



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION AND RELIEF REQUESTED .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>LEGAL STANDARD.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>ARGUMENT .....</b>	<b>7</b>
	US 6,773,172.....	7
	US 10,585,337.....	10
<b>VI.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>13</b>

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

## Cases

<i>Alexander v. CareSource</i> , 576 F.3d 551, 558-59 (6th Cir. 2009).....	6
<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> , 477 U.S. 242 (1986).....	5, 6
<i>Arendale v. City of Memphis</i> , 519 F.3d 587 (6th Cir. 2008).....	6
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986).....	5
<i>Combs v. Int'l Ins. Co.</i> , 354 F.3d 568 (6th Cir. 2004).....	6
<i>Davis v. McCourt</i> , 226 F.3d 506 (6th Cir. 2000).....	6
<i>Dekarske v. Fed. Exp. Corp.</i> , 294 F.R.D. 68 (E.D. Mich. 2013).....	5
<i>Gregg v. Allen-Bradley Co.</i> , 801 F.2d 859 (6th Cir. 1986).....	6
<i>Kendall v. Hoover Co.</i> , 751 F.2d 171 (6th Cir. 1984).....	5
<i>Lewis v. Philip Morris Inc.</i> , 355 F.3d 515 (6th Cir. 2004).....	6
<i>Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.</i> , 475 U.S. 574 (1986).....	6, 7
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Mirowski Family Ventures, LLC</i> , 571 U.S. 191, 192 (2014).....	11
<i>Perry v. Jaguar of Troy</i> , 353 F.3d 510 (6th Cir. 2003).....	6
<i>Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficosa N. Am. Corp.</i> 299 F.3d 1313 (Fed Cir, 2002).....	5
<i>Webasto Thermo &amp; Comfort N. Am., Inc. v. Bestop, Inc.</i> , Case No. 16-cv-13456, 2-4 (E.D. Mich. Jul. 12, 2019) ..	5, 7

## Rules

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a).....	5
Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e).....	6

## I. INTRODUCTION AND RELIEF REQUESTED

The Court should grant partial summary judgment in favor of the Defendant on the grounds that the accused instrumentalities do not infringe any of the asserted claims in either U.S. Pat. Nos. 6,773,172 (the '172 patent) or 10,585,337 (the '337 patent). Defendant makes this filing simultaneously to its filing of its cross-motion for claim construction pursuant to LPR 6.2, and as such shares the Joint Appendix ("JA") which is incorporated herein by reference.

## II. BACKGROUND

The Plaintiff asserts claim 29 of the '172 patent and claims 1, 7, 11, 18, 25, 26, 30, 35 and 42 of the '337 patent against various products produced currently or in the past by the Defendant. Of the asserted claims, only claim 29 of the '172 patent and claims 1 and 25 of the '337 patent are independent. As will be shown below, Defendant does not infringe any of these claims, and therefore does not infringe any of the claims dependent upon them.

The text of claim 29 in the '172 patent (emphasis added):

29. An apparatus for engaging photographic equipment to a support, said apparatus comprising:

- (a) a member defining a channel having a first side wall capable of lateral movement with respect to a second side wall;
- (b) **a lever capable of causing said lateral movement and movable between *a first position* and *a second position*, said lever engaged on a *side* of said member, said side defining opposed first and second corners; and**
- (c) **a *handle portion* of said lever where said handle portion extends beyond said first corner when in said first position and extends beyond and *around* said second corner when in said second position.**

The text of claim 1 of the '337 patent (emphasis added):

1. An integrated panoramic device comprising:

(a) a base having a lower surface suitable for supporting said base;

(b) a first clamp member secured for rotation to said base and comprising a first clamp surface rotatable about a single axis substantially normal to said lower surface, said panoramic device being free from and incapable of said first clamp surface being rotatable about an axis other than said single axis substantially normal to said lower surface;

(c) a second clamp member including a second clamp surface slidably secured to said first clamp member and movable as a result of movement of a first member to approach said second clamp surface relative to said first clamp surface to clamp an article therebetween and movable as a result of movement of said first member to separate said second clamp surface relative to said first clamp surface to release an article clamped between said first clamp surface and said second clamp surface;

(d) a second member as a result of movement to selectively impede relative rotation of said first clamp member and said base, **said first clamp member and said second clamp member *not releasable from said base by movement of said second member***, said first clamp member rotatable through 360 degrees with respect to said base; and

(e) wherein said first member is engaged with said first clamp member, wherein said first member passes through a portion of said second clamp member.

The text of claim 25 of the '337 patent (emphasis added):

25. An integrated panoramic device comprising:

(a) a base having a lower surface suitable for supporting said base;

- (b) a first clamp member secured for rotation to said base and comprising a first clamp surface rotatable about a single axis substantially normal to said lower surface, said panoramic device being free from and incapable of said first clamp surface being rotatable about an axis other than said single axis substantially normal to said lower surface;
- (c) a second clamp member including a second clamp surface slidably secured to said first clamp member and movable as a result of movement of a first member to approach said second clamp surface relative to said first clamp surface to clamp an article therebetween and movable as a result of movement of said first member to separate said second clamp surface relative to said first clamp surface to release an article clamped between said first clamp surface and said second clamp surface;
- (d) a second member as a result of movement to selectively impede relative rotation of said first clamp member and said base, **said first clamp member and said second clamp member *not releasable from said base by movement of said second member***, said first clamp member rotatable through 360 degrees with respect to said base;
- (e) wherein said second member is engaged with said base and wherein said second member includes a knob attached thereto.

The italicized terms in the above claims have been submitted for claim construction and are summarized in the tables below:

**US 10,585,337**

<b>Patent no. Claim no.</b>	<b>Term</b>	<b>Plaintiff's Definition</b>	<b>Defendant's definition</b>
10,585,337 – Claim 1(d) and 25(d)	“said first clamp member and said second clamp member not releasable from said base by movement of said second member”	Plain meaning	Construed under 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph, “Means-plus-function”:  <u>Function</u> : retaining the first clamp member and the second clamp member to the base.  <u>Structure in Spec</u> : the plug 22 and retaining member 24 shown in FIG. 1 of ‘337 patent. See also col. 2, lines 61-64, of ‘337 patent.
10,585,337 – Claim 1(d) and 25(d)	“not releasable”	Plain meaning or alternatively “not easily removed and replaced”	Not intended for release

**US 6,773,172**

<b>Patent no. Claim no.</b>	<b>Term</b>	<b>Plaintiff's Definition</b>	<b>Defendant's definition</b>
6,773,172 – Claim 29(b)	“side”	Plain meaning or Alternatively “a lateral surface”	A flat outer surface of an object
6,773,172 – Claim 29(c)	“around”	Plain meaning	Wrap-around
6,773,172 – Claim 29(c)	“handle portion”	Plain meaning	End portion of lever
6,773,172 – Claim 29(c)	“first position”	Plain meaning	Unlocked position of the clamp
6,773,172 – Claim 29(c)	“second position”	Plain meaning	Locked position of the clamp

### **III. STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS**

The Initial Accused Products utilize similar structures to each other in relation to the Asserted Patents, even to the point that the Defendant's FBT-ASPL and FBT-ASFBL products were used to illustrate all of Initial Plaintiff's Infringement Contentions.

Plaintiff submitted a second set of infringement contentions relating the Defendant's FHP-ULP product which does not share such commonality.

### **IV. LEGAL STANDARD**

After claim construction, infringement is determined by comparing the claims to the allegedly infringing device to determine whether all of the elements and limitations of the claim are found in the accused device. *Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficosa N. Am. Corp.* 299 F.3d 1313, 1323 (Fed Cir, 2002). Such infringement may be literal or by the use of a substantial equivalent. *Id.* The Court in the Eastern District of Michigan case of *Webasto Thermo & Comfort N. Am., Inc. v. Bestop, Inc.*, Case No. 16-cv-13456, 2-4 (E.D. Mich. Jul. 12, 2019) provides an overview of the legal standard for summary judgement:

Summary judgment is appropriate where the moving party demonstrates that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact. *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986); Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). "A fact is 'material' for purposes of a motion for summary judgment where proof of that fact 'would have [the] effect of establishing or refuting one of the essential elements of a cause of action or defense asserted by the parties.'" *Dekarske v. Fed. Exp. Corp.*, 294 F.R.D. 68, 77 (E.D. Mich. 2013) (quoting *Kendall v. Hoover Co.*, 751 F.2d 171, 174 (6th Cir. 1984)). A dispute is genuine "if the evidence is such that a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party." *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 247-48 (1986).

"In deciding a motion for summary judgment, the court must draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party." *Perry v. Jaguar of Troy*, 353 F.3d 510, 513 (6th Cir. 2003) (citing *Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 587 (1986)). At the same time, the non-movant must produce enough evidence to allow a reasonable jury to find in his or her favor by a preponderance of the evidence, *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 252, and "[t]he 'mere possibility' of a factual dispute does not suffice to create a triable case." *Combs v. Int'l Ins. Co.*, 354 F.3d 568, 576 (6th Cir. 2004) (quoting *Gregg v. Allen-Bradley Co.*, 801 F.2d 859, 863 (6th Cir. 1986)). Instead, "the non-moving party must be able to show sufficient probative evidence [that] would permit a finding in [his] favor on more than mere speculation, conjecture, or fantasy." *Arendale v. City of Memphis*, 519 F.3d 587, 601 (6th Cir. 2008) (quoting *Lewis v. Philip Morris Inc.*, 355 F.3d 515, 533 (6th Cir. 2004)). "The test is whether the party bearing the burden of proof has presented a jury question as to each element in the case. The plaintiff must present more than a mere scintilla of the evidence. To support his or her position, he or she must present evidence on which the trier of fact could find for the plaintiff." *Davis v. McCourt*, 226 F.3d 506, 511 (6th Cir. 2000) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). That evidence must be capable of presentation in a form that would be admissible at trial. See *Alexander v. CareSource*, 576 F.3d 551, 558-59 (6th Cir. 2009).

The non-moving party may not rest upon the mere allegations or denials of his pleadings, but the response, by affidavits or as otherwise provided in Rule 56, must set forth specific facts which demonstrate that there is a genuine issue for trial. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e). "When the moving party has carried its burden under Rule 56(c), its opponent must do more than simply show that there is some metaphysical doubt as to the material facts .




Below is a representative figure of the Defendant's accused instrumentalities taken from the Plaintiff's final infringement contentions:



**FBT-ASPL: Locked Position**


The above figure clearly shows that when in the locked position the handle portion of the lever does not “wrap around” a corner (curve around the contours of a corner) since the latching surface of the lever is circular in shape not a flat surface as in the ‘172 patent. Accordingly, no reasonable jury would find Defendant’s accused instrumentalities FBT-ASPL and the like infringe claim 29 of the ‘172 patent.

In the above claim 29 of the ‘172 patent, assuming the term “first position” is construed as the “unlocked position of the clamp” and the term “second position” is construed as the “locked position of the clamp,” the Defendant’s accused instrumentality FPH-ULP does not infringe the claim. FIGs. 1 and 4 of the ‘172 patent are reproduced below showing the first, unlocked position of the clamp and the second, locked position of the clamp:



**FIG. 1**

**FIG. 1 of '172 patent  
First Position - Unlocked  
(JA p. 7)**




**FIG. 4**

**FIG. 4 of '172 patent  
Second Position - Locked  
(JA p. 8)**

Below are figures of the Defendant's accused instrumentality FPH-ULP taken from the Plaintiff's amended final infringement contentions (Dkt. 78):



**FPH-ULP: Unlocked Position**




**FPH-ULP: Locked Position**

The above figures clearly show that the Defendant's FPH-ULP product operates in a manner opposite that recited in claim 29 of the '172 patent (i.e., opposite as shown in the above FIG. 1 and FIG. 4 of the '172 patent). That is, when the FPH-ULP is in the locked position as shown above, the handle portion of the lever does not wrap around the second corner as recited in claim 29(c) of the '172 patent.

**US 10,585,337**

In the above claims 1(d) and 25(d) of the '337 patent, assuming the phrase "said first clamp member and said second clamp member not releasable from said base by movement of said second member" is construed under 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph, the Defendant's accused instrumentalities do not include the corresponding structure (or equivalents thereof under 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph). The corresponding structure for performing the function disclosed in the '337 patent specification is shown in FIG. 1 (JA, p. 107) as the plug 22 and the retaining member 24 which are described at col. 2, lines 61-64 (JA, p. 119): "A retaining member 24 is secured to the plug 22 in such a manner to maintain the panning base and the body 12 together with the desired ability to freely rotate." FIG. 1 of the '337 patent is reproduced below showing the plug 22 and retaining member 24 for performing the retaining (not releasable) function:



**FIG. 1**

**FIG. 1 of '172 patent  
(JA p. 107)**

Below again is the representative figure of the Defendant's accused instrumentalities taken from the Plaintiff's final infringement contentions:



**FBT-ASPL: No Plug 22 or Retaining Member 24**

The above figure clearly shows the accused instrumentalities do not include the plug 22 or retaining member 24 (or equivalent thereof under 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph) and therefore do not infringe the claims. Further, “a patentee ordinarily bears the burden of proving infringement” *Medtronic, Inc. v. Mirowski Family Ventures, LLC*, 571 U.S. 191, 192 (2014), and assuming the claims are construed under 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph, the Plaintiff has not carried this burden.

In the above claims 1(d) and 25(d) of the ‘337 patent, assuming the phrase “not releasable” is construed as “not intended for release” the Defendant’s accused instrumentalities do not infringe this element. With the Defendant’s accused instrumentalities, the “second element” recited in the claims corresponds to a restraining band used to enable/disable rotation of the clamp body relative to the base, and when the restraining band is sufficiently loosened, it allows the release of the clamp body from the base. The following figures are taken from U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2022/0268399 (Exhibit 1) which illustrate the Defendant’s accused instrumentalities FBT-ASPL and the like:




FIG. 3  
Prior Art




FIG. 2  
Prior Art

Referring to paragraph [0022] of the ‘399 patent publication:

“With reference to FIGS. 1-3, a prior art ball head 100 features a base 110 supporting a clamp 130. Base 110 interfaces with a tripod or some other support bolt 115. A band 120 circumscribes the top edge of the base 110 and the bottom edge of the clamp 130. Both components feature a V-shaped groove circumscribing the bottom edge of clamp 130 and the top edge of base 110. Band 120 has two annular inner edges, one at its top and one at its bottom, which then interface with the V-shaped grooves. A tightening-means, such as bolt 125, is used to tighten or loosen band 120 and allow or arrest rotation of the clamp 130. *If sufficiently loosened, the band 120 will allow the removal of clamp 130 from the system.* Otherwise, the interface of the annular inner edges and the V-shaped grooves will secure the clamp 130 to the base 110.”

Accordingly, the Defendant’s accused instrumentalities FBT-ASPL and the like do not infringe the claims since by sufficiently loosening the restraining band 120 (the “second element” recited in the claims) the *intent is to release the clamp body 130 from the base 110.*

## VI. CONCLUSION

As detailed above, Defendant unequivocally does not infringe any of the asserted claims in either the '172 or '337 patents. The elements needed for infringement are not present in any of Defendant's Accused products and no reasonable jury could find their existence. For these reasons, Defendant requests the Court grant Defendant's Motion for Partial Summary Judgement.

Dated this 4<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2022

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Geoffrey E. Dobbin

Geoffrey E. Dobbin

Geoff@DobbinIPLaw.com

DOBBIN IP LAW, P.C.

2250 S Redwood Road, Suite 5

West Valley City, UT 84119-1355

Telephone: 801-969-6609

/s/ Howard H. Sheerin

Howard H. Sheerin, Attorney at Law

Sheerin@siliconvalleyip.com

8711 E Pinnacle Peak Rd., Suite 289

Scottsdale, AZ 85255

Telephone: 415-238-4007

Attorneys for the Defendant Field Optics  
Research, Inc.