

1 JAMES C. YOON, State Bar No. 177155
2 jyoon@wsgr.com
3 SARA L. TOLBERT, State Bar No. 300945
4 stolbert@wsgr.com
5 JAMIE Y. OTTO, State Bar No. 295099
6 jotto@wsgr.com
7 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI P.C.
8 650 Page Mill Road
9 Palo Alto, California 94304-1050
10 Telephone: (650) 493-9300
11 Fax: (650) 565-5100

12 Attorneys for Defendants
13 *Blast Motion, Inc. and*
14 *Taylor Made Golf Company, Inc.*

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
16 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

17 NEWSPIN SPORTS, LLC,
18 Plaintiff,
19 v.
20 BLAST MOTION, INC., and TAYLOR
21 MADE GOLF COMPANY, INC.,
22 Defendants.

Case No.: 3:18-cv-02273-BEN-JLB

**DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO
EX PARTE MOTION TO EXTEND
CLAIM CONSTRUCTION
DEADLINES**

Complaint Filed: Sept. 28, 2018

Judge: Hon. Roger T. Benitez
Courtroom: 5A-5th Flr.

Magistrate Judge: Hon. Jill L.
Burkhardt
Courtroom: Suite 5140

Hearing Date and Time: N/A

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Magistrate Judge Jill Burkhardt’s Chambers Rules Section VI and VII, Defendants Blast Motion, Inc. and Taylor Made Golf Company, Inc. (collectively, “Defendants”) submit this opposition to Plaintiff NewSpin Sports, LLC’s (“NewSpin”) *ex parte* motion to extend claim construction deadlines.

In its *ex parte* motion, NewSpin, for the first time in this litigation, asserts that it lacks documents needed for *claim construction*. This assertion is both false and baseless. NewSpin has all the documents necessary for claim construction. NewSpin has already identified constructions for the terms it seeks to construe, identified constructions for claim terms proposed by Defendants, and identified intrinsic and extrinsic evidence to support its proposed constructions of the disputed claim terms. Indeed, NewSpin met and conferred with Defendants concerning the scope of the constructions – all without access to technical documentation it alleges is insufficient under Patent L.R. 3.4. NewSpin never explains how Defendants’ internal documents would suddenly become relevant to construe the terms of NewSpin’s patents. NewSpin’s position is wrong as a matter of law. The Federal Circuit has expressly declared that it is legal error to interpret claims in light of the accused products. *See SRI Int’l v. Matsushita Elec. Corp.*, 775 F.2d 1107, 1118 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (“A claim is construed in the light of the claim language, the other claims, the prior art, the prosecution history, and the specification, *not* in light of the accused device.”) (emphasis in original). Even if the documentation NewSpin claims it needs was relevant, the time to identify such information and documents—all of which would be extrinsic evidence—has long since passed. The Patent Local Rules prohibit the introduction of any new extrinsic evidence at this stage.

Now, only a week before opening claim construction briefs are due and in violation of Judge Burkhardt’s Chamber Rules, Plaintiff attempts to use Defendants’ forthcoming document production and the circumstances imposed by COVID-19 to argue that it cannot electronically file its claim construction briefs. The Court should deny

1 NewSpin's request because NewSpin fails to demonstrate good cause to move the case
2 schedule.

3 **II. NEWSPIN HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED GOOD CAUSE TO MOVE**
4 **THE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION DEADLINES**

5 **A. Claim Construction is Not Impacted by Defendants' Document Production**

6 Until NewSpin's *ex parte* motion, filed a week before opening claim construction
7 briefs are due, NewSpin did not make it known to Defendants that it would need
8 Defendants' supplemental production to identify its claim construction positions.
9 NewSpin served Preliminary Claim Constructions on January 27, 2020, and Responsive
10 Claim Constructions on February 10, 2020. During counsels' February 17, 2020
11 telephonic meet and confer—used to narrow the claim construction issues and finalize
12 preparation of the Joint Claim Construction Chart, Worksheet and Hearing Statement
13 pursuant to Patent L.R. 4.1(e)—NewSpin did not mention that it needed any
14 supplemental document production¹ in order to finalize its claim construction positions.
15 The parties filed their Joint Claim Construction Chart, Joint Claim Construction
16 Worksheet, and Joint Hearing Statement on February 24, 2020, identifying all of the
17 intrinsic and extrinsic evidence on which the parties would rely to support their proposed
18 claim constructions. *See* Dkt. Nos. 49, 50, 51.

19 NewSpin does not (and cannot) articulate why it would need Defendants' internal
20 technical documents to construe terms of its asserted patents. Intrinsic evidence is the
21 best source for interpreting an asserted claim term. *See Vitronics Corp. v. Conception*,

22
23
24 ¹ Defendants dispute that they are in violation of Patent L.R. 3.4 in light of their
25 production of documents sufficient to show the operation of the Accused Products,
26 which include engineering drawings, technical specifications and marketing documents
27 explaining the design and operation of the Accused Products. Defendants are also
28 preparing its supplemental production due on April 14, 2020 as discussed during the
March 18, 2020 telephonic discovery hearing with the Court.

1 90 F.3d 1576, 1582 (Fed. Cir. 1996). Even if extrinsic evidence is used, it “cannot be
2 used to vary the meaning of the claims as understood based on a reading of the intrinsic
3 record.” *Shinsedai Co. v. Nintendo Co.*, No. 11-cv-2799-IEG-MDD, 2013 U.S. Dist.
4 LEXIS 200944, at *10 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 26, 2013) (citing *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d
5 1303, 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2005)). Of the ten terms in dispute, NewSpin takes the position
6 that eight should be construed according to their plain and ordinary meaning. *See* Dkt.
7 No. 51. The only extrinsic evidence identified by NewSpin is (1) an expert declaration
8 that will explain the understanding of a person of ordinary skill in the art and a discussion
9 of the technological background or (2) third-party dictionary definitions or technical
10 papers. *See* Dkt. No. 50. NewSpin does not cite to any public or internal Blast Motion
11 documents in support of its claim construction positions. It does not need to because
12 claim construction is a separate analysis from infringement. *See Koninklijke Phillips*
13 *N.V. v. Zoll Lifecor Corp.*, No. 2:12-cv-1369, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 168547, at *113
14 (W.D. Pa. Feb. 3, 2016) (“claim construction is undertaken before the infringement
15 analysis, largely with a blind-eye to the effect of a particular construction on
16 infringement.”). Further confirmation that NewSpin does not need additional documents
17 to support its claim constructions is its position that none of disputed claim terms are case
18 dispositive. *See* Dkt. No. 49 at 2.

19 NewSpin’s request to the Court that Defendants supplement their document
20 production was made on the basis of its need to determine *infringement* positions.²
21 NewSpin does not mention the supposed lack of documents for claim construction. Ex. 1
22 at 2 (“None of these documents describe the operation of the Accused Products at the
23

24 ² While counsel for NewSpin and counsel for Defendants had discussed the possibility of
25 a stay of the case schedule, no agreement on the issue was ever reached. Nor can
26 NewSpin point to any. *See* Wojcio Decl. ¶ 5 (“Ms. Tolbert responded favorably to this
27 proposal and said she would discuss it with her client), ¶ 7 (noting that counsel for
28 Defendants never indicated whether Defendants would join or oppose a motion to stay).

1 level of detail required for purposes of determining **infringement**. . . These are all
2 relevant to Plaintiff’s claims of **infringement** in this case.”) (emphasis added).

3 Even if NewSpin wanted to amend its positions on claim construction at this point,
4 it would not be allowed to do so under this district’s Patent Local Rules because the
5 deadline to identify constructions and evidence in support has passed pursuant to the
6 Court’s Case Management Order Regulating Discovery and Other Pretrial Proceedings in
7 a Patent Case (Dkt. No. 43). The parties identified all of the intrinsic and extrinsic
8 evidence on which they would rely upon to support their proposed claim constructions on
9 February 24, 2020. *See* Dkt. Nos. 49, 50, 51. Claim construction discovery closed on
10 March 13, 2020. Dkt. No. 43 ¶ 7. If NewSpin wanted further discovery to assist in
11 formulating its claim construction positions, it should have made a timely request for
12 Defendants’ document production or filed a motion with the Court well before it was
13 required to identify supporting evidence on February 24, 2020.

14 **B. Claim Construction Briefing is Not Impacted by Current Office Closures**

15 While Defendants are mindful of the evolving nature and difficulties associated
16 with the restrictions associated with COVID-19, NewSpin does not present sufficient
17 justification to delay the proceedings at this time. Defendants’ counsel’s offices are
18 similarly closed until April 7, and Defendants’ counsel are also subject to “shelter in
19 place” restrictions. However, claim construction issues have already been identified,
20 submitted to the Court, and all that is left to do is file the claim construction briefs
21 electronically and attend the hearing.³ To argue that a claim construction brief cannot be
22 submitted remotely has the same effect of arguing that no court deadline can be met. But
23 this cannot be true, given that NewSpin filed the instant *ex parte* motion.

24
25
26 ³ Defendants note that the currently-scheduled date for the claim construction hearing on
27 April 30, 2020 is not impacted by the Order of the Chief Judge No. 18, which has
28 continued jury trials to at least April 16, 2020.

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.