

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

**FITBIT'S RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
I. U.S. PATENT NO. 6,013,007.....	1
A. “means for computing athletic performance feedback data from the series of time-stamped waypoints obtained by said GPS receiver” (Claims 1, 21) .....	1
1. Philips’ admissions compel a finding of indefiniteness .....	1
2. Philips’ case law citations actually support a finding of indefiniteness .....	5
3. Philips’ other arguments against indefiniteness fail.....	7
4. Philips misrepresents Fitbit’s proposed construction and the parties’ disputes.....	8
5. Construction of “athletic performance feedback data”.....	9
B. “means for suspending and resuming operation of said means for computing when a speed of the athlete falls below a predetermined threshold” (Claim 7).....	11
II. U.S. PATENT NO. 6,976,958.....	13
A. “in the event of an interruption of the wireless connection . . . configured to store the health parameter or visual data in a memory or on the removable memory device” (Claims 15, 16).....	13
B. “memory” (Claims 15, 16) .....	14
C. “internet-enabled wireless web device” (Claims 15, 16).....	15
D. “health parameter indicative of a disease state or condition of a patient” (Claim 15) and “health parameter or visual data corresponding to a patient’s disease state or condition” (Claim 16).....	16
III. U.S. PATENT NO. 7,088,233.....	16
A. “governing information transmitted between the first personal device and the second device” (Claim 1).....	16
B. “first personal device” (Claim 1) .....	18
C. “wireless communication” (Claim 1).....	19
IV. U.S. PATENT NO. 8,277,377.....	20
A. “indicating a physiologic status of a subject” (Claim 1).....	20

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****Page(s)****Cases**

<i>Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	15
<i>Alfred E. Mann Found. for Sci. Research v. Cochlear Corp.</i> 841 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	6, 7
<i>Aristocrat Techs. Australia Pty. Ltd. v. Int’l Game Tech.</i> , 521 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	1, 8
<i>Augme Techs., Inc. v. Yahoo! Inc.</i> , 755 F. 3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	8
<i>B. Braun Med., Inc. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 124 F.3d 1419 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	4, 12
<i>Biomedino, LLC v. Waters Techs. Corp.</i> , 490 F.3d 946 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	5, 6
<i>BlackBoard, Inc. v. Desire2Learn, Inc.</i> , 574 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	3
<i>Default Proof Credit Card System, Inc. v. Home Depot USA, Inc.</i> , 412 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	3
<i>EON Corp. IP Holdings LLC v. AT&amp;T Mobility LLC</i> , 785 F.3d 616 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	3, 4, 12
<i>Finisar Corp. v. DirectTV Grp., Inc.</i> , 523 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	5, 6
<i>Function Media, LLC v. Google, Inc.</i> , 708 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	3, 8
<i>GPNE Corp. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 830 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	14, 19
<i>Harris Corp. v. Ericsson Inc.</i> , 417 F.3d 1241 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	2
<i>Merck &amp; Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 .....	13
<i>Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co.</i> ,	

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

(continued)

	<b>Page(s)</b>
868 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	13
<i>Oatey Co. v. IPS Corp.</i> , 514 F.3d 1271 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	16, 18, 20
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	18, 20
<i>S3 Inc. v. NVIDIA Corp.</i> , 259 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	5
<i>SkinMedica, Inc. v. Histogen Inc.</i> , 727 F.3d 1187 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	16
<i>Ventana Med. Sys. v. BioGenex Labs., Inc.</i> , 473 F.3d 1173 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	15
<i>Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC</i> , 792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	1, 2, 9, 12
<i>WMS Gaming, Inc. v. Int’l Game Tech.</i> , 184 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	7, 8
 <b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 112.....	7

Fitbit's claim constructions are supported by Federal Circuit law and intrinsic record. Philips' constructions rely on expert testimony to rewrite claim language, skirt statutory disclosure requirements, and contradict file history admissions. The case law is decidedly on Fitbit's side; even Philips' legal authorities support Fitbit's positions.

## **I. U.S. PATENT NO. 6,013,007**

### **A. “means for computing athletic performance feedback data from the series of time-stamped waypoints obtained by said GPS receiver” (Claims 1, 21)**

#### **1. Philips' admissions compel a finding of indefiniteness**

The law of indefiniteness pertaining to a computer-implemented function of a means-plus-function (“MPF”) is straightforward. Such claim terms are indefinite if the patent specification fails to disclose a linked algorithm, as is the case here. *See Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC*, 792 F.3d 1339, 1351-52 (Fed. Cir. 2015); D.I. 72 at 2-5; D.I. 44 at 9-15.<sup>1</sup> As detailed in subsection I.A.2 below, Philips' opening brief grossly misstates the relevant law. Indeed, the cases Philips relies on recognize the MPF disclosure requirements and support indefiniteness here.<sup>2</sup>

In an attempt to supply the missing algorithm, Philips supplements the '007 patent disclosure with testimony from its expert, Dr. Martin. This strategy is inappropriate because the content of the specification controls. *See Harris Corp. v. Ericsson Inc.*, 417 F.3d 1241, 1253

---

<sup>1</sup> The '007 patent's failure to disclose the necessary algorithm is not surprising given that it was filed in 1998 and issued in 2000. It was not until years later that the Federal Circuit provided guidance that “[t]he corresponding structure for a § 112, ¶ 6 claim for a computer-implemented function is the algorithm disclosed in the specification.” *Aristocrat Techs. Australia Pty. Ltd. v. Int'l Game Tech.*, 521 F.3d 1328, 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

<sup>2</sup> Philips argued in the parties' joint status report that indefiniteness should be addressed during claim construction (D.I. 60 at 2-3, 7-9). Now Philips takes the inconsistent position that the Court should delay addressing indefiniteness until after claim construction (D.I. 73 at 8). Indefiniteness for failure to disclose an algorithm is commonly determined in the context of claim construction. *E.g., Williamson v. Citrix Online LLC*, 792 F.3d 1339, 1345-46, 1351-55 (*en banc*) (affirming finding of indefiniteness in claim construction order).

# 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.