

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

PHILIPS NORTH AMERICA LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

FITBIT LLC,

Defendant.

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

**FITBIT'S OPPOSITION TO PHILIPS'S
MOTION TO STRIKE FITBIT'S INEQUITABLE CONDUCT DEFENSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	1
LEGAL STANDARD.....	3
ARGUMENT.....	5
I. FITBIT’S INEQUITABLE CONDUCT PLEADING WAS TIMELY FILED.	5
1. The Scheduling Order Does Not Preclude Fitbit’s Answer.....	5
2. Fitbit Timely Answered Under Rule 12—The Applicable Rule.	6
3. Fitbit Did Not “Omit” Inequitable Conduct From Its L.R. 16.6 Disclosures.....	7
II. FITBIT’S INEQUITABLE CONDUCT PLEADING SATISFIES RULE 9(B).	7
1. Mr. Helget Had an Affirmative Duty to Disclose the Co-pending ’902 Application When Prosecuting the ’233 Patent.	8
2. The ’233 Patent Claims Would Not Have Issued But For Mr. Helget’s Failure to Disclose the Co-Pending ’902 Application.	12
3. Fitbit’s Inequitable Conduct Pleading Permits a Reasonable Inference That Mr. Helget Intended to Deceive the Patent Office.....	16
4. The ’233 Patent Is Unenforceable Due to Mr. Helget’s Inequitable Conduct Prosecuting the ’902 Patent.....	19
CONCLUSION.....	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<u>CASES</u>	
<i>Akron Polymer Container Corp. v. Exxel Container, Inc.</i> , 148 F.3d 1380 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	10
<i>Allflex USA, Inc. v. Avid Identification Sys., Inc.</i> , 704 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	7
<i>Am. Hoist & Derrick Co. v. Sowa & Sons, Inc.</i> , 725 F.2d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	11
<i>Armour & Co. v. Swift & Co.</i> , 466 F.2d 767 (7th Cir. 1972)	9
<i>Bennet v. Spoor Behrins Campbell & Young, Inc.</i> , 124 F.R.D. 562 (S.D.N.Y. 1989)	4
<i>Bio-Vita, Ltd. v. Rausch</i> , 759 F. Supp. 33 (D. Mass. 1991).....	4
<i>Camey v. Force Factor, LLC</i> , No. CV 14-14717-RWZ, 2016 WL 10998440 (D. Mass. May 16, 2016).....	5
<i>Cave Consulting Grp., Inc. v. Optuminsight, Inc.</i> , No. 15-CV-03424-JCS, 2016 WL 1611042 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 22, 2016).....	4
<i>Consol. Aluminum Corp. v. Foseco Int’l Ltd.</i> , 910 F.2d 804 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	20
<i>Dayco Prod., Inc. v. Total Containment, Inc.</i> , 329 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	10
<i>Eisai Co., Ltd. v. Dr. Reddy’s Laboratories, Ltd.</i> , No. 03 CIV. 9053 (GEL), 2007 WL 1437834 (S.D.N.Y. May 14, 2007)	15
<i>Exergen Corp. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 575 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	passim
<i>Fitbit LLC v. Koninklijke Philips N.V. et al.</i> , Case No. 1:20-cv-11613-WGY (D. Mass. 2020)	7
<i>Gamble v. Boyd Gaming Corp.</i> , No. 2:13-CV-01009-JCM, 2014 WL 1331034 (D. Nev. Apr. 1, 2014)	6
<i>Golden Valley Microwave Foods, Inc. v. Weaver Popcorn Co.</i> , 837 F. Supp. 1444 (N.D. Ind. 1992), <i>aff’d</i> , 11 F.3d 1072 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	14

Guardant Health, Inc. v. Found. Med., Inc.,
 No. CV 17-1616-LPS-CJB, 2020 WL 2477522 (D. Del. Jan. 7, 2020) 20

Harris Corp. v. Fed. Exp. Corp.,
 No. 6:07-CV-1819-ORL, 2010 WL 2639564 (M.D. Fla. June 29, 2010) 9

Helget v. Fitbit, Inc.,
 Case No. 21-mc-91150-FDS (D. Mass. Feb. 15, 2021)..... 3

Honeywell Consumer Prods., Inc. v. Windmere Corp.,
 993 F. Supp. 22 (D. Mass. 1998) 4

In re Clark,
 522 F.2d 623 (C.C.P.A.1975) 14

In re Mott,
 539 F.2d 1291, 190 USPQ 536 (CCPA 1976) 11

Leviton Mfg. Co., Inc. v. Universal Sec. Instruments, Inc.,
 606 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 13

Lu v. Davis,
 No. CV 19-11968-PBS, 2020 WL 7408278 (D. Mass. Nov. 2, 2020), *report and recommendation adopted*, No. 1:19-CV-11968, 2020 WL 8026733 (D. Mass. Nov. 24, 2020) 6

McIntosh v. Loc. Union 33, United Roofers, Waterproofers & Allied Workers,
 No. CIV.A. 12-11815-NMG, 2013 WL 5295687 (D. Mass. July 22, 2013) 6

McKesson Info. Sols., Inc. v. Bridge Med., Inc.,
 487 F.3d 897 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 9

Petedge, Inc. v. Fortress Secure Sols., LLC,
 No. CV 15-11988-FDS, 2016 WL 407065 (D. Mass. Feb. 2, 2016) 4, 17

PowerOasis, Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.,
 522 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 11

Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.,
 649 F.3d 1276 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... passim

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 101 2, 7, 13

35 U.S.C. § 102 7

35 U.S.C. § 103 7

35 U.S.C. § 112..... 7

RULES

Fed R. Civ. P. 12(f)..... 4

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12..... 3, 5, 6, 7

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(4)(A)..... 2, 6

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6)..... 2, 7

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f)..... 4

Fed. R. Civ. P. 9..... 18

Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b)..... 1, 4, 7, 18

Local Rule 16.6(d)(4)..... 7

REGULATIONS

37 C.F.R. § 1.56..... 9, 10

37 C.F.R. § 1.56(a)..... 9

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.