

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

JOSEF MAATUK,
Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

**EMERSON ELECTRIC, INC., BERND ZIMMERMAN,
PRASAD KHADKIKAR, DOES 1-10, INCLUSIVE,**
Defendants

THERM-O-DISC,
Defendant-Appellee

2019-1615

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio in No. 1:16-cv-03023-TMP, Magistrate Judge Thomas M. Parker.

Decided: August 14, 2019

JOSEF MAATUK, Los Angeles, CA, pro se.

DAVID UTYKANSKI, Harness, Dickey & Pierce, PLC,
Troy, MI, for defendant-appellee.

Before PROST, *Chief Judge*, PLAGER and HUGHES, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

This case involves a business relationship in fluid sensor technology that ended in 1999. Pro se appellant, Dr. Josef Maatuk, appeals two decisions from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio granting summary judgment to Therm-O-Disc. *Maatuk v. Emerson Elec. (Maatuk I)*, No. 1:16-CV-03023, 2017 WL 9485679 (N.D. Ohio Nov. 14, 2017) (R. & R. *adopted by* 2018 WL 562934); *Maatuk v. Emerson Elec., Inc. (Maatuk II)*, No. 1:16-CV-03023, 2019 WL 425605 (N.D. Ohio Feb. 4, 2019). Dr. Maatuk claims that Therm-O-Disc breached a confidential disclosure agreement in 1999 and is liable for trade secret misappropriation and unjust enrichment. He claims that he is entitled to be listed as a joint inventor on U.S. Patent No. 7,775,105. Because Dr. Maatuk previously litigated and lost his trade secret misappropriation claim and failed to provide evidence that he made more than an insignificant contribution to the conception of the '105 patent, we affirm.

I

In 1997, Dr. Maatuk entered into a confidential disclosure agreement with Therm-O-Disc (TOD) to allow TOD to evaluate Dr. Maatuk's multi-functional liquid sensor technology for a potential licensing agreement. The agreement included a provision stating that it would be construed according to Ohio law. Between 1997 and 1999, Dr. Maatuk corresponded with Prasad Khadkikar and Bernd Zimmermann, TOD employees, and provided TOD with a sample probe, prototypes, and other information for constructing his sensor. Dr. Maatuk never discussed turbidity sensors with any of TOD's employees.

In mid-1999, TOD informed Dr. Maatuk that it would not license his liquid sensor technology. The parties broke

off their relationship, and Dr. Maatuk threatened to sue TOD for breaching the confidential disclosure agreement and infringing his U.S. patents.

TOD filed a complaint for declaratory judgment in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, seeking judgment that it did not breach the confidential disclosure agreement or infringe Dr. Maatuk's patents. On August 28, 2000, Dr. Maatuk subsequently sued TOD in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California, asserting breach of the confidential disclosure agreement, trade secret misappropriation, fraud, and negligence. Dr. Maatuk's suit was transferred to the Northern District of Ohio, which consolidated it with the declaratory judgment suit. The Northern District of Ohio ultimately ruled in favor of TOD. Dr. Maatuk appealed to this court, and we affirmed on August 1, 2003. *Therm-O-Disc, Inc. v. Maatuk*, 73 F. App'x 391, 392 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

On December 10, 2003, Mr. Khadkikar and Mr. Zimmermann conceived the idea for a multi-functioned sensor that combined a turbidity sensor with a fluid level sensor. On April 21, 2004, they filed a provisional patent application for their invention, which eventually issued as U.S. Patent No. 7,775,105. The '105 patent "incorporates a combination of more than one of a fluid level sensing component or a fluid flow rate sensing component, a turbidity sensing component, a temperature sensing component and a pressure sensing component." '105 patent col. 1 ll. 59–63. Each claim requires a turbidity sensor and at least one other fluid sensor.

On August 17, 2016, Dr. Maatuk sued TOD and other parties in the Central District of California, asserting correction of inventorship for the '105 patent, misappropriation of trade secrets, and unjust enrichment. On December 15, 2016, the case was transferred to the Northern District of Ohio. After transfer, the district court granted the

motion in part, finding the claims time-barred under the Ohio Uniform Trade Secrets Act.

The parties conducted fact and expert discovery with regards to Maatuk's correction of inventorship claim. At the close of discovery, TOD moved for summary judgment. The court granted the motion, explaining that Dr. Maatuk did not produce "any evidence that he worked with Khadkikar and Zimmermann to arrive at a definite and permanent idea of a multi-function sensor that integrated a turbidity sensor with other sensor modules." *Maatuk II*, 2019 WL 425605, at *9. Because the "invention described in the '105 patent is the *integration* of a turbidity sensor with . . . other sensors into a single multi-function sensor device," Dr. Maatuk's inability to show any collaboration or work on turbidity sensors precluded finding him a joint inventor. *Id.* The court also found that Dr. Maatuk's alleged contributions did not constitute a contribution to the conception of the '105 patent.

Dr. Maatuk appeals the grant of both summary judgment motions. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(1).

II

"We review a district court's grant of summary judgment *de novo*." *Ekchian v. Home Depot, Inc.*, 104 F.3d 1299, 1302 (Fed. Cir. 1997). "Summary judgment is appropriate when there is no genuine issue of material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." *Fina Oil & Chem. Co. v. Ewen*, 123 F.3d 1466, 1472 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

A.

We first address the district court's determination that Dr. Maatuk's trade secrets and unjust enrichment claims were time-barred.

“We apply the trade secret law of the appropriate state,” in this case, Ohio, as was stipulated in the confidential disclosure agreement. *Ultimax Cement Mfg. Corp. v. CTS Cement Mfg. Corp.*, 587 F.3d 1339, 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2009). “An action for misappropriation shall be commenced within four years after the misappropriation is discovered or by the exercise of reasonable diligence should have been discovered. For the purposes of this section, a continuing misappropriation constitutes a single claim.” Ohio Rev. Code § 1333.66; *see also* Ohio Rev. Code § 1333.63 (making unjust enrichment a statutory remedy for misappropriation). Under Ohio’s “single claim” approach, the limitations period begins to run once the wronged party becomes aware of a breach of a confidential relationship. *See Kehoe Component Sales Inc. v. Best Lighting Prod., Inc.*, 796 F.3d 576, 583 (6th Cir. 2015). Subsequent breaches do not create a new cause of action because “it is the relationship between the parties at the time the secret is disclosed that is protected, and that the fabric of the relationship once rent is not torn anew with each added use or disclosure, although the damage suffered may thereby be aggravated.” *Id.* (cleaned up).

We agree that Dr. Maatuk’s trade secret misappropriation claim is time-barred. As the district court explained, “[u]nder Sixth Circuit precedent, Maatuk’s trade secret misappropriation claim accrued at the latest when he instructed his attorney to send [a] cease and desist letter to TOD and then filed [his first lawsuit]” on August 28, 2000, because it shows he was cognizant of a breach in the confidential disclosure agreement. *Maatuk I*, 2017 WL 9485679, at *7. His claims having accrued in 2000, at the latest, his August 17, 2016, suit falls well outside the four-year statutory period provided by Ohio law.

Dr. Maatuk argues that his claims should be preserved under *Amalgamated Indus. Ltd. v. Tressa, Inc.*, 69 F. App’x 255 (6th Cir. 2003). He contends that, under *Amalgamated*, a party bringing a trade secrets claim may backdate

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.