

United States District Court  
Southern District  
of California



**L O C A L R U L E S**

Revised as of:  
March 18, 2020

## 2.5 Relationship to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Except as provided in this paragraph or as otherwise ordered, it will not be a legitimate ground for objecting to an opposing party's discovery request (*e.g.*, interrogatory, document request, request for admission, deposition question), or declining to provide information otherwise required to be disclosed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1), that the discovery request or disclosure requirement is premature in light of, or otherwise conflicts with, these Patent Local Rules. A party may object, however, to responding to the following categories of discovery requests on the ground that they are premature in light of the timetable provided in the Patent Local Rules:

- a. Requests seeking to elicit a party's claim construction position;
- b. Requests seeking to elicit from the patent claimant a comparison of the asserted claims and the accused apparatus, product, device, process, method, act, or other instrumentality;
- c. Requests seeking to elicit from an accused infringer a comparison of the asserted claims and the prior art; and
- d. Requests seeking to elicit an opinion of counsel, and related documents, upon which a party intends to rely for any patent-related claim or defense.

Where a party properly objects to a discovery request as set forth above, that party must provide the requested information on the date on which it is required to provide, the requested information to an opposing party under these Patent Local Rules, unless another legitimate ground for objection exists.

## 3. Patent Disclosures

### 3.1 Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions.

Not later than fourteen (14) days after the Initial Case Management Conference, a party claiming patent infringement must serve on all parties a "Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions." Separately for each opposing party, the "Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions" must contain the following information:

- a. Each claim of each patent in suit that is allegedly infringed by each opposing party;
- b. Separately for each asserted claim, each accused apparatus, product, device, process, method, act, or other instrumentality ("Accused Instrumentality") of each opposing party of which the party is aware. This identification must be as specific as possible. Each product, device and apparatus must be identified by name or model number, if known. Each method or process must be identified by name, if known, or by any product, device,

or apparatus which, when used, allegedly results in the practice of the claimed method or process;

- c. A chart identifying specifically where each element of each asserted claim is found within each Accused Instrumentality, including for each element that such party contends is governed by 35 U.S.C. §112(6), the identity of the structure(s), act(s), or material(s) in the Accused Instrumentality that performs the claimed function;
- d. For each claim which is alleged to have been indirectly infringed, an identification of any direct infringement and a description of the acts of the alleged indirect infringer that contribute to or are inducing that direct infringement. Insofar as alleged direct infringement is based on joint acts of multiple parties, the role of each such party in the direct infringement must be described.
- e. Whether each element of each asserted claim is claimed to be literally present and/or present under the doctrine of equivalents in the Accused Instrumentality;
- f. For any patent that claims priority to an earlier application, the priority date to which each asserted claim allegedly is entitled;
- g. If a party claiming patent infringement asserts or wishes to preserve the right to rely, for any purpose, on the assertion that its own apparatus, product, device, process, method, act, or other instrumentality practices the claimed invention, the party must identify, separately for each asserted claim, each such apparatus, product, device, process, method, act, or other instrumentality that incorporates or reflects that particular claim; and
- h. If a party claiming infringement alleges willful infringement, the basis for such allegation.

### **3.2 Document Production Accompanying Disclosure.**

With the “Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions,” the party claiming patent infringement must produce to each opposing party or make available for inspection and copying, the following documents in the possession, custody or control of that party:

- a. Documents (*e.g.*, contracts, purchase orders, invoices, advertisements, marketing materials, offer letters, beta site testing agreements, and third party or joint development agreements) sufficient to evidence each discussion with, disclosure to, or other manner of providing to a third party, or sale of or offer to sell, the claimed invention prior to the date of application for the patent in suit. A party’s production of a document as required within these rules does not constitute an admission that such document evidences or is prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102;

- b. All documents evidencing the conception, reduction to practice, design and development of each claimed invention, which were created on or before the date of application for the patent in suit or the priority date identified pursuant to Patent L.R. 3.1.e, whichever is earlier;
- c. A copy of the file history for each patent in suit and each application to which a claim for priority is made under Patent L.R. 3.1.e.
- d. Documents sufficient to evidence ownership of the patent rights by the party asserting patent infringement; and
- e. If a party identifies instrumentalities pursuant to Patent L.R. 3.1.g, documents sufficient to show the operation of any aspects of elements of such instrumentalities the patent claimant relies upon as embodying any asserted claims.

The producing party must separately identify by production number which documents correspond to each category. If the documents identified above are not in the possession, custody or control of the party charged with production, that party must use its best efforts to obtain all responsive documents and make a timely disclosure.

### 3.3 Invalidity Contentions.

Not later than sixty (60) days after service upon it of the “Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions,” each party opposing a claim of patent infringement must serve on all parties its “Invalidity Contentions,” which must contain the following information:

- a. The identity of each item of prior art that allegedly anticipates each asserted claim or renders it obvious. This includes information about any alleged knowledge or use of the invention in this country prior to the date of invention of the patent. Each prior art patent must be identified by its number, country of origin, and date of issue. Each prior art publication must be identified by its title, date of publication, and where feasible, author and publisher. Prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) must be identified by specifying the item offered for sale or publicly used or known, the date the offer or use took place or the information became known, and the identity of the person or entity that made the use or that made and received the offer, or the person or entity that made the information known or to whom it was made known. Prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(f) must be identified by providing the name of the person(s) from whom and the circumstances under which the invention or any part of it was derived. Prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(g) must be identified by providing the identities of the person(s) or entities involved in and the circumstances surrounding the making of the invention before the patent applicant(s);
- b. Whether each item of prior art anticipates each asserted claim or renders it obvious. If obviousness is alleged, an explanation of why the prior art renders the asserted claim obvious, including an identification of any combinations of prior art showing obviousness;

- c. A chart identifying where specifically in each alleged item of prior art each element of each asserted claim is found, including for each element that such party contends is governed by 35 U.S.C. §112(6), the identity of the structure(s), act(s), or material(s) in each item of prior art that performs the claimed function;
- d. Any grounds of invalidity based on indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. §112(2) of any of the asserted claims;
- e. Any grounds of invalidity based on lack of written description, lack of enabling disclosure, or failure to describe the best mode under 35 U.S.C. §112(1).

### 3.4 Document Production Accompanying Invalidity Contentions

With the “Invalidity Contentions,” the party opposing a claim of patent infringement must produce or make available for inspection and copying:

- a. Source code, specifications, schematics, flow charts, artwork, formulas, or other documentation sufficient to show the operation of any aspects or elements of any Accused Instrumentality identified by the patent claimant in its Patent L.R. 3.1.c chart; and
- b. A copy of each item of prior art identified pursuant to Patent L.R. 3.3.a which does not appear in the file history of the patent(s) at issue. To the extent any such item is not in English, an English translation of the portion(s) relied upon must be produced.

### 3.5 Disclosure Requirements in Patent Cases for Declaratory Relief.

- a. **Invalidity Contentions if No Claim of Infringement.** In all cases in which a party files a complaint or other pleading seeking a declaratory judgment that a patent is not infringed, is invalid, or is unenforceable, Patent Local Rules 3.1 and 3.2 will not apply unless and until a claim for patent infringement is made by a party. If the defendant does not assert a claim for patent infringement in answer to the complaint, no later than fourteen (14) days after the Initial Case Management Conference the party seeking a declaratory judgment must serve upon each opposing party Invalidity Contentions that conform to Patent L.R. 3.3 and produce or make available for inspection and copying the documents described in Patent L.R. 3.4.
- b. **Inapplicability of Rule.** This Patent L.R. 3.5 does not apply to cases in which a request for declaratory judgment that a patent is not infringed, is invalid, or is unenforceable, is filed in response to a complaint for infringement of the same patent.

### 3.6 Amended and Final Contentions.

- a. As a matter of right, a party asserting infringement may serve Amended Infringement Contentions no later than the filing of the parties’ Joint Claim Construction Chart. Thereafter, absent undue prejudice to the opposing party, a party asserting infringement may only amend its infringement contentions:

# 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.