

1 Ryan E. Hatch (SBN 235577)  
rhatch@linerlaw.com  
2 Jason L. Haas (SBN 217290)  
jhaas@linerlaw.com  
3 LINER LLP  
1100 Glendon Avenue, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
4 Los Angeles, California 90024.3518  
Telephone: (310) 500-3500  
5 Facsimile: (310) 500-3501  
6 Attorneys for Plaintiff SIGNAL IP, INC.  
7

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10  
11 SIGNAL IP, INC., a California  
corporation,  
12  
Plaintiff,  
13  
vs.  
14 AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO.,  
INC., a California corporation;  
15 HONDA OF AMERICA MRG, INC.,  
an Ohio corporation,  
16  
Defendant.  
17

Case No. 2:14-cv-02454-JAK (JEMx)  
(Related to 2:14-cv-02962-JAK  
(JEMx); 8:14-cv-00497-JAK (JEMx);  
8:14-cv-00491-JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-  
02963 JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-02457-  
JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-03111-JAK  
(JEMx); 2:14-cv-03109-JAK (JEMx);  
2:14-cv-03113-JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-  
03108-JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-03114-  
JAK (JEMx))

**PLAINTIFF SIGNAL IP, INC.'S  
SECOND AMENDED RESPONSES  
TO DEFENDANTS' FIRST SET OF  
COMMON INTERROGATORIES  
(NOS. 1-8)**

18 AND RELATED CASES  
19

The Hon. John A. Kronstadt  
Trial Date: March 15, 2016  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Plaintiff Signal IP, Inc. (“Signal IP”, “Plaintiff” or “Responding Party”),  
2 through its counsel, and pursuant to F.R.C.P. 26 and 33, hereby amends its prior  
3 responses to the First Set of Common Interrogatories (NOS. 1-8) served on Signal  
4 IP by Defendants American Honda Motor Co., Inc. and Honda of America Mfg.,  
5 Inc., BMW North America LLC, Kia Motors America, Inc., Mazda Motor of  
6 America, Inc., Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC, Nissan North America, Inc., Porsche  
7 Cars North America, Inc., and Subaru of America, Inc. (each a “Defendant” and,  
8 collectively, “Defendants”), as follows:

9 **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

10 Signal IP has not fully completed investigation of the facts relating to this  
11 case, discovery in this action, or preparation for trial. All of the responses contained  
12 herein are based only upon such information and documents that are presently  
13 available to, and specifically known to Signal IP. It is anticipated that further  
14 discovery, independent investigation, legal research and analysis will supply  
15 additional facts, which may, in turn, clarify and add meaning to known facts as well  
16 as establish entirely new factual matters, all of which may lead to substantial  
17 additions to, changes in, and variations from the contentions and responses herein  
18 set forth.

19 The following discovery responses are given without prejudice to Signal IP’s  
20 right to produce evidence of any subsequently discovered fact or facts, witnesses or  
21 information that Signal IP may later identify, locate, or recall. Signal IP accordingly  
22 reserves the right to supplement or change any and all responses herein as additional  
23 facts are ascertained, analyses are made, legal research is completed and contentions  
24 are formulated. The responses contained herein are made in a good faith effort to  
25 supply as much factual information and as much specification of legal contentions  
26 as is presently known but should in no way be to the prejudice of this Responding  
27 Party in relation to further discovery, research, or analysis. This preliminary  
28 statement is incorporated into each and every response set forth below.

**GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

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

1. Signal IP objects to these interrogatories to the extent that they attempt to impose obligations on it greater or different than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of the Central District of California, the Standing Order for Patent Cases Assigned to Judge John A. Kronstadt, or any order of the Court.

2. Signal IP objects to these interrogatories to the extent that they seek the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, attorney work product doctrine, and/or other privileges held by Signal IP or any person acting on its behalf or third parties. Signal IP will not waive the attorney-client privilege or disclose information protected by the attorney work product doctrine. In responding to the interrogatories, whenever the term “privileged” appears it shall encompass the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine.

3. Signal IP objects to the interrogatories to the extent they assume disputed facts or legal conclusions in describing the information or documents sought.

4. Signal IP objects to these interrogatories as they are overbroad, vague, ambiguous and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

5. Signal IP objects to these interrogatories in their entirety as they are replete with undefined and ill-defined terms, making the interrogatories vague, ambiguous and unintelligible. Signal IP has made a good faith effort to provide substantive responses to the extent that is able to determine the meaning of the interrogatories.

6. Signal IP reserves the right to make any additional or different objections as may be appropriate based upon any amendment(s) to the pleadings and/or further court proceedings in this action. Signal IP does not concede that any of its responses are or will be admissible evidence in any subsequent proceeding,

1 including the trial of this or any other action, or any evidentiary hearing.

2         7. Signal IP expressly reserves the right to supplement or amend its  
3 responses based on subsequently discovered information, documents and witnesses  
4 in these actions.

5         8. Signal IP objects to each interrogatory to the extent it seeks information  
6 equally available to BMW through public sources or records

7         The general objections set forth above, and the objections to the  
8 interrogatories set forth below, are made as to matters which are clearly  
9 objectionable from the face of the interrogatories. These objections are made  
10 without prejudice to or waiver of Signal IP's right to object, on all appropriate  
11 grounds to the provision of specific information hereafter, prior to, or at the time of  
12 service of these responses.

13         Subject to and without waiver of the general objections above, each and every  
14 one of which is incorporated into each and every response below, and subject to  
15 Signal IP's right to amend and supplement these responses, Signal IP responds to  
16 each interrogatory as follows:

17

18                                 **RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES**

19 **INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

20         For each Asserted Claim of each of the Patents-in-Suit, describe in as much  
21 detail as You contend is possible the facts and circumstances relating to its  
22 conception and reduction to practice. While not limiting, it is expected that a full  
23 response to this Interrogatory would include the date(s) and location(s) of  
24 conception and reduction to practice, whether and how diligence was exercised in  
25 reducing the alleged invention to practice, whether reduction to practice was actual  
26 or constructive, the identity of each person (including Third-Parties) who  
27 contributed to conception or the development of the alleged invention(s) and their  
28 role including, and the identity of any document that supports Your response to this

1 Interrogatory.

2 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

3 Plaintiff objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information  
4 that is neither relevant to a claim or defense nor reasonably calculated to lead to the  
5 discovery of admissible evidence to the extent that it seeks information on the  
6 conception and reduction to practice of the inventions claimed in U.S. Patents  
7 5,714,927 (the “927 Patent”); 5, 954,775 (the “775 Patent”); and 5,463,374 (the  
8 “374 Patent”). As set forth in the various Infringement Contentions served by  
9 Plaintiff on June 18, 2015, Plaintiff does not claim a priority date earlier than the  
10 application date for the ‘927 Patent, ‘775 Patent, and ‘374 Patent. For this reason,  
11 the conception and reduction to practice of these three patents is not relevant.

12 Plaintiff further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks  
13 discovery of information protected from discovery by attorney-client privilege, work  
14 product doctrine, the joint defense privilege, and the common interest privilege.  
15 Plaintiff also objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information  
16 protected by any other applicable privilege or immunity. Signal IP objects to this  
17 Interrogatory on the grounds that it is compound.

18 Subject to its general and specific objections, and without waiving them,  
19 Plaintiff responds that, pursuant to FRCP 33(d), Defendant is referred to the  
20 documents Plaintiff produced at SIG00001716-1765 for the information available to  
21 Plaintiff on the conception and reduction to practice of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,486.

22 Plaintiff asserts a priority date for U.S. Patent No. 6,012,007 (the “007  
23 Patent”) based on the application date for U.S. Patent No. 5,732,375, because the  
24 007 Patent is a continuation-in-part of that earlier patent. Plaintiff has no  
25 information relating to the conception and reduction to practice of the ‘007 Patent  
26 beyond the information contained in the patent applications for the ‘375 and ‘007  
27 Patents.

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.