



**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 SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF NONINFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,277,377**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Pages</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. RELEVANT LEGAL STANDARDS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT	2
III. STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS	2
A. Facts Pertinent To Both Grounds 1 and 2	3
B. Facts Pertinent To Ground 1	5
C. Facts Pertinent To Ground 2	8
IV. FITBIT IS ENTITLED TO SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF NONINFRINGEMENT BECAUSE THE ACCUSED METHODS DO NOT MEET '377 PATENT CLAIM 1	11
A. Relevant Legal Standards For Noninfringement	11
B. Ground 1: No Infringement Because Fitbit Uses   In The Method Accused Of Practicing '377 Claim Elements 1.g And 1.h.....	12
1. Argument	12
2. Conclusion	14
C. Ground 2: No Infringement Because Fitbit's Calculation Of RHR Cardio Fitness Score And Cardio Fitness Level Is Not "Based On The Exercise- Related Information"	15
1. Argument	16
2. Conclusion	19
V. CONCLUSION.....	19

[REDACTED]

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Pages</u>
<u>Cases</u>	
<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> , 477 U.S. 242 (1986).....	2
<i>Arthur A. Collins, Inc. v. N. Telecom Ltd.</i> , 216 F.3d 1042 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	2
<i>Automed Techs., Inc. v. Microfil, LLC</i> , 244 F. App'x 354 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	13
<i>Brita Wasser-Filter-Systeme v. Recovery Eng'g, Inc.</i> , 243 F.3d 560 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	11
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986).....	2
<i>Cognex Corp. v. ITC</i> , 550 F. App'x 876 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	12
<i>Dippin' Dots, Inc. v. Mosey</i> , 476 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	11
<i>Ferring B.V. v. Watson Lab'ys, Inc.-Fla.</i> , 764 F.3d 1401 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	12
<i>Limelight Networks, Inc. v. Akamai Techs., Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 915 (2014).....	11
<i>Litton Sys. Inc. v. Honeywell Inc.</i> , 140 F.3d 1449 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	12
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Mirowski Fam. Ventures, LLC</i> , 571 U.S. 191 (2014).....	2
<i>NTP, Inc. v. Research In Motion, Ltd.</i> , 418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	13
<i>Quest Licensing Corp. v. Bloomberg L.P.</i> , No. 14-CV-561(GMS), 2017 WL 239345 (D. Del. Jan. 19, 2017)	15
<i>Quest Licensing Corp. v. Bloomberg LP</i> , 726 F. App'x 819 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	15



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (cont'd)

Pages

Smith v. Garlock Equip. Co.,
658 F. App'x 1017 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 19

Telemac Cellular Corp. v. Topp Telecom, Inc.,
247 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..... 2

Traxcell Techs., LLC v. Sprint Commc'ns Co. LP,
15 F.4th 1121 (Fed. Cir. 2021) 2

UltimatePointer, L.L.C. v. Nintendo Co., Ltd.,
816 F.3d 816 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 15

Wisconsin Alumni Res. Found. v. Apple Inc.,
905 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2018)..... 14, 19

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 112..... 3

Rules

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a) 2

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c) 2

Local Rule 56.1 2

...

[REDACTED]

I. INTRODUCTION

Fitbit moves for summary judgment of noninfringement of U.S. Patent No. 8,277,377 (the “377 patent”) on two grounds: (1) the accused methods do not practice elements 1.g and 1.h of the asserted method claims; and (2) the accused method of providing Resting Heart Rate (RHR) Cardio Fitness Score (and associated Cardio Fitness Level) does not practice claim element 1.h because RHR Cardio Fitness Score is not calculated “based on the exercise-related information.”

For the first ground, the parties’ technical experts agree that claim elements 1.g and 1.h must be performed by the same server or the same server array. However, there is no dispute that Fitbit’s systems purportedly perform elements 1.g and 1.h using [REDACTED]. Thus, no reasonable juror could find that the accused methods infringe claim 1.

For the second ground, claim element 1.h requires “a calculation performed by the server based on the exercise-related information.” A user’s RHR Cardio Fitness Score is calculated from an equation whose inputs are [REDACTED]. It is undisputed that the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] do not comprise “exercise-related information.” Fitbit’s technical expert, Dr. Joseph Paradiso, explained that resting heart rate is not “exercise-related information” under element 1.h, while Philips’ expert, Dr. Thomas Martin, did not contradict this opinion despite being repeatedly asked about the point at his deposition. Therefore, no reasonable juror could find that a user’s RHR Cardio Fitness Score (and associated Cardio Fitness Level) is calculated “based on the exercise-related information,” and thus, the accused method does not infringe claim 1.

Because these methods do not infringe claim 1, they also do not infringe the other asserted claims 4, 5, 6, 9, and 12, all of which depend from claim 1.

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.