

EXHIBIT A

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

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

**PHILIPS NORTH AMERICA LLC'S REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF ITS
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION (Dkt. 403)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Argument 1

 A. Fitbit Does Not Defend the Court’s Misinterpretation of *Berkheimer* 1

 B. The Court Can Reconsider its Decision and Should not “Ignore” Error as Fitbit Requests 2

 C. The Court’s Opinion Relied on the Incorrect Determination That the Inventive Concepts Were Not Captured by the Claims 3

 D. The Court’s Opinion Did Not Find That the Claims Failed to Eliminate Location Based Restraints..... 4

 E. Fitbit Did Not Present Any Evidence of Conventionality With Regard to the Ordered Combination of Elements 5

III. Conclusion 6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Am. Axle & Mfg., Inc. v. Neapco Holdings LLC,
967 F.3d 1285 (Fed. Cir. 2020)..... 3

Berkheimer v. HP Inc.,
881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018)..... 1, 2, 3

Cooperative Entertainment v. Kollektive Tech.,
50 F.4th 127 (Fed. Cir. 2022) 1, 2

Cosmo Key Sols. GmbH & Co. KG v. Duo Sec. LLC,
15 F.4th 1091 (Fed. Cir. 2021) 1, 2

DeGrandis v. Children’s Hosp. Boston,
No. 14-10416, 2015 WL 1959433 (D. Mass. Apr. 30, 2015)..... 2

Fernández–Vargas v. Pfizer,
522 F.3d 55 (1st Cir. 2008)..... 2

Perfect Curve, Inc. v. Hat World, Inc.
988 F.Supp.2d 38 (D. Mass. 2013) 2

I. Introduction

As explained in Philips’s Motion, Philips seeks reconsideration because the Court appears to have misunderstood *Berkheimer v. HP Inc.*, 881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018) as requiring that the “reasons why” an inventive concept is inventive be explicitly recited in a claim in addition to the inventive concept itself. *See* Dkt. 404 at 5-9. While Fitbit opposes the Motion, its Opposition (Dkt. 406) only serves to reinforce the fact that reconsideration is appropriate. Fitbit’s Opposition is devoid of any rebuttal to Philips’s argument that *Berkheimer* was misapplied. Instead, Fitbit’s brief largely focuses on the purported reasons why the Court’s decision should be sustained **even if** the Court misapplied *Berkheimer*. Essentially, Fitbit asks that the Court “ignore” its error and sustain its earlier decision on alternative grounds not fully reached in the Court’s original opinion—which would be improper.

II. Argument

A. Fitbit Does Not Defend the Court’s Misinterpretation of *Berkheimer*

In resignation to the truth, Fitbit does not even attempt to defend the Court’s misapplication of *Berkheimer*, and provides **no rebuttal** to Philips’s explanation that *Berkheimer* did not (as this Court held) require that claims recite *ipsis verbis* the “reasons why” inventive concepts are inventive. *See* Dkt. 404 at 5-8.¹ Nor does Fitbit dispute that applying this Court’s test would have led to the **opposite** result in *Berkheimer*. *See* Dkt. 404 at 8-9.

Further, Fitbit did not dispute that the Federal Circuit has consistently found claims patent eligible that do not explicitly recite the “reasons why” they are unconventional, and failed to address cases like *Cosmo Key* and *Cooperative Entertainment* discussed in Philips’s brief. *See* Dkt. 404 at 9-12 (discussing *Cosmo Key Sols. GmbH & Co. KG v. Duo Sec. LLC*, 15 F.4th 1091 (Fed.

¹ The closest Fitbit ever comes to a response to Philips’s arguments concerning the Court’s misapplication of *Berkheimer* consist of simply interjecting the words “and it did not”, in a conclusory fashion, in the following sentence: “Thus, even if the Court did misapply *Berkheimer* in finding that the alleged inventive concepts are not

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.