

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

LAMKIN IP DEFENSE
RDL@LamkinIPDefense.com
Rachael D. Lamkin (246066)
One Harbor Drive, Suite 304
Sausalito, CA 94965
(916) 747-6091 Telephone

Michelle L. Marriott (*pro hac vice*)
michelle.marriott@eriseip.com
Erise IP, P.A.
7015 College Blvd.
Suite 700
Overland Park, KS 66211
(913) 777-5600 Telephone
(913) 777-5601 Facsimile

*Attorneys for Defendants Garmin
International, Inc. and Garmin Ltd.*

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

PHILIPS NORTH AMERICA LLC,
Plaintiff,
v.
GARMIN INTERNATIONAL, INC.
AND GARMIN LTD.,
Defendants.

Case No. 2:19-cv-06301-AB-KS

**DEFENDANTS' RESPONSIVE
CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

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 CONTENTS

- I. U.S. Patent No. 6,013,007 (the '007 Patent)..... 1
 - a. Means for Computing Athletic Performance Feedback Data from the Series of Time-Stamped Waypoint, Claims 1, 21, limitation (b)..... 1
 - b. Means For Presenting the Athletic Performance Feedback Data, Claims 1, 21, limitation 1, 21(c) 7
 - c. Means For Suspending and Resuming Operation, Claim (7)..... 8
 - d. Means For Exchanging GPS Route Waypoints, Claim 25..... 9
- II. U.S. Patent No. 7,088,233 (the '233 Patent)..... 9
 - a. First Personal Device, Claims 1, 10, 14, 24, limitation (a) 9
 - b. Governing Information Transmitted Between the First Personal Device and Second Device, Claim 1(c) 11
 - c. Wireless Communication, Claims 1, 13, 15, 16 12
 - d. Body or Physiological Parameters, Claims 8-9..... 13
 - e. Location Determination Module, Claim 24..... 13
 - f. Powered Down State, Claim 26..... 13
 - g. Means for Signaling, Claim 26..... 14
- III. U.S. Patent No. 9,314,192 14
 - a. Any One of a Plurality of Positions, Claims 1, 20 14
 - b. Analyzing the Measured Value, Claims 1, 20..... 14
 - c. Derive a Subject Related Value, Claims 1, 20 15
- IV. U.S. Patent No. 8,277,377: The Claims Should Be Construed In View Of The Applicant’s Disclaimers of Claim Scope..... 15
 - a. “web-enabled wireless phone” 16
 - b. “method for interactive exercising monitoring” and “sending the exercise-related information to an internet server ('377) 17
 - c. “calculation performed by the server based on the exercise-related information ('377) 17
 - d. “physiologic status ('377) 18
- V. U.S. Patent No. 6,976,958: The Claims Should Be Construed To Clarify That They Are Directed To Disease Management, Not Exercise..... 19
- VI. U.S. Patent No. 9,801,542: The Asserted Claims – Which Claim Monitoring, Analyzing, and Warning Of “User” Specific “Undesirable” Conditions – are Indefinite 23

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

Cases

Alloc, Inc. v. ITC, 342 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 22

Aristocrat Techs. Austral. Pty Ltd. v. Int’l Game Tech, 521 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 1, 4, 7

Biogen Idec Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline LLC, 713 F.3d 1090 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 16

Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Med., Inc., 296 F.3d 1106 (Fed. Cir. 2002)..... 4

Cultor Corp. v. A.E. Staley Mfg. Co., 224 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2000)..... 22

Datamize, LLC v. Plumtree, 417 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 24

Ergo Licensing, LLC v. CareFusion 303, Inc., 673 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... passim

Gold v. Winget (In re NM Holdings Co., LLC), 407 B.R. 232 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 2009)..... 11

Guzik Tech. Enters., Inc. v. W. Dig. Corp., No. 11-CV-03786-PSG, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 101538, at *24-25 (N.D. Cal. July 19, 2013)..... 8

In re Bakersfield Westar Ambulance, Inc., 123 F.3d 1243, 1248 (9th Cir. 1997)..... 8

Interval Licensing LLC v. AOL, Inc., 766 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 24

Laitram Corp. v. Morehouse Indus., Inc., 143 F.3d 1456 (Fed. Cir. 1998) 22

Lopez v. Lopez (In re Lopez), Nos. 7-03014749 JA, 08-01182 J, 2009 Bankr. LEXIS 3594 (Bankr. D.N.M. Nov. 5, 2009)..... 11

Microsoft Corp. v. Multi-Tech Sys., Inc., 357 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2004) 22

Naylor v. Flavan, No. CV 08-03746 GAF (AJW), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 132295, at *12 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 7, 2009) 8

Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*)..... 3

Pratt & Whitney v. United States, 170 Ct. Cl. 829, 345 F.2d 838 (1965) 10

Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Endo Pharm. Inc., 438 F.3d 1123 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 22

Regents of the Univ. of Minn. v. AGA Med. Corp., 717 F.3d 929, 936 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 9

Site Update Sols., LLC v. Accor N. Am., Inc., No. 5:11-cv-3306-PSG, 2015 WL581175, at *5-6 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 11, 2015) 7

Southwall Techs., Inc. v. Cardinal IG Co, 54 F.3d 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1995)..... 16

Watts v. XL Sys., 232 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 2000) 22

1 **I. U.S. Patent No. 6,013,007 (the '007 Patent)**

2 **a. Means for Computing Athletic Performance Feedback Data from the**
3 **Series of Time-Stamped Waypoint, Claims 1, 21, limitation (b)**

4 There is no dispute that the “means for computing” limitation is a means-plus-
5 function limitation that must be construed under 35 U.S.C. 112(6) (now 35 U.S.C.
6 112(f)). The Parties further agree that the function of limitation (b) is “computing
7 athletic performance feedback data from the series of time-stamped waypoints.” *See*
8 *Dkt. 77* at 5. When a patentee claims a computer-implemented invention and invokes
9 means-plus-function limitations, the Federal Circuit has “consistently required that
10 the structure disclosed in the specification be more than simply a general purpose
11 computer or microprocessor.” *Aristocrat Techs. Austral. Pty Ltd. v. Int’l Game Tech.*,
12 521 F.3d 1328, 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2008). This requirement seeks to avoid “pure
13 functional claiming” and mandates that the patent must disclose sufficient
14 algorithmic structure. *Id.* Where no structure appears in the specification, the
15 question is “whether an algorithm was disclosed at all.” *Id.* at 1337. Here, there is
16 none. The testimony of Philips’ expert, Dr. Martin, confirms that an off-the-shelf
17 processor (Philips’ proposed structure¹) would not even be able to calculate
18 waypoints, and certainly could not perform the claimed “computing athletic
19 performance feedback data” based on the waypoints, but would require special
20 programming. Declaration of Rachael Lamkin (“Lamkin Dec.”) Ex. C (Martin Tr.)
21 48:6-50:14 (“Q: But the key is that someone would need to program those off-the-
22 shelf processors; correct? A. That is correct.”). And as Philips readily conceded in

23 _____
24 ¹ Philips’ proposed structure, while a moving target, is insufficient. Neither a
25 “processor and equivalents” (Lamkin Dec. Ex. B at 1; *Dkt. 73-2*) nor “a processor
26 (CPU) that also utilizes memory and is connected to a GPS receiver module that
27 provides geographical position information signals to the memory for storage” (*Dkt.*
28 *77* at 7) discloses the algorithmic structure required. *See Ergo Licensing, LLC v.*
CareFusion 303, Inc., 673 F.3d 1361, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2012).

1 briefing filed yesterday in co-pending litigation, the specification discloses no such
2 special programming:

3 Here, the formulas for calculating distance, speed, and pace from a series of points—all
4 of which involves high school level math—are not expressly disclosed in the specification, but
5 are aspects of the algorithm that a POSITA would nevertheless be well aware of. *See Alfred E.*

6 Lamkin Dec. Ex. F at p. 6. The claims are indefinite.

7 Philips’ arguments cannot save the claims. By way of background, the
8 claimed function references “time-stamped waypoints.” Waypoints are exact points
9 of latitude and longitude. Dkt. 45-1 (’007 Patent), FIG 12, 2:33-35; Lamkin Dec. Ex.
10 A (GPS Land Navigation) at 28. Time-stamped waypoints are said latitude and
11 longitude points that have date and time information associated with those points by
12 the “built-in processing unit.” Dkt. 45-1, 7:35-44. According to the claimed
13 function, “athletic performance feedback data” is computed “from the series of time-
14 stamped waypoints obtained by said GPS receiver.”

15 Philips cherry picks the types of data the ’007 patent declares to be
16 “performance data.” But, the ’007 is clearly sets forth the types of data that is
17 calculated from time-stamped way points:

18 During the exercise session, the GPS receiver module 604 continuously
19 determines the athlete’s geographical position and stores it in the
20 memory 608 along with other information such as the date and time that
21 each position was acquired. From these positions and times,
22 performance data such as elapsed distance, current and average speeds
and paces, calories burned, miles remaining, and time remaining are
calculated.

23 Dkt. 45-1 at 7:40-48.²

24 “[T]he specification ‘is always highly relevant to the claim construction
25 analysis. Usually, it is dispositive; it is the single best guide to the meaning of a
26

27 ² All underlined text is “emphasis added” unless otherwise noted.

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.