

1 Gregory L. Diskant (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Eugene M. Gelernter (admitted *pro hac vice*)
2 Maggie Wittlin (admitted *pro hac vice*)
PATTERSON BELKNAP WEBB & TYLER LLP
3 1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
4 Telephone: (212) 336-2000
Facsimile: (212) 336-2222
5 gldiskant@pbwt.com
emgelernter@pbwt.com
6 mwittlin@pbwt.com

7 Charles D. Hoffmann (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Sean Marshall (admitted *pro hac vice*)
8 HOFFMANN MARSHALL STRONG LLP
116 W 23rd Street, Suite 500
9 New York, NY 10011
10 Telephone: (212) 851-8403
Facsimile: (646) 741-4502
11 charlie@hmscounsel.com
sean@hmscounsel.com
12

13 Susan Roeder (S.B. #160897)
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
2765 Sand Hill Road
14 Menlo Park, CA 94025
Telephone: (650) 473-2600
15 Facsimile: (650) 473-2601
sroeder@omm.com
16

17 Attorneys for Plaintiffs LIFESCAN, INC.
and LIFESCAN SCOTLAND, LTD.

18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
19 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
20 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

21 LIFESCAN, INC. and LIFESCAN
SCOTLAND, LTD.,

22 Plaintiffs,

23 v.

24 SHASTA TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,
25 CONDUCTIVE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
DECISION DIAGNOSTICS CORP. and
26 PHARMATECH SOLUTIONS, INC.,

27 Defendants.

Case No. CV11-04494-WHO

**OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION
FOR JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS**

(ECF No. 399)

Date: May 14, 2014
Time: 2 p.m.
Place: 17th Floor, Courtroom 2
Judge: Hon. William H. Orrick

OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION
FOR JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS
CASE NO. CV11-04494-WHO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

A. Introduction 1

B. Factual Background 1

 1. The ‘105 Patent 1

 2. The Parties’ Products 2

 3. Procedural History 2

 4. The Federal Circuit Decision 4

 5. Evidence and Arguments Not Considered at the Preliminary Injunction Stage
 Show that the Meters Do Not Embody the ‘105 Patent’s Inventive Aspects 6

C. This Court Should Deny Defendants’ Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings 9

 1. Defendants Cannot Meet the Standard for Judgment on the Pleadings 9

 2. Defendants Cannot Meet the Summary Judgment Standard 11

 3. The Federal Circuit Decision Does Not Bar the Presentation of Additional
 Evidence on Patent Exhaustion 12

 4. Collateral Estoppel Does Not Bar LifeScan from Litigating the Exhaustion
 Issue on the Merits 14

 a. There is No Final Judgment on the Merits in a Previous Action 15

 b. LifeScan Did Not Have an Opportunity to Fully Develop the Evidence
 at the Preliminary Injunction Stage 15

CONCLUSION 16

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

Altana Pharma AG v. Teva Pharms. USA Inc.,
566 F.3d 999 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....12

Amazon.com, Inc. v. Barnesandnoble.com, Inc.,
239 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....5

Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.,
477 U.S. 242 (1986).....11

Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.,
920 F. Supp. 2d 1079 (N.D. Cal. 2013)9

Aro Manufacturing Co. v. Convertible Top Replacement Co.,
365 U.S. 336 (1961).....3, 8

Atari Games Corp. v. Nintendo of Am.,
Nos. C 88-4805, C 89-0027, 1993 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8183 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 15, 1993).....13

Cornell Univ. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.,
No. 01-cv-1974, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 60209 (N.D.N.Y. Aug. 1, 2008).....9, 12

Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Salazar,
706 F.3d 1085 (9th Cir. 2013)4, 12, 13

Fleming v. Pickard,
581 F.3d 922 (9th Cir. 2009)10

Freedman Seating Co. v. Am. Seating Co.,
420 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....14

Fresenius USA, Inc. v. Baxter Int’l, Inc.,
721 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....13

Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S,
108 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....13

Gilligan v. Jamco Dev. Corp.,
108 F.3d 246 (9th Cir. 1997)10

Glaxo Grp. Ltd. v. Apotex, Inc.,
376 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....13

Haberman v. Gerber Prods. Co.,
236 F. App’x 592 (Fed. Cir. 2007)14



1 *Hansen Beverage Co. v. Vital Pharm., Inc.*,
 No. 08-CV-1545, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 105447 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 30, 2008).....15

2

3 *Heuft Systemtechnik GmbH v. Indus. Dynamics Co.*,
 282 F. App'x 836 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 14

4

5 *In re iPhone 4S Consumer Litig.*,
 No. C 12-1127 CW, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 103058 (N.D. Cal. July 23, 2013)10

6 *In re King*,
 801 F.2d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....7

7

8 *Kemin Foods v. Pigmentos Vegetales Del Centro S.A. De C.V.*,
 No. 4:02-cv-40327, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 31188 (S.D. Iowa Sept. 9, 2004)13

9

10 *Kendall v. Visa USA, Inc.*,
 518 F.3d 1042 (9th Cir. 2008)14, 15

11 *Keurig, Inc. v. Sturm Foods, Inc.*,
 732 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....10

12

13 *LifeScan Scotland, Ltd. v. Shasta Technologies, LLC*,
 734 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... passim

14 *Loctite Corp. v. Ultraseal Ltd.*,
 781 F.2d 861 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....7

15

16 *Minebea Co. v. Papst*,
 374 F. Supp. 2d 202 (D.D.C. 2005)9

17

18 *Perricone v. Medicis Pharm. Corp.*,
 432 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....7

19

20 *Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Boehringer Ingelheim GmbH*,
 237 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....12

21 *Quanta Computer, Inc. v. LG Electronics, Inc.*,
 553 U.S. 617 (2008)..... passim

22

23 *Scott v. Harris*,
 550 U.S. 372 (2007).....11

24 *Scott v. Kuhlmann*,
 746 F.2d 1377 (9th Cir. 1984)10

25

26 *Storage Tech. Corp. v. Custom Hardware Engineering & Consulting, Ltd.*,
 02-12102, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 43690 (D. Mass. June 28, 2006).....13

27

28 *Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Contractors USA, Inc.*,
 617 F.3d 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....14

1 *Turner v. Cook*,
2 362 F.3d 1219 (9th Cir. 2004)10

3 *Ugine & ALZ Belgium v. United States*,
4 452 F.3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....12

5 *Univ. of Tex. v. Camenisch*,
6 451 U.S. 390 (1981).....12, 15, 16

7 *Weisbuch v. County of Los Angeles*,
8 119 F.3d 778 (9th Cir. 1997)10

9 *Wolfson v. Brammer*,
10 616 F.3d 1045 (9th Cir. 2010)14

11 **STATUTES**

12 35 U.S.C. § 103.....2

13 35 U.S.C. § 271(c)8

14 **OTHER AUTHORITIES**

15 Bernard Chao, *Breaking Aro’s Commandment: Recognizing that Inventions Have Heart*, 20
16 Fordham Intell. Prop. Media & Ent. L.J. 1183 (2010).....8

17 Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a)11

18 Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(c)9, 10, 11

19 Thomas G. Hungar, *Observations Regarding the Supreme Court’s Decision in Quanta*
20 *Computer v. LG Electronics, Inc.*, 49 IDEA 517 (2009).....8

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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.