

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
28

HONORABLE MARSHA J. PECHMAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

INTERVAL LICENSING LLC,
Plaintiff,
v.
AOL, INC., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. No. 2:10-cv-01385-MJP
**FACEBOOK’S MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION OF COURT’S
FEBRUARY 16, 2011 SCHEDULING ORDER**
**NOTED ON MOTION CALENDAR:
March 2, 2011**

Pursuant to L.R. 7(h), Defendant Facebook Inc. (“Facebook”) respectfully seeks reconsideration of the Court’s Scheduling Order of February 16, 2011 (“Scheduling Order”) because of the February 18, 2011 ruling in *In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litigation*,. Nos. 2009-1450, 2009-1451, 2009-1452, 2009-1468, 2009-1469, 2010-1017, 2011 WL 607381 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 18, 2011) which could not have been brought to the Court’s attention earlier with reasonable diligence.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Court’s Scheduling Order is squarely at odds with the recent Federal Circuit decision in *In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litigation*, 2011 WL 607381 (“*In re Katz*”). The Court’s Scheduling Order “refuses to set a limit on the number of claims Plaintiff may pursue in

1 this litigation.” (Scheduling Order D.I. 178 at 3.) However, the Federal Circuit decision in *In re*
2 *Katz* found it was appropriate for the court to limit the number of asserted claims. *In re Katz*
3 went on to specifically recognize due process rights in patent litigation cases, and cautioned that
4 limitations which would hinder a party’s ability to fully present its case would not be appropriate.
5 *In re Katz*, 2011 WL 607381, at *3-4. While limiting the case to representative claims will not
6 hinder plaintiff’s ability to present its case, the portion of the Court’s Scheduling Order that limits
7 Defendants to construing 10 claim terms per litigation track will hinder Defendants’ ability to
8 present their full case. Thus, *In re Katz* provides grounds for reconsideration of the Scheduling
9 Order’s limitation on terms for claim construction and refusal to limit the number of asserted
10 claims.

11 **II. ARGUMENT**

12 **A. Limitation of Asserted Claims Is Appropriate**

13 It would be an appropriate exercise of the Court’s discretion to limit the number of claims
14 Interval may assert against Defendants in this case. As held by the Federal Circuit in its recent
15 *In re Katz* decision, a court may limit the number of asserted claims allowed in a patent case so
16 long as the limitation does not “risk[] erroneously depriving [Plaintiff] of its rights [where] that []
17 risk outweigh[s] the added costs associated with a substitute procedure.” *In re Katz*, 2011 WL
18 607381, at *3. Thus, the Court should reconsider its refusal to limit the number of asserted
19 claims, as such a limit would result in efficiency and cost savings for the parties and the Court,
20 and would not deprive Interval of its due process rights.

21 **B. Claim Construction Term Limitation Is Prejudicial**

22 While the Court refused to limit Plaintiff’s number of asserted claims, it erroneously
23 limited all parties in each track to a maximum of 10 claim terms for construction. (D.I. 178 at 3.)
24 In light of the large number of defendants with separate accused products and large number of
25 asserted claims over 2 separate patents, as well as numerous issues that also usually encompass
26 claim construction, such as means-plus-function claiming, indefiniteness, *Bilski* challenges, etc., a
27 limitation to 10 claim terms for construction in the 682/507 track violates not only Facebook’s
28 due process rights, but improperly abdicates the Court’s duty to construe all disputed terms rather

1 than let the jury guess as to claim scope. “When the parties present a fundamental dispute
 2 regarding the scope of a claim term, it is the court's duty to resolve it.” *O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v.*
 3 *Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.*, 521 F.3d 1351, 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2008). The parties have not yet met
 4 and conferred regarding the claim terms to be construed, and the exact number of disputed claim
 5 terms is not known. As such, the limit currently set forth in the Scheduling order is improper.
 6 Based on Interval’s infringement contentions, Facebook’s non-infringement contentions and the
 7 Defendants’ invalidity contentions, it appears the current 10 claim term limitation for the 682/507
 8 track will not allow for resolution of all fundamental disputes. Therefore, this limit should be
 9 removed.

10 III. CONCLUSION

11 For the foregoing reasons, Facebook respectfully requests reconsideration of the
 12 Scheduling Order with respect to these issues.

13
 14
 15 DATED this 2nd day of March, 2011.

COOLEY LLP

/s/ Christopher B. Durbin

Christopher B. Durbin (WSBA #41159)

COOLEY LLP

719 Second Avenue, Suite 900

Seattle, WA 98104

Tel: (206) 452-8700

Fax: (206) 452-8800

Email: cdurbin@cooley.com

Michael G. Rhodes (*pro hac vice*)

Heidi L. Keefe (*pro hac vice*)

Mark R. Weinstein (*pro hac vice*)

Christen M.R. Dubois (*pro hac vice*)

Elizabeth L. Stameshkin (*pro hac vice*)

3175 Hanover St.

Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130

Tel: (650) 843-5000

Fax: (650) 849-7400

Attorneys for Defendant FACEBOOK, INC.

27 922248 /HN

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 2, 2011, I electronically filed the following document(s):
Facebook's Motion for Reconsideration of Court's February 16, 2011 Scheduling Order
with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send an email notification of such filing to the attorney(s) of record listed below.

Justin A. Nelson
Matthew R. Berry
Edgar Guy Sargent
SUSMAN GODFREY
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3800
Seattle, WA 98101

By Electronic CM/ECF:

jnelson@susmangodfrey.com
mberry@susmangodfrey.com
esargent@susmangodfrey.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Interval Licensing LLC

Eric J. Enger
Michael F. Heim
Nathan J. Davis
HEIM PAYNE & CHORUSH LLP
600 Travis Street, Suite 6710
Houston, TX 77002

By Electronic CM/ECF:

eenger@hpcllp.com
mheim@hpcllp.com
ndavis@hpcllp.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Interval Licensing LLC

Max L. Tribble
SUSMAN GODFREY
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100
Houston, TX 77002

By Electronic CM/ECF:

mtribble@susmangodfrey.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Interval Licensing LLC

Cortney S. Alexander
Gerald F. Ivey
Robert L. Burns
Elliott C. Cook
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER LLP
Two Freedom Square
11955 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20910

By Electronic CM/ECF:

cortney.alexander@finnegan.com
gerald.ivey@finnegan.com
robert.burns@finnegan.com
elliott.cook@finnegan.com

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
28

Brian M. Berliner
Neil L. Yang
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope Street, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, CA 90071

By Electronic CM/ECF:

bberliner@omm.com
nyan@omm.com

Attorneys for Defendant Apple, Inc.

David Almeling
George A. Riley
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111

By Electronic CM/ECF:

dalmeling@omm.com
griley@omm.com

Attorneys for Defendant Apple, Inc.

Jeremy E. Roller
Scott T. Wilsdon
YARMUTH WILSDON CALFO PLLC
818 Stewart Street, Suite 1400
Seattle, WA 98101

By Electronic CM/ECF:

jroller@yarmuth.com
wilsdon@yarmuth.com

Attorneys for Defendant Apple, Inc.

J. Christopher Carraway
John D. Vandenberg
Kristin L. Cleveland
Klaus H. Hamm
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN
121SW Salmon Street, Suite 1600
Portland, OR 97204

By Electronic CM/ECF:

chris.carraway@klarquist.com
john.vandenberg@klarquist.com
kristin.cleveland@klarquist.com
klaus.hamm@klarquist.com

Attorneys for eBay, Inc.; Netflix, Inc.; Office Depot, Inc.; and Staples, Inc.

Arthur W. Harrigan, Jr.
Christopher Wion
DANIELSON HARRIGAN LEYH &
TOLLEFSON
999 Third Avenue, Suite 4400
Seattle, WA 98104

By Electronic CM/ECF:

arthurh@dhlt.com
chrisw@dhlt.com

Attorneys for eBay, Inc.; Netflix, Inc.; Office Depot, Inc.; and Staples, Inc.

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
28

Aneelah Afzali
Scott A.W. Johnson
Shannon M. Jost
STOKES LAWRENCE
800 5th Avenue, Suite 4000
Seattle, WA 98104-3179

By Electronic CM/ECF:

aneelah.afzali@stokeslaw.com
sawj@stokeslaw.com
shannon.jost@stokeslaw.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Google, Inc. and
YouTube LLC*

Dimitrios T. Drivas
John Handy
Kevin X. McGann
Aaron Chase
WHITE & CASE
1155 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

By Electronic CM/ECF:

ddrivas@whitecase.com
jhandy@whitecase.com
kmcgann@whitecase.com
aaron.chase@whitecase.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Google, Inc. and
YouTube LLC*

Warren S. Heit
Wendy Schepler
WHITE & CASE
3000 El Camino Real
Bldg. 5, 9th Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94306

By Electronic CM/ECF:

wheit@whitecase.com
wschepler@whitecase.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Google, Inc. and
YouTube LLC*

Kevin C. Baumgardner
Steven W. Fogg
CORR CRONIN MICHELSON
BAUMGARDNER & PREECE
1001 4th Avenue, Suite 3900
Seattle, WA 98154

By Electronic CM/ECF:

kbaumgardner@corrchronin.com
sfogg@corrchronin.com

Attorneys for Defendant OfficeMax Inc.

Jeffrey D. Neumeyer
OFFICEMAS INCORPORATED
1111 West Jefferson Street
P.O. Box 50
Boise, ID 83728

By Electronic CM/ECF:

JeffNeumeyer@officemax.com

Attorneys for Defendant OfficeMax Inc.

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
28

Douglas S. Rupert
John L. Letchinger
WILDMAN, HARROLD ALLEN & DIXON
225 West Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
Chicago, IL 60606

By Electronic CM/ECF:
rupert@wildman.com
letchinger@wildman.com

Attorneys for Defendant OfficeMax Inc.

Eric W. Ow
Francis Ho
Michael I. Kreeger
Michael A. Jacobs
Richard S. J. Hung
MORRISON & FOERSTER
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

By Electronic CM/ECF:
eow@mofocom
fho@mofocom
mkreeger@mofocom
mjacobs@mofocom
rhung@mofocom

Attorneys for Defendants Yahoo! Inc.

Mark P. Walters
Dario A. Machleidt
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
1191 Second Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101

By Electronic CM/ECF:
dmachleidt@flhlaw.com
mwalters@flhlaw.com

Attorneys for Defendants Yahoo! Inc.

/s/Christopher B. Durbin
Christopher B. Durbin (WSBA #41159)
COOLEY LLP
719 Second Avenue, Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98104-1732
Telephone: (262) 452-8700
Facsimile: (262) 452-8800
Email: cdurbin@cooley.com

Attorneys for Defendant
FACEBOOK, INC.