

**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 OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF ITS
MOTION TO STRIKE, IN PART, THE INFRINGEMENT EXPERT REPORT
AND OPINIONS OF DR. TOM MARTIN PURSUANT TO
FED. R. CIV. P. 37(c)(1) AND LOCAL RULE 16.6(d)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
LEGAL STANDARDS	2
ARGUMENT.....	4
I. PHILIPS VIOLATED ITS DISCOVERY OBLIGATIONS BY FAILING TO TIMELY DISCLOSE THREE NEW INFRINGEMENT THEORIES FIRST RAISED IN THE MARTIN REPORT.....	4
1. Philips Failed To Disclose Its Joint Infringement Theory.....	4
2. Philips Failed To Disclose Its GPS Data And Run Cardio Fitness Score Infringement Theory.....	9
3. Philips Failed To Disclose Its Representative Product Infringement Theory.....	12
II. FEDERAL RULE 37 PROHIBITS PHILIPS FROM RELYING ON ITS PREVIOUSLY UNDISCLOSED INFRINGEMENT THEORIES.	13
III. PHILIPS’ UNTIMELY DISCLOSURE OF ITS NEW INFRINGEMENT THEORIES IS NEITHER SUBSTANTIALLY JUSTIFIED NOR HARMLESS.....	14
1. Philips Has No Credible Justification For Its Failure to Timely Disclose Its New Infringement Theories.....	14
2. Fitbit Is Significantly Prejudiced By Philips’ Late Disclosures.	16
3. The History Of This Litigation Weighs In Favor of Exclusion.	19
4. Philips’ Late Disclosure Would Necessitate Further Adjustment Of The Case Schedule And Thereby Disrupt The Court’s Docket.	19
5. Exclusion Of Philips’ New Infringement Theories Would Not Deprive Philips Of The Ability To Advance An Infringement Case.	20
CONCLUSION.....	20

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

<i>Adobe Sys. v. Wowza Media Sys.</i> , No. 11-cv-02243-JST, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23153 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 22, 2014).....	18
<i>Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.</i> , 797 F.3d 1020 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	4, 16
<i>Arthur v. Atkinson Freight Lines Corp.</i> , 164 F.R.D. 19 (S.D.N.Y.1995).....	2
<i>Asia Vital Components Co. v. Asetek Danmark A/S</i> , 377 F. Supp. 3d 990 (N.D. Cal. 2019).....	13
<i>AVX Corp. v. Cabot Corp.</i> , 251 F.R.D. 70 (D. Mass. 2008).....	2, 19
<i>B-K Lighting, Inc. v. Vision3 Lighting</i> , 930 F. Supp. 2d 1102 (C.D. Cal. 2013).....	3, 13
<i>Changzhou Kaidi Elec. Co. v. Okin Am., Inc.</i> , 112 F. Supp. 3d 330 (D. Md. 2015).....	14
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Dr. Reddy's Lab'ys, Ltd.</i> , No. 1:16-CV-0308-TWP-DKL, 2017 WL 1531834 (S.D. Ind. Apr. 28, 2017).....	13
<i>Harriman v. Hancock Cty.</i> , 627 F.3d 22 (1st Cir. 2010).....	4, 14
<i>Hochstein v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , No. 04-73071, 2009 WL 2498481 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 17, 2009).....	3, 13
<i>Inline Plastics Corp. v. Lacerta Grp., Inc.</i> , Case No. 4:18-cv-11631-TSH (D. Mass. Feb. 23, 2021).....	3, 11, 13
<i>Klonoski, M.D. v. Mahlab, M.D.</i> , 156 F.3d 255 (1st Cir.1998).....	3
<i>L & W, Inc. v. Shertech, Inc.</i> , 471 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	12
<i>Milos Misha Subotincic v. 1274274 Ontario Inc.</i> , No. SACV 10-01946 AG, 2013 WL 3964994 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 9, 2013).....	12

Nalco Co. v. Chem-Mod, LLC,
883 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2018)..... 7

O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Monolithic Power Sys., Inc.,
467 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 8, 13

Poulis-Minott v. Smith,
388 F.3d 354 (1st Cir. 2004)..... 3

Providence Piers, LLC v. SMM New England, Inc.,
No. CV 12-532S, 2015 WL 9699936 (D.R.I. Oct. 1, 2015)..... 19

Pulse Elecs., Inc. v. U.D. Elec. Corp.,
18-cv-373, 2021 WL 981123 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 16, 2021) 12

Spanston, Inc. v. ITC,
629 F.3d 1331 (Fed.Cir.2010)..... 12

Thermos Co. v. Starbucks Corp.,
No. 96 C 3833, 1999 WL 203822 (N.D. Ill. April 6, 1999) 14

Travel Sentry, Inc. v. Tropp,
877 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 7

Wilson v. Bradlees of New England, Inc.,
250 F.3d 10 (1st Cir. 2001)..... 3, 4, 13, 14

Woods v. DeAngelo Marine Exhaust, Inc.,
692 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 3, 8

RULES

Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e) 2

Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e)(1)..... 2

Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(c) 3, 14

Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(c)(1)..... 3, 14

INTRODUCTION

Defendant Fitbit LLC (“Fitbit”) moves under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(c)(1) to strike, in part, the November 16, 2021 Opening Report of Dr. Tom Martin (the “Martin Report”). The Martin Report presents three new infringement theories that Plaintiff Philips North America LLC (“Philips”) did not disclose during discovery, including in response to Fitbit’s Interrogatory No. 9 or in Philips’ Local Rule 16.6(d) infringement contentions:

- 1) Fitbit directly infringes via joint infringement by directing and controlling users’ performance of certain steps of claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 8,277,377 (“the ’377 patent”);
- 2) Fitbit directly and indirectly infringes by providing users with Run Cardio Fitness Scores based on GPS data collected by the user’s mobile phone or Fitbit device; and
- 3) certain accused Fitbit products are representative of others for the infringement analysis.

Upon the Martin Report’s disclosure of these new theories, Fitbit requested additional time to investigate and address Philips’ new allegations in responsive expert reports in an effort to mitigate prejudice, but Philips refused. (*See* Ex. 1 at 1.)

Although Fitbit served Interrogatory No. 9 specifically directed to Philips’ new joint infringement theory, and repeatedly requested that Philips supplement its infringement contentions to provide more specificity, Philips never disclosed these three theories in its Interrogatory No. 9 response or Local Rule 16.6(d) infringement contentions. Rather, Philips laid in wait and then disclosed these three new theories for the first time in the Martin Report on November 16, 2021—nearly eight months after the close of fact discovery. In doing so, Philips violated Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(e) and Local Rule 16.6(d). Philips has no credible explanation for its failure to timely disclose these theories during discovery. Introducing these theories now—after the close of fact discovery and only weeks before Fitbit’s rebuttal noninfringement report was due—prejudices Fitbit. Pursuant to Rule 37(c)(1), Fitbit requests that the Court strike Philips’ three new infringement theories contained in the portions of the Martin Report indicated by green redaction

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.