

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\_\_\_\_\_  
RACING OPTICS, INC.,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.  
AEVOE CORP.,  
Defendant.  
\_\_\_\_\_

2:15-cv-01774-RCJ-VCF

**ORDER**

This case arises out of competing patents for lens-protection technology. Plaintiff has asked the Court to overturn an order of the Magistrate Judge granting Defendant’s motion for a protective order.

**I. FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

Since 1999, Plaintiff Racing Optics, Inc., through its founders Stephen, Bart, and Seth Wilson (collectively, “the Inventors”), has developed and delivered lens-protection systems, including “tear-off” protectors for high-speed racing consisting of stacks of optically engineered laminated lenses applied to race car windshields, motorcycle goggles, and racing helmet visors. (Compl. ¶ 2, ECF No. 1). Once damaged, the top layer of the lens can be torn off to reveal a new, undamaged layer, providing a clear view. (*Id.*). The technology is also used in the medical, military, consumer, and industrial fields. (*Id.* ¶ 3). Most importantly here, Racing Optics

1 developed a “bubble-free” screen protector that avoids difficult-to-remove air bubbles created  
2 when applying conventional screen protectors by eliminating the full adhesive in the central area  
3 of the screen and spacing the protector away from the screen with an “air bearing.” (*Id.* ¶ 5).

4 Racing Optics filed U.S. Patent Application No. 12/780,443 for the bubble-free screen  
5 protector technology, titled “Touch Screen Shield,” on May 14, 2010. (*Id.* ¶ 6). In mid-2012,  
6 after the ‘443 Application had been published but while it was still pending, Defendant Aevoe  
7 Corp.’s President and Executive Director Jon Lin contacted Racing Optics and informed it that  
8 Aevoe was the assignee of U.S. Patent No. 8,044,942 for a bubble-free screen protector invented  
9 by Lin. (*Id.* ¶ 6–8). The ‘942 Patent claimed priority to a January 18, 2011 provisional  
10 application. (*Id.* ¶ 8). By 2013, Aevoe had filed five patent infringement actions based on the  
11 ‘942 Patent, including three in this District presided over by Chief Judge Navarro. (*Id.* ¶ 8 &  
12 n.1). On March 15, 2013, Racing Optics filed a divisional application of the still-pending ‘443  
13 Application, U.S. Patent Application No. 13/838,311, also titled “Touch Screen Shield.” (*See*  
14 U.S. Patent No. 8,974,620, at [21, 22, 62], ECF No. 1-3). On January 16, 2015, Racing Optics  
15 filed a continuation application of the still-pending ‘311 Application (itself a divisional  
16 application of the still-pending ‘443 Application), U.S. Patent Application No. 14/599,176, also  
17 titled “Touch Screen Shield.” (*See* U.S. Patent No. 9,104,256, at [21, 22, 60], ECF No. 1-2). The  
18 ‘311 Application issued as the ‘620 Patent on March 10, 2015. The ‘176 Application issued as  
19 the ‘256 Patent on August 11, 2015. The ‘443 Application issued as the ‘545 Patent on  
20 September 8, 2015.

21 In summary, Racing Optics is the assignee of U.S. Patents No. 8,974,620; 9,104,256; and  
22 9,128,545 (collectively, “the Patents”), which issued on March 10, 2015; August 11, 2015; and  
23 September 8, 2015, respectively. (*Id.* ¶¶ 23–28). Racing Optics sued Aevoe in this Court for  
24

1 direct, contributory, and inducement infringement of claims 12, 14–16, and 18–20 of the ‘545  
2 Patent; claims 1–4, 6–7, 9–17, and 19–23 of the ‘256 Patent; and claims 1–11 and 13–14 of the  
3 ‘620 Patent via the production, use, offer for sale, and/or importation into the United States of  
4 screen protectors for electronic devices, including the iVisor AG, iVisor XT, and iVisor Glass  
5 (collectively, “the Accused Products”). (*Id.* ¶¶ 30, 42, 53). Aevoe answered and filed  
6 counterclaims for non-infringement, invalidity, and unenforceability due to fraud upon or  
7 inequitable conduct before the Patent Office. Racing Optics amended to add a claim of  
8 infringement of U.S. Patent No. 9,274,625, which issued on March 1, 2016. Aevoe moved for  
9 judgment on the pleadings against the claim for infringement of the ‘620 Patent, arguing that the  
10 invention(s) therein or the application relating thereto had been abandoned. The Court denied  
11 the motion. Racing Optics has asked the Court to overturn the Magistrate Judge’s order granting  
12 Aevoe a protective order against certain discovery.

## 13 **II. LEGAL STANDARDS**

14 Rule 72(a) permits a district court judge to modify or set aside a magistrate judge’s non-  
15 dispositive ruling that is clearly erroneous or contrary to law:

16 When a pretrial matter not dispositive of a party’s claim or defense is  
17 referred to a magistrate judge to hear and decide, the magistrate judge must  
18 promptly conduct the required proceedings and, when appropriate, issue a written  
19 order stating the decision. A party may serve and file objections to the order  
20 within 14 days after being served with a copy. A party may not assign as error a  
21 defect in the order not timely objected to. The district judge in the case must  
22 consider timely objections and modify or set aside any part of the order that is  
23 clearly erroneous or is contrary to law.

24 Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a); *see also* Local R. IB 3-1(a). Rule 72(a) institutes an abuse-of-discretion-  
type standard. *See Grimes v. City and Cnty. of S.F.*, 951 F.2d 236, 241 (9th Cir. 1991) (citing  
*United States v. BNS Inc.*, 858 F.2d 456, 464 (9th Cir. 1988) (“We still must determine, however,  
whether the court abused its discretion in issuing its order based on the facts before it which are

1 supported by the record. Under the abuse of discretion standard, we cannot simply substitute our  
2 judgment for that of the district court, but must be left with the definite and firm conviction that  
3 the court committed a clear error of judgment in reaching its conclusion after weighing the  
4 relevant factors.”)).

### 5 **III. ANALYSIS**

6 On April 20, 2016, the Magistrate Judge granted in part and denied in part Racing Optics’  
7 motion to compel the production of certain documents. Specifically, the Magistrate Judge  
8 sustained Aevoe’s objections to Racing Optics’ Requests for Production Nos. 25–27 (“the  
9 RPF”). The RFP concerned any documents produced by Aevoe in previous litigation concerning  
10 the ‘942 Patent. The Magistrate Judge noted that the RFP were improper “piggyback” requests.  
11 Racing Optics did not ask the undersigned to overturn that ruling but later included similar  
12 requests in a subpoena to Buchanan, Ingersoll & Rooney (“BIR”). On July 28, 2016, the  
13 Magistrate Judge granted Aevoe’s motion for a protective order against the discovery, citing his  
14 previous order sustaining Aevoe’s objections to the RFP. The Magistrate Judge noted that the  
15 fourteen document requests submitted to BIR were essentially the same impermissible  
16 “piggyback” requests as the RFP, because taken together they sought every document produced  
17 or generated in a particular previous case (*Aevoe Corp. v. AE Tech Co., Ltd.*, No. 12-cv-53-  
18 GMN-NJK, i.e., “the Prior Action”) concerning the ‘942 Patent. The Magistrate Judge also  
19 found that the information from the previous action was simply not relevant to the present action.

20 Racing Optics has asked the Court to overturn the July 28, 2016 ruling as being in clear  
21 error or contrary to law under Rule 72(a). Racing Optics argues that certain documents  
22 concerning technical specifications of the accused products in the Prior Action and an expert  
23 report concerning a reasonable royalty analysis are relevant to the present case. But those are not  
24

1 the only documents Racing Optics demanded of BIR. Racing Optics sought broad categories of  
2 documents from BIR, and it does not matter what Racing Optics now claims it was prepared to  
3 accept in lieu of the full range of documents demanded via the subpoena. The subpoena  
4 demands the broad range of documents as explained by the Magistrate Judge:

5 1. DOCUMENTS produced by AEVOE during the AEVOE V. AE TECH  
6 LITIGATION that would assist in understanding the design, research,  
7 development, operation, manufacture, marketing, testing, sale, demonstration  
and/or installation of the ACCUSED PRODUCTS, or any products marketed  
under similar product names.

8 2. Deposition transcripts and exhibits accompanying depositions of AEVOE or  
9 third parties during the AEVOE V. AE TECH LITIGATION discussing or  
10 attempting to discuss the design, research, development, operation, manufacture,  
marketing, testing, sale, demonstration and/or installation of the ACCUSED  
PRODUCTS, or any products marketed under similar product names.

11 3. DOCUMENTS produced by AEVOE during the AEVOE V. AE TECH  
12 LITIGATION that would assist in understanding the corporate structure of  
AEVOE.

13 4. Deposition transcripts and exhibits accompanying depositions of AEVOE or  
14 third parties during the AEVOE V. AE TECH LITIGATION discussing or  
attempting to discuss the corporate structure of AEVOE.

15 5. DOCUMENTS produced by AEVOE during the AEVOE V. AE TECH  
16 LITIGATION that would assist in understanding AEVOE's manufacturers, third  
17 party distributors, or other companies AEVOE contracts with related to the  
development, design, production, manufacturing and/or supply of the ACCUSED  
PRODUCTS, or any products marketed under similar product names.

18 6. Deposition transcripts and exhibits accompanying depositions of AEVOE or  
19 third parties during the AEVOE V. AE TECH LITIGATION discussing or  
20 attempting to discuss AEVOE's manufacturers, third party distributors, or other  
companies AEVOE contracts with related to the development, design, production,  
21 manufacturing and/or supply of the ACCUSED PRODUCTS, or any products  
marketed under similar product names.

22 7. DOCUMENTS produced by YOU or AEVOE during the AEVOE V. AE  
23 TECH LITIGATION that would assist in understanding AEVOE's knowledge of  
the ASSERTED PATENTS and/or the patent applications that were eventually  
24 granted as the ASSERTED PATENTS.

# 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.