

Kumar Maheshwari (SBN 245,010)
Maresh Law Group, PC
7700 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 800
Irvine, CA 92618
Phone: (530) 400-9246
Fax: (949) 377-3836
Email: kumar@maheshlaw.com

J. Curtis Edmondson (SBN 236,105)
Edmondson IP Law
Venture Commerce Center
3699 NE John Olsen Ave.
Hillsboro, OR 97124
Phone: (503) 336-3769
Fax: (503) 214-8470
E-mail: jcedmondson@edmolaw.com

Attorney for Plaintiff **Caravan Canopy Int'l, Inc.**

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA—SOUTHERN DIVISION**

**CARAVAN CANOPY INT'L, INC.,
Plaintiff,**

v.

**COSTCO WHOLESALE
CORPORATION, LOWE'S HOME
CENTERS, LLC, Z-SHADE CO.
LTD., WALMART INC.,
SHELTERLOGIC CORP., et al.,**

Defendants.

**Case No. 8:19-cv-01072-AG-ADS
Case No. 5:19-cv-01224-AG-ADS
Case No. 2:19-cv-06224-AG-ADS
Case No. 2:19-cv-06952-AG-ADS
Case No. 2:19-cv-06978-AG-ADS**

**PLAINTIFF'S PATENT
DISCLOSURES**

Pursuant to this Court's Standing Patent Rules ("SPR"), Plaintiff provides the following disclosures to Defendants.

Petitioners Exhibit 1021
Patent 5,944,040

SPR 2.1 Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions

Per SPR 2.1.1, Plaintiff states that each of the following claims of the patent-in-suit—U.S. Patent No. 5,944,040 (“the ‘040 patent”)—is allegedly infringed by each Defendant (including for each claim the applicable statutory subsections of 35 U.S.C. § 271 asserted):

Defendant Costco: Claims 1-3, all under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a)

Defendant Lowe’s: Claims 1-3, all under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a)

Defendant Z-Shade: Claims 1-3, all under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a)

Defendant Walmart: Claims 1-3, all under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a)

Defendant ShelterLogic: Claims 1-3, all under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a)

Per SPR 2.1.2, Plaintiff identifies the following Accused Instrumentality for each asserted claim and Defendant:

Defendant Costco: ProShade Canopy, for each asserted claim

Defendant Lowe’s: Garden Treasure for each asserted claim

Defendant Z-Shade: Quest Shelter model, for each asserted claim

Defendant Walmart: Ozark Trail, for each asserted claim

Defendant ShelterLogic: Quick Shade, for each asserted claim

Per SPR 2.1.3, attached hereto as Exhibits A-B (for Walmart and ShelterLogic; other defendants have been served with their respective infringement contentions) are charts “identifying specifically where each limitation of each asserted claim is found within each Accused Instrumentality, including, for each limitation that such party contends is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112(6)/(f), the identity of the structure(s), act(s), or material(s) in the Accused Instrumentality that performs the claimed function, and whether each limitation of each asserted claim is alleged to be literally present or present under the doctrine of equivalents.”

Per SPR 2.1.4, Plaintiff states that the priority date allegedly applicable to each asserted claim is May 23, 1997, from the foreign filing of the Republic of Korea.

Per SPR 2.1.5, Plaintiff 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; therefore, Plaintiff identifies as follows, separately for each asserted claim, each such apparatus, product, device, process, method, act, or other instrumentality that incorporates or reflects that particular claim: Caravan makes and sells the V-Series Pro 10 ft. x 10 ft. canopy which is marked by the '040 patent and practices the asserted patent and all the claims therein.

Per SPR 2.1.6, Plaintiff states as follows the present basis (prior to any discovery) for its allegation of willful infringement: Plaintiff's products were in the marketplace and have been marked with the patents. Plaintiff has had sales discussions with one or more of the Defendants while demonstrating the products.

SPR 2.2 Document Production Accompanying Disclosure

Plaintiff has or will promptly produce or make available for inspection and photocopying the items described as follows in S.P.R. 2.2.1 through 2.2.3, as follows (identifying the documents corresponding to each category by production number):

SPR 2.2.1 A copy of the file history for each patent in suit (*see* Exhibit C).

SPR 2.2.2 All documents evidencing ownership of the patent rights by the party asserting patent infringement (*see* Exhibit D).

SPR 2.2.3 If a party identifies instrumentalities under SPR 2.1.5, documents sufficient to show the operation of any aspects or elements of such instrumentalities the patent claimant relies upon as embodying any asserted claims (*see* Exhibits E).

SPR 2.3 Early Meeting of the Parties

Counsel for Plaintiff and Defendants have or will promptly exchange Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(A) initial disclosures and meet in person or telephonically to prepare for the scheduling conference and prepare the joint Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) report.

SPR 3.1 Exchange of Proposed Terms for Construction

Plaintiff provides as follows its “list of claim terms the party contends should be construed by the Court, and identify any claim term the party contends should be governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112(6)/(f):” (1) “center pole,” and (2) “collapsible at the hinge joint in accordance with a sliding motion of said slider along the side pole.” The parties shall then work to limit the terms in dispute by narrowing or resolving differences, and to jointly identify the 10 terms likely to be most significant to the case.

SPR 3.2 Exchange of Claim Constructions and Extrinsic Evidence

Plaintiff provides as follows its “proposed constructions of each term identified by either party for claim construction:”¹ See Exhibit F (Plaintiff proposes the prior constructions adopted by the court in *Int’l E-Z-Up, Inc. v. Caravan Canopy Int’l, Inc.*, Case 2:01-cv-06530-SVW-AJWX (April 16, 2002)).

¹ Each such construction shall also, for each term that any party contends is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112(6)/(f), identify the structure(s), act(s), or material(s) corresponding to that term’s function. At the same time the parties exchange their constructions, each party shall also identify all references from the specification or prosecution history that support its proposed construction and designate any supporting extrinsic evidence including, without limitation, dictionary definitions, citations to learned treatises and prior art, and testimony of percipient and expert witnesses. Extrinsic evidence shall be identified by production number and by producing a copy if not previously produced. For any supporting witness, percipient or expert, the identifying party shall also provide a declaration containing that witness’ testimony regarding claim construction. The parties shall then meet and confer to narrow the issues and finalize preparation of a Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement.

DATED: December 10, 2019

Respectfully Submitted,
Mahesh Law Group, PC

By: /s/ Kumar Maheshwari
Kumar Maheshwari
Attorney for Plaintiff
Caravan Canopy Int'l, Inc.

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.