182 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	13

## I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Philips North America, LLC (“Philips”) submits its responsive claim construction brief. As demonstrated below, Fitbit’s opening claim construction brief (Dkt. 73) fails to demonstrate, by clear and convincing evidence, the indefiniteness of any asserted claims. Fitbit further fails to justify why any of its proposed constructions—which not only lack support in the specifications but often contradict them—should be adopted by this Court. Philips’s proposed constructions are grounded in the intrinsic record and the plain meaning of various terms to a person of ordinary skill in the art and should be adopted.

## II. PHILIPS’S POSITIONS ON CLAIM CONSTRUCTION SHOULD BE ADOPTED

### A. ’007 Patent: “means for computing athletic performance feedback data from the series of time-stamped waypoints obtained by said GPS receiver”

As explained in Philips’s opening claim construction brief, and confirmed in Fitbit’s own brief, the structure and function for this claim element is largely undisputed. What is disputed is the construction of “athletic performance feedback data” and whether the specification supports the recited function. The claim construction dispute is summarized as follows:

Philips’s Proposal	Fitbit’s Proposed Construction
Determining any of the following from a series of time-stamped waypoints obtained by said GPS receiver during an exercise session: elapsed distance of an athlete; current or average speed of an athlete; current or average pace of an athlete.	“athletic performance feedback data” means elapsed distance, current and average speeds and paces, calories burned, miles remaining and time remaining.

#### i. “Athletic performance feedback data” does not include calories burned

The dispute as to this term boils down to one primary issue: whether the construction of “athletic performance feedback data” should include “calories burned.” Fitbit attempts to include “calories burned” in the construction of “athletic performance feedback data” in order to

buttress its indefiniteness argument because every other type of athletic performance feedback data simply utilize high school level math to determine some form of distance or speed from a series of time-stamped GPS waypoints, and comply with the requirements of Section 112, ¶¶2 and 6. (*See* Dkt. 73 at 7-10 and Dkt. 73-5, Martin Decl. ¶¶ 13-27.)

The written description of the specification only mentions calories twice. Once in describing how prior art treadmills displayed a measure of calories burned (*see* Dkt. 73-1 at 1:22-24), and again in characterizing how a number of items can constitute “athletic performance data” but never referring to calories burned as “athletic performance feedback data” (*see* Dkt. 73-1 at 7:44-47). Fitbit has failed to explain how or why “calories burned” should be included in the construction of “athletic performance feedback data” given such a limited and ambiguous disclosure, nor why or how one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood “athletic performance feedback data” as including calories burned. They would not have. To the contrary, and as explained in Philips’s opening brief the specification unambiguously confirms that elapsed distance of an athlete, current or average speed of an athlete, or current or average pace of an athlete, all constitute athletic performance feedback data determined from a series of time-stamped GPS waypoints. (*See* Dkt. 73-0 at 6-7.).

Philips’s original proposed construction did not include “miles remaining” and “time remaining” because those measures are not necessarily determined from a “series of time-stamped waypoints obtained by said GPS receiver” (as required by the claim language itself). Philips would not dispute that determinations of “miles remaining” and “time remaining” for an athlete that actually did rely on a “series of time-stamped waypoints obtained by said GPS receiver” would constitute “athletic performance feedback data” in the claim, as those items

# 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.