

The Honorable James L. Robart

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

PHILIPS NORTH AMERICA LLC, a
Delaware Company; KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS
N.V., a Company of the Netherlands; and
PHILIPS INDIA, LTD., an Indian Company,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

SUMMIT IMAGING INC., a Washington
Corporation; LAWRENCE R NGUYEN, an
individual; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,

Defendants.

NO. 2:19-cv-01745-JLR

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT
ON:**

**(1) PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AND
SECOND CAUSES OF ACTION FOR
VIOLATIONS OF THE DMCA;**

**(2) DEFENDANTS' THIRD
COUNTERCLAIM AND THIRD
AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE FOR
COPYRIGHT MISUSE;**

**(3) DEFENDANTS' SECOND
AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE FOR
UNCLEAN HANDS; AND**

**(4) DEFENDANTS' NINTH
AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE FOR
LACHES, ACQUIESCENCE AND/OR
ESTOPPEL**

NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:
April 30, 2021

Oral Argument Requested

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

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS..... 3

 A. Summit’s Violations of the DMCA..... 3

 1. Philips’ ultrasound systems and software..... 3

 2. Philips’ software are copyrighted works. 5

 3. Philips’ protection mechanisms..... 6

 4. Adepto’s methods of accessing Philips’ CSIP Software bypasses
 Philips’ protection mechanisms..... 8

 5. Summit’s other methods of accessing Philips’ CSIP Software
 bypass Philips’ protection mechanisms..... 11

 B. Philips’ Copyright Infringement Claim..... 12

 C. Defendants’ Copyright Misuse Affirmative Defense and Counterclaim 14

 D. The August 2014 Meeting..... 15

III. PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT IS PROPER AS A MATTER OF LAW..... 16

IV. SUMMARY JUDGMENT SHOULD BE GRANTED ON PHILIPS DMCA
CLAIMS 17

 A. The Relevant Law Prohibits Circumvention Of Technological Measures
 That Control Access To Copyright Protected Works..... 17

 B. The Undisputed Facts Demonstrate Numerous Independent
 Circumventions..... 17

 1. Philips’ CSIP Software are copyrighted works..... 17

 2. Philips’ protection mechanisms effectively control access to the
 Philips’ CSIP Software..... 18

 3. Summit circumvents these access controls to access Philips’
 copyright protected works. 20

 C. Summit’s modifications [REDACTED] intentionally alter copyright
 management information..... 21

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

V. SUMMARY JUDGMENT SHOULD BE GRANTED ON SUMMIT’S COPYRIGHT MISUSE COUNTERCLAIM AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE..... 23

A. Summit’s Copyright Misuse Claim Is Not Cognizable As A Matter Of Law..... 23

B. The Undisputed Factual Record Confirms That Summit Has No Misuse Claim. 26

 1. Philips agreements do not include unduly restrictive terms..... 27

 2. No material dispute of fact exists regarding Philips’ right to enforce its copyrights in its copyrighted system software..... 28

C. Copyright Misuse Is Not a Defense to Philips’ DMCA Claims..... 31

VI. SUMMARY JUDGMENT SHOULD BE GRANTED ON SUMMIT’S SECOND AND NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES 32

A. Defendants Have No Unclean Hands Defense..... 32

B. Defendants’ Ninth Affirmative Defense for Laches, Acquiescence, and Estoppel Fail as a Matter of Law..... 33

VII. CONCLUSION 35



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

1		
2	Cases	
3	<i>321 Studios v. MGM Studios, Inc.</i> ,	
4	307 F. Supp. 2d 1085 (N.D. Cal. 2004).....	31
5	<i>A&M Records v. Napster, Inc.</i> ,	
6	239 F.3d 1004 (9th Cir. 2001).....	24, 25
7	<i>Aardwolf Indus., LLC v. Abaco Machs. United States, Inc.</i> ,	
8	2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 222669 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2017)	26
9	<i>Actuate Corp. v. Intl. Bus. Machines Corp.</i> ,	
10	2010 WL 1340519 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 5, 2010).....	19
11	<i>Aecon Bldgs., Inc. v. Zurich N. Am.</i> ,	
12	572 F. Supp. 2d 1227 (W.D. Wash. 2008)	33
13	<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby Inc.</i> ,	
14	477 U.S. 242 (1986)	16
15	<i>Apple Inc. v. Psystar Corp.</i> ,	
16	658 F.3d 1150 (9th Cir. 2011).....	23, 24, 25, 30
17	<i>Apple, Inc. v. Psystar Corp.</i> ,	
18	673 F. Supp. 2d 931 (N.D. Cal. 2009).....	27, 29
19	<i>Avia Group Int'l, Inc. v. L.A. Gear California</i> ,	
20	853 F.2d 1557 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	16
21	<i>Bounce Exch., Inc. v. Zeus Enter., Ltd.</i> ,	
22	2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 165073 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 9, 2015).....	22
23	<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> ,	
24	477 U.S. 317 (1986)	16
25	<i>Computer Associates Intern., Inc. v. Altai, Inc.</i> ,	
26	982 F.2d 693 (2d Cir. 1992)	17
27	<i>Danjaq LLC v. Sony Corp.</i> ,	
	263 F.3d 942 (9th Cir. 2001).....	34
	<i>Disney Enters. v. Redbox Automated Retail, LLC</i> ,	
	2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 69103 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 20, 2018)	26
	<i>Dolores Press v. Robinson</i> ,	
	2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 156200 (C.D. Cal. July 1, 2020)	28
	<i>DZ Bank AG Deutsche Zentral-Genossenschaftsbank v. Connect Ins. Agency, Inc.</i> ,	
	2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18614 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 14, 2016)	34
	<i>Ellenburg v. Brockway, Inc.</i> ,	
	763 F.2d 1091 (9th Cir. 1985).....	33
	<i>Exec. Corp. v. Oisoon, LLC</i> ,	
	2017 WL 4310113 (M.D. Tenn. Sept. 28, 2017)	5

1	<i>Fed. Trade Comm'n v. Qualcomm Inc.</i> ,	
2	969 F.3d 974 (9th Cir. Aug. 11, 2020).....	25
3	<i>Granite State Ins. Comp. v. Smart Modular Techs., Inc.</i> ,	
4	76 F.3d 1023 (9th Cir. 1996).....	35
5	<i>In re Napster, Inc. Copyright Litig.</i> ,	
6	191 F. Supp. 2d 1087 (N.D. Cal. 2002).....	23
7	<i>IQ Group v. Wiesner Publ'g, Inc.</i> ,	
8	409 F. Supp. 2d 587 (D.N.J. 2006).....	22
9	<i>JCW Software, LLC v. Embroidme.com, Inc.</i> ,	
10	2012 WL 13015051 (S.D. Fla. May 29, 2012).....	18, 20
11	<i>Kassa v. Selland Auto Transport, Inc.</i> ,	
12	2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 62390 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 31, 2006).....	16
13	<i>MDY Indus., LLC v. Blizzard Entm't, Inc.</i> ,	
14	629 F.3d 928 (9th Cir. 2010).....	31
15	<i>Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.</i> ,	
16	518 F.Supp.2d 1197 (C.D. Cal. 2007).....	32
17	<i>MGM Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.</i> ,	
18	454 F. Sup. 2d 966 (C.D. Cal. 2006).....	25, 28
19	<i>Microsoft Corp. v. EEE Bus. Inc.</i> ,	
20	555 F. Supp. 2d 1051 (N.D. Cal. 2008).....	21
21	<i>Oldcaste Precast, Inc. v. Granite Precasting & Concrete, Inc.</i> ,	
22	2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20977 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 2, 2011).....	30
23	<i>Omega S.A. v. Costco Wholesale Corp.</i> ,	
24	2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 155893 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 9, 2011)	31
25	<i>Omega S.A. v. Costco Wholesale Corp.</i> ,	
26	776 F.3d 692 (9th Cir. 2015).....	23, 25, 26, 28
27	<i>Oracle Am., Inc. v. Google Inc.</i> ,	
28	750 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	17, 18
29	<i>Petrella v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc.</i> ,	
30	572 U.S. 663 (2014)	34
31	<i>Pollstar v. Gigmania, Ltd.</i> ,	
32	170 F. Supp. 2d 974 (E.D. Cal. 2000).....	31
33	<i>Pom Wonderful LLC v. Welch Foods, Inc.</i> ,	
34	737 F. Supp. 2d 1105 (C.D. Cal. 2010).....	33
35	<i>Practice Mgmt. Info. Corp. v. Am. Med. Ass'n</i> ,	
36	121 F.3d 516 (9th Cir. 1997).....	23, 24, 26, 27
37	<i>Rimini St., Inc. v. Oracle Int'l Corp.</i> ,	
38	2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89295 (D. Nev. July 9, 2015).....	25, 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.