

**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' MOTION FOR PARTIAL  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF DIRECT INFRINGEMENT  
AND NO INVALIDITY (DKT. 335)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Pages</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. LEGAL STANDARDS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT .....	1
III. PHILIPS' REQUEST FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF LITERAL, DIRECT INFRINGEMENT BY FITBIT'S USERS IS UNSUPPORTED .....	2
A. The Accused Wearables And Fitbit Users Cannot Infringing Claim 1 .....	2
1. Fitbit's Users Cannot And Do Not Perform Elements 1.a, or 1.g- 1.h.....	2
a. The Asserted Claims Require One Server To Perform Elements 1.a, 1.g, And 1.h, But Fitbit Uses Different Servers.....	2
b. The Asserted Claims Require One Server To Perform Elements 1.g and 1.h, But Fitbit Uses Different Servers .....	3
c. The Accused System Does Not Provide A Calculated Response .....	5
d. Resting Heart Rate Is Not Exercise-Related Information.....	6
e. A Wi-Fi Network Is Not A "Wireless Network" Of Element 1.g .....	8
2. Fitbit's Users Cannot Perform Element 1.c .....	9
3. Fitbit's Users Cannot Perform Element 1.b.....	10
B. Philips' Exclusively Circumstantial Evidence Of Alleged Infringement Is Insufficient Under Controlling Caselaw .....	10
1. The Cases Cited In Support Of Fitbit's Motion For Summary Judgment Are Applicable; Philips' Cited Cases Are Not.....	11
a. Philips' Cited Cases Are Inapposite .....	11
b. The Cases Cited By Fitbit Are Directly On-Point .....	12
2. The Accused Wearables Do Not Necessarily Infringe And Fitbit Does Not Instruct Its Users To Perform The Entire Accused Method In The Required Order, But Rather Advises Its Users Of Noninfringing Uses.....	13

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)**

	<b><u>Pages</u></b>
a. Fitbit Instructs Its Users How To Use The Accused Wearables With A Tablet Or PC, Which Does Not Infringe.....	14
b. The Accused Wearables Can Sync Data When The User Is Not Exercising And Fitbit Does Not Instruct Its Users That Syncing Data While Exercising Is Preferred .....	16
c. The Accused Wearables May Sync Data Without Using A Wireless Network.....	18
IV. DR. PARADISO PRESENTED ADEQUATE EVIDENCE THAT THE IFIT SYSTEM PRACTICES ELEMENT 1.H.....	18
V. CONCLUSION.....	20

..

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b><u>Pages</u></b>
<b><u>Cases</u></b>	
<i>ACCO Brands, Inc. v. ABA Locks Mfrs. Co., Ltd</i> 501 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	12, 13, 16, 18
<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> , 477 U.S. 242 (1986).....	2
<i>Becton Dickinson &amp; Co. v. C.R. Bard, Inc.</i> , 922 F.2d 792 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	2
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986).....	2
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 251 F.3d 955 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	19
<i>E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3Com Corp.</i> , 473 F.3d 1213 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	12, 14
<i>Finnigan Corp. v. ITC</i> 180 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	20
<i>Fleming v. Escort Inc.</i> , 774 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	20
<i>Fujitsu Ltd. v. Netgear Inc.</i> , 620 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	11, 13
<i>IAP Intermodal, LLC vs. Northwest Airlines Corp.</i> , No. 2:04-cv-65, 2005 WL 6217423 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 7, 2005).....	7
<i>Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.</i> , 580 F.3d 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	11, 12
<i>Moleculon Res. Corp. v. CBS, Inc.</i> , 793 F.2d 1261 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	9, 11
<i>Noonan v. Staples, Inc.</i> , 556 F.3d 20 (1st Cir. 2009).....	2
<i>Thomson S.A. v. Quixote Corp.</i> 166 F.3d 1172 (Fed.Cir.1999).....	20

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (cont'd)**

**Pages**

*Toshiba Corp. v. Imation Corp.*,  
681 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 11, 12

*TQ Delta, LLC v. 2Wire, Inc.*,  
No. 13-1835-RGA, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 153651 (D. Del. Aug. 6, 2021) ..... 20

*Wi-LAN USA, Inc. v. Apple Inc.*,  
830 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 9

*Wonderland Nurserygoods Co. v. Thorley Indus. LLC*,  
No. 2:13-cv-00387, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 110935 (W.D. Pa. Aug. 21, 2015)..... 20

**Rules**

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

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

# 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.