

**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

**DEFENDANT FITBIT LLC'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PHILIPS'
MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF THE NOVEMBER 16, 2021
EXPERT REPORT OF JOSEPH A. PARADISO (DKT. 259)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LEGAL STANDARDS	2
III. FITBIT’S RELIANCE ON THE REMAINING DISPUTED REFERENCES SHOULD NOT BE STRICKEN	3
1. Factual Background	3
2. Fitbit’s Reliance On Vaisanen Was Disclosed And Does Not Prejudice Philips	5
3. Fitbit’s Reliance On The Other Prior Art References Subject to Philips’ Motion Did Not Need To Be Disclosed, Was Disclosed In All But One Instance, And In Either Case Does Not Prejudice Philips	6
a. The Local Rules Do Not Require Disclosure Of References Merely Used To Show The State Of The Art And Fitbit Is Not Attempting To Assert A “Backdoor” Obviousness Argument	7
b. Fitbit Disclosed All But One Of The Remaining Disputed References	11
c. Philips’ Claims Of Prejudice Ring Hollow	13
IV. PHILIPS’ VAGUE INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS AND FAILURE TO NOTIFY FITBIT THAT THE PARTIES DISPUTE THE SCOPE OF CLAIM 1 NECESSITATED DR. PARADISO’S INDEFINITENESS OPINION	14
1. Factual Background	14
2. Dr. Paradiso’s Indefiniteness Opinion Was Disclosed As Soon As It Was Discovered And Should Not Be Stricken	18
CONCLUSION	20

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

<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , No. 2:15-CV-1455-WCB, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 225041 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 3, 2017).....	9, 10
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.</i> , 932 F.Supp.2d 1076 (N.D. Cal. 2013).....	10, 20
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics v. Verinata Health, Inc.</i> , 805 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	9
<i>Berkheimer v. HP Inc.</i> , 890 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	8
<i>Digital Reg. of Texas, LLC v. Adobe Systems Inc.</i> , No. CV 12–01971–CW (KAW), 2014 WL 1653131 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 24, 2014).....	2, 8
<i>ePlus, Inc. v. Lawson Software, Inc.</i> , 700 F.3d 509 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	20
<i>Fresenius Med. Care Holdings, Inc. v. Baxter Int’l, Inc.</i> , No. C 03-1431 SBA, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 90856 (N.D. Cal. May 5, 2006)	6
<i>Fujifilm Corp. v. Motorola Mobility LLC</i> , No. 12-cv-03587-WHO, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21413 (N.D. Cal Feb. 20, 2015)	9
<i>iFLY Holdings LLC v. Indoor Skydiving Germany GmbH</i> , No. 2:14-cv-1080, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 92550, 2016 WL 3680064 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 24, 2016).....	10
<i>Macaulay v. Anas</i> , 321 F.3d 45 (1st Cir. 2003).....	2
<i>Maxell, Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 136283, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 136283 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 26, 2021)	10
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instrs., Inc.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014).....	20
<i>O2 Micro Intern. v. Beyond Innov.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	19

Verinata Health, Inc. v. Sequenom, Inc.,
No. C 12-865, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 116382, 2014 WL 4100638 (N.D. Cal.
Aug. 20, 2014) 9, 10

STATUTES

35 U.S.C § 112..... 2
35 U.S.C. § 101..... 2, 3, 7, 10

RULES

Local Rule 16.6(d) 2, 7
Local Rule 16.6(d)(4)(F)..... 7

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendant Fitbit LLC (“Fitbit”) respectfully requests that this Court deny, in-part, the Motion to Strike portions of the Expert Report of Joseph A. Paradiso, Ph.D. (the “Paradiso Report”) Regarding Invalidity of U.S. Patent No. 8,277,377 (the “377 Patent”) filed by Plaintiff Philips North America LLC (“Philips”). (Dkt. 259 (“Motion”); *see also* Dkt. 260 (“Memorandum”).) Philips disputes Dr. Paradiso’s reliance on fourteen prior art references and an indefiniteness opinion. In an effort to narrow the disputes, Fitbit hereby withdraws its reliance on the following three prior art references subject to Philips’ Motion: U.S. Patent No. 5,689,825 (“Averbuch”), U.S. Patent No. 6,311,058 (“Wecker”), and U.S. Patent No. 6,493,758 (“McLain”). Fitbit respectfully requests that the Court deny the remainder of Philips’ Motion.

First, Philips’ issue with Fitbit’s incorporation by reference of an *inter partes* review petition that relied on U.S. Patent No. 6,560,443 (“Vaisanen”) as a secondary obviousness reference should be ignored given that Philips was undisputedly on notice of Fitbit’s invalidity contention with respect to Vaisanen, which was raised in Fitbit’s petition for *inter partes* review of the same claims of ’377 patent asserted here and incorporated by reference into Fitbit’s contentions, and Philips already addressed that argument in its Patent Owner Preliminary Response filed in response to Fitbit’s IPR petition.

Second, Dr. Paradiso’s reliance on the remaining disputed prior art references to illustrate the state of the art, rather than as anticipating references or part of an obviousness combination, comports with this District’s local patent rules and the majority rule under case law collected from various other districts.

Third, Dr. Paradiso’s indefiniteness opinion regarding the claim term “server” was necessitated by Philips’ own vague infringement contentions and Philips’ failure to respond to Fitbit’s clear non-infringement contentions. Indeed, it was not until Philips’ opening expert report

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.