

3. PATENT DISCLOSURES
 - 3.1. Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions
 - 3.2. Document Production Accompanying Disclosure
 - 3.2A. Non-Infringement Contentions and Responses
 - 3.3. Invalidity Contentions
 - 3.4. Document Production Accompanying Invalidity Contentions
 - 3.4A. Responses to Invalidity Contentions
 - 3.5. Disclosure Requirement in Patent Cases for Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity
 - (a) Invalidity Contentions If No Claim of Infringement
 - (b) Inapplicability of Rule
 - 3.6. Disclosure Requirements for Patent Cases Arising Under 21 U.S.C. § 355 (commonly referred to as “the Hatch-Waxman Act”)
 - 3.7. Amendments
 - 3.8. Advice of Counsel
4. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION PROCEEDINGS
 - 4.1. Exchange of Proposed Terms for Construction
 - 4.2. Exchange of Preliminary Claim Constructions and Extrinsic Evidence
 - 4.3. Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement
 - 4.4. Completion of Claim Construction Discovery
 - 4.5. Claim Construction Submissions
 - 4.6. Claim Construction Hearing

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

**REPORT OF THE LOCAL PATENT RULES COMMITTEE
Explanatory Notes for 2011 Amendments**

In September 2010, almost two years after the Local Patent Rules had been adopted, the Committee reconvened to assess the impact and effectiveness of the Local Patent Rules. Based on the experiences of members of the Committee from the Judiciary and the Bar, there was an unanimous view that the Local Patent Rules have served to benefit the Court and the parties in patent litigation.

Notwithstanding those positive experiences, the Committee also believed that certain amendments might be warranted. Those areas of proposed changes include: (a) design patents; (b) certain disclosure obligations; (c) clarifying disclosure of evidence in connection with a *Markman* hearing; (d) need for responses to infringement and invalidity contentions; (e) specific modifications for disclosures exclusive to Hatch-Waxman cases; (f) amendments to required submissions or filings; and clarification in the language of rules.

Subcommittees were appointed for each of the subject areas and shortly thereafter recommendations were proposed to the full Committee, which discussed them at length.

With regard to design patents, shortly after the Committee had submitted its proposed patent rules in 2008, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit issued its *en banc* ruling in *Egyptian Goddess v. Swisa*, 543 F.3d 665 (2008), which held, in part, that a trial court should not provide a detailed verbal description of the claimed design. This holding is in tension with certain of the Local Patent Rules which call for a narrative claims chart, claim construction contentions and a claim construction hearing. The Committee determined that in light of the Federal Circuit authority modifications were appropriate to better suit the needs of design patents. See L. Pat. R. 3.1(c) and (e); 3.3(c); 3.4A(c); 4.1(c); 4.2(e); 4.3(g); 4.4; and 4.5(d).

While the Local Patent Rules expressly reference obligations regarding infringement and invalidity, the Committee noted that in cases outside of Hatch-Waxman matters, no provision presently exists that requires the allegedly infringing party to provide its non-infringement contentions. Accordingly, the Committee proposed disclosure obligations for non-infringement similar to those required for assertion of infringement and invalidity. See L. Pat. R. 3.2A(a) and (b); and 3.4(c).

As to invalidity contentions, while there are disclosure obligations by a party asserting invalidity, the Committee determined that a requirement that mandates that the patent holder respond in kind to invalidity contentions will provide parity between the parties and serve to focus the invalidity challenge. See L. Pat. R. 3.4A(a),(b) and (c); and 3.5 (a).

To help ensure that the spirit of the disclosure obligations is fully appreciated, the Committee recommended various rules requiring parties to disclose all materials that they intend to rely upon in connection with infringement, non-infringement, and invalidity contentions and or responses thereto. See L. Pat. R. 3.2(f); 3.2A(c); 3.4(c); and 3.4A(d).

In the area of Hatch-Waxman actions under L. Pat. R. 3.6, the Committee concluded that in order to help narrow the focus of a generic's invalidity contentions, the patent holder should be required to provide early disclosure of each patent and patent claim for infringement to which its infringement contentions would be limited. This eliminates speculation and added work by the generics in formulating their non-infringement and invalidity contentions. Changes recommended to disclosure obligations in non-Hatch-Waxman cases as they would apply in the Hatch-Waxman context were also proposed. In addition, the Committee determined that the ANDA filer should produce its Abbreviated New Drug Application or New Drug Application shortly after filing an answer or motion as this is a fundamental element of the Hatch-Waxman action. It was also recommended that the ANDA filer be required to advise the Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") of any motion for injunctive relief and supply the parties with relevant communications with the FDA which concern the subject matter filed in the District Court. This is intended to keep the FDA and parties apprised of any proceedings that may impact the ongoing litigation. See L. Pat. R. 3.6(a), (b), (c), (i) and (j).

In an effort to avoid potential misunderstandings as to the scope of permitted amendments to obligations under the Local Patent Rules, the Committee sought to clarify that amendments apply to all filings with the Court or exchanges between the parties as may be required by the Local Patent Rules. The proposed rule also makes plain that any amendments require the approval of the Court, notwithstanding consent by the parties. See L. Pat. R. 3.7.

Finally, as to claim construction and claim construction proceedings, the Committee proposed adding language to clarify that evidence to be used must be disclosed in a timely fashion. See L. Pat. R. 4.2(b) and (c); and 4.3(f).

In December 2010, the Committee submitted the proposed amendments to the Board of Judges for their consideration.

Local Patent Rules Committee

Hon. Jerome B. Simandle, U.S.D.J., Chair
Hon. Stanley R. Chesler, U.S.D.J.
Hon. Mary L. Cooper, U.S.D.J.
Hon. Faith S. Hochberg, U.S.D.J.
Hon. Peter G. Sheridan, U.S.D.J.
Hon. Tonia J. Bongiovanni, U.S. M.J.
Hon. Joel Schneider, U.S.M.J.
Hon. Mark Falk, U.S.M.J.
Hon. Patty Shwartz, U.S.M.J.
John T. O'Brien, Legal Coordinator
Arnold B. Calmann, Esq.
Thomas Curtin, Esq.
David De Lorenzi, Esq.
Marc S. Friedman, Esq.
Dennis F. Gleason, Esq.
Mary Sue Henifin, Esq.

Norman E. Lehrer, Esq.
Peter Menell, Prof. of Law,
Univ. of Calif., Berkeley School of Law
William L. Mentlik, Esq.
George F. Pappas, Esq.
Matthew D. Powers, Esq.
Donald Robinson, Esq.
Robert G. Shepherd Esq.
December 2, 2010

L. Civ. R. 9.3 -- LOCAL PATENT RULES

1. SCOPE OF RULES

1.1. Title.

These are the Local Patent Rules for the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. They should be cited as “L. Pat. R. __.”

1.2. Scope and Construction.

These rules apply to all civil actions filed in or transferred to this Court which allege infringement of a patent in a complaint, counterclaim, cross-claim or third party claim, or which seek a declaratory judgment that a patent is not infringed, is invalid or is unenforceable. The Local Civil Rules of this Court shall also apply to such actions, except to the extent that they are inconsistent with these Local Patent Rules. If the filings or actions in a case do not trigger the application of these Local Patent Rules under the terms set forth herein, the parties shall, as soon as such circumstances become known, meet and confer for the purpose of agreeing on the application of these Local Patent Rules to the case and promptly report the results of the meet and confer to the Court.

1.3. Modification of these Rules.

The Court may modify the obligations or deadlines set forth in these Local Patent Rules based on the circumstances of any particular case, including, without limitation, the simplicity or complexity of the case as shown by the patents, claims, products, or parties involved. Such modifications shall, in most cases, be made at the initial Scheduling Conference, but may be made at other times by the Court sua sponte or upon a showing of good cause. In advance of submission of any request for a modification, the parties shall meet and confer for purposes of reaching an agreement, if possible, upon any modification.

1.4. Effective Date.

These Local Patent Rules take effect on January 1, 2009. They govern patent cases filed, transferred or removed on or after that date. For actions pending prior to the effective date, the Court will confer with the parties and apply these rules as the Court deems practicable.

2. GENERAL PROVISIONS

2.1. Governing Procedure.

(a) **Initial Scheduling Conference.** When the parties confer pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f), the parties shall discuss and address in the Discovery Plan submitted pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) and L. Civ. R. 26.1(b)(2) the topics set forth in those rules and the following topics:

(1) Proposed modification of the obligations or deadlines set forth in these Local Patent Rules to ensure that they are suitable for the circumstances of the particular case (see L. Pat. R. 1.3);

(2) The scope and timing of any claim construction discovery including disclosure of and discovery from any expert witness permitted by the court;

(3) The format of the Claim Construction Hearing, including whether the Court will hear live testimony, the order of presentation, and the estimated length of the hearing;

(4) How the parties intend to educate the Court on the patent(s) at issue;
and

(5) The need for any discovery confidentiality order and a schedule for presenting certification(s) required by L. Civ. R. 5.3(b)(2).

2.2. Confidentiality.

Discovery cannot be withheld or delayed on the basis of confidentiality absent Court order. Pending entry of a discovery confidentiality order, discovery and disclosures deemed confidential by a party shall be produced to the adverse party for outside counsel's Attorney's Eyes Only, solely for purposes of the pending case and shall not be disclosed to the client or any other person.

Within 30 days after the initial Scheduling Conference, (a) the parties shall present a consent discovery confidentiality order, supported by a sufficient certification under L. Civ. R. 5.3(b)(2), or (b) in the absence of consent, a party shall, supported by a sufficient certification, apply for entry of a discovery confidentiality order under L. Civ. R. 5.3(b)(5) and L. Civ. R. 37.1(a)(1). The Court will decide those issues and enter the appropriate order, or the Court may enter the District's approved Discovery Confidentiality Order as set forth in Appendix S to these Rules if appropriate, in whole or in part.

With respect to all issues of discovery confidentiality, the parties shall comply with all terms of L. Civ. R. 5.3.

2.3. Relationship to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Except as provided in this paragraph or as otherwise ordered, it shall not be a ground for objecting to an opposing party's discovery request (e.g., interrogatory, document request, request for admission, deposition question) or declining to provide information otherwise required to be disclosed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1) that the discovery request or disclosure requirement is premature in light of, or otherwise conflicts with, these Local Patent Rules, absent other legitimate objection. A party may object, however, to responding to the following categories of discovery requests (or decline to provide information in its initial disclosures under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)) on the ground that they are premature in light of the timetable provided in the Local Patent Rules:

- (a) Requests seeking to elicit a party's claim construction position;
- (b) Requests seeking to elicit a comparison of the asserted claims and the accused apparatus, product, device, process, method, act, or other instrumentality;
- (c) Requests seeking to elicit a comparison of the asserted claims and the prior art; and
- (d) Requests seeking to elicit the identification of any advice of counsel, and related documents.

Where a party properly objects to a discovery request (or declines to provide information in its initial disclosures under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)) as set forth above, that party shall provide the requested information on the date on which it is required to be provided to an opposing party under these Local Patent Rules or as set by the Court, unless there exists another legitimate ground for objection.

2.4. Exchange of Expert Materials.

(a) Disclosures of claim construction expert materials and depositions of such experts are governed by L. Pat. R. 4.1, et seq., unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

(b) Upon a sufficient showing that expert reports related to issues other than claim construction cannot be rendered until after a claim construction ruling has been entered by the Court, the disclosure of expert materials related to issues other than claim construction will not be required until claim construction issues have been decided.

3. PATENT DISCLOSURES

3.1. Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions.

Not later than 14 days after the initial Scheduling Conference, a party asserting patent infringement shall serve on all parties a "Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions." Separately for each opposing party, the "Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions" shall contain the following information:

(a) Each claim of each patent in suit that is allegedly infringed by each opposing party, including for each claim the applicable statutory subsections of 35 U.S.C. § 271 asserted;

(b) Separately for each asserted claim, each accused apparatus, product, device, process, method, act, or other instrumentality (“Accused Instrumentality”) of each opposing party of which the party is aware. This identification shall be as specific as possible. Each product, device, and apparatus shall be identified by name or model number, if known. Each method or process shall be identified by name, if known, or by any product, device, or apparatus which, when used, allegedly results in the practice of the claimed method or process;

(c) Other than for design patents, a chart identifying specifically where each limitation of each asserted claim is found within each Accused Instrumentality, including for each limitation that such party contends is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112(6), the identity of the structure(s), act(s), or material(s) in the Accused Instrumentality that performs the claimed function;

(d) For each claim which is alleged to have been indirectly infringed, an identification of any direct infringement and a description of the acts of the alleged indirect infringer that contribute to or are inducing that direct infringement. Insofar as alleged direct infringement is based on joint acts of multiple parties, the role of each such party in the direct infringement must be described;

(e) Other than for design patents, whether each limitation of each asserted claim is alleged to be literally present or present under the doctrine of equivalents in the Accused Instrumentality;

(f) For any patent that claims priority to an earlier application, the priority date to which each asserted claim allegedly is entitled;

(g) If a party asserting patent infringement wishes to preserve the right to rely, for any purpose, on the assertion that its own apparatus, product, device, process, method, act, or other instrumentality practices the claimed invention, the party shall identify, separately for each asserted claim, each such apparatus, product, device, process, method, act, or other instrumentality that incorporates or reflects that particular claim; and

(h) If a party asserting patent infringement alleges willful infringement, the basis for such allegation.

3.2. Document Production Accompanying Disclosure.

With the “Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions,” the party asserting patent infringement shall produce to each opposing party or make available for inspection and copying:

(a) Documents (e.g., contracts, purchase orders, invoices, advertisements, marketing materials, offer letters, beta site testing agreements, and third party or joint development agreements) sufficient to evidence each discussion with, disclosure to, or other manner of

providing to a third party, or sale of or offer to sell, or any public use of, the claimed invention prior to the date of application for the patent in suit. A party's production of a document as required herein shall not constitute an admission that such document evidences or is prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102;

(b) All documents evidencing the conception, reduction to practice, design, and development of each claimed invention, which were created on or before the date of application for the patent in suit or the priority date identified pursuant to L. Pat. R. 3.1(f), whichever is earlier;

(c) A copy of the file history for each patent in suit (or so much thereof as is in the possession of the party asserting patent infringement);

(d) All documents evidencing ownership of the patent rights by the party asserting patent infringement;

(e) If a party identifies instrumentalities pursuant to L. Pat. R. 3.1(g), documents sufficient to show the operation of any aspects or elements of such instrumentalities the party asserting patent infringement relies upon as embodying any asserted claims; and

(f) All documents or things that a party asserting patent infringement intends to rely on in support of any of its infringement contentions under these Rules.

(g) With respect to each of the above document productions, the producing party shall separately identify by production number which documents correspond to each category.

3.2A Non-Infringement Contentions and Responses.

Not later than 45 days after service upon it of the “Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions,” each party opposing an assertion of patent infringement shall serve on all parties its “Non-infringement Contentions and Responses” to Infringement Contentions which shall include the following:

(a) The written basis for its Non-Infringement Contentions and responses;

(b) The party's responses shall follow the order of the infringement claims chart that is required under L. Pat. R. 3.1(c), and shall set forth the party's agreement or disagreement with each allegation therein, including any additional or different claims at issue;

(c) The production or the making available for inspection of any document or thing that it intends to rely on in defense against any such Infringement Contentions.

3.3. Invalidity Contentions.

Not later than 45 days after service upon it of the “Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions,” each party opposing an assertion of patent infringement, shall serve on all parties its "Invalidity Contentions" which shall contain the following information:

(a) The identity of each item of prior art that allegedly anticipates each asserted claim or renders it obvious. Each prior art patent shall be identified by its number, country of origin, and date of issue. Each prior art publication shall be identified by its title, date of publication, and where feasible, author and publisher. Prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) shall be identified by specifying the item offered for sale or publicly used or known, the date the offer or use took place or the information became known, and the identity of the person or entity which made the use or which made and received the offer, or the person or entity which made the information known or to whom it was made known. Prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) shall be identified by providing the name of the person(s) from whom and the circumstances under which the invention or any part of it was derived. Prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(g) shall be identified by providing the identities of the person(s) or entities involved in and the circumstances surrounding the making of the invention before the patent applicant(s);

(b) Whether each item of prior art anticipates each asserted claim or renders it obvious. If obviousness is alleged, an explanation of why the prior art renders the asserted claim obvious, including an identification of any combinations of prior art showing obviousness;

(c) Other than for design patents, a chart identifying where specifically in each alleged item of prior art each limitation of each asserted claim is found, including for each limitation that such party contends is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112(6), the identity of the structure(s), act(s), or material(s) in each item of prior art that performs the claimed function; and

(d) Any grounds of invalidity based on 35 U.S.C. § 101, indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. § 112(2) or enablement or written description under 35 U.S.C. § 112(1) of any of the asserted claims.

3.4. Document Production Accompanying Invalidity Contentions.

With the “Invalidity Contentions," the party opposing an assertion of patent infringement shall produce or make available for inspection and copying:

(a) Source code, specifications, schematics, flow charts, artwork, formulas, or other documentation sufficient to show the operation, composition, or structure of any aspects or elements of an Accused Instrumentality identified by the party asserting patent infringement in its L. Pat. R. 3.1(c) chart; and

(b) A copy or sample of the prior art identified pursuant to L. Pat. R. 3.3(a) which does not appear in the file history of the patent(s) at issue. To the extent any such item is not in English, an English translation of the portion(s) relied upon shall be produced.

(c) A party asserting invalidity shall also produce any other document or thing on which it intends to rely in support of its assertion.

(d) With respect to each of the above document productions, the producing party shall separately identify by production number which documents correspond to each category.

3.4A Responses to Invalidity Contentions.

Not later than 14 days after service upon it of the “Invalidity Contentions,” each party defending the validity of the patent shall serve on all parties its “Responses to Invalidity Contentions” which shall include the following:

(a) For each item of asserted prior art, the identification of each limitation of each asserted claim that the party believes is absent from the prior art, except for design patents, where the party shall supply an explanation why the prior art does not anticipate the claim;

(b) If obviousness is alleged, an explanation of why the prior art does not render the asserted claim obvious;

(c) The party's responses shall follow the order of the invalidity chart required under L. Pat. R. 3.3(c), and shall set forth the party's agreement or disagreement with each allegation therein and the written basis thereof; and

(d) The production or the making available for inspection and copying of any document or thing that the party intends to rely on in support of its Responses herein.

3.5. Disclosure Requirement in Patent Cases for Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity.

(a) **Invalidity Contentions If No Claim of Infringement.** In all cases in which a party files a complaint or other pleading seeking a declaratory judgment that a patent is invalid, L. Pat. R. 3.1 and 3.2 shall not apply unless and until a claim for patent infringement is made by a party. If the declaratory defendant does not assert a claim for patent infringement in its answer to the complaint, or within 14 days after the Initial Scheduling Conference, whichever is later, the party seeking a declaratory judgment of invalidity shall serve upon each opposing party its Invalidity Contentions that conform to L. Pat. R. 3.3 and produce or make available for inspection and copying the documents described in L. Pat. R. 3.4. Each party opposing the declaratory plaintiff's complaint seeking a declaratory judgment of invalidity shall serve its “Responses to Invalidity Contentions” as required under L. Pat. R. 3.4A.

(b) **Inapplicability of Rule.** This L. Pat. R. 3.5 shall not apply to cases in which a request for a declaratory judgment that a patent is invalid is filed in response to a complaint for infringement of the same patent, in which case the provisions of L. Pat. R. 3.3 and 3.4 shall govern.

3.6. Disclosure Requirements for Patent Cases Arising Under 21 U.S.C. § 355 (commonly referred to as “the Hatch-Waxman Act”).

The following applies to all patents subject to a Paragraph IV certification in cases arising under 21 U.S.C. § 355 (commonly referred to as “the Hatch-Waxman Act”). This rule takes precedence over any conflicting provisions in L. Pat. R. 3.1 to 3.5 for all cases arising under 21 U.S.C. § 355.

(a) On the date a party answers, moves, or otherwise responds, each party who is an ANDA filer shall produce to each party asserting patent infringement the entire Abbreviated New Drug Application or New Drug Application that is the basis of the case in question.

(b) Not more than seven days after the initial Scheduling Conference, each party asserting patent infringement shall serve on all parties a “Disclosure of Asserted Claims” that lists each claim of each patent that is allegedly infringed by each opposing party, including for each claim the applicable statutory subsections of 35 U.S.C. § 271 asserted.

(c) Not more than 14 days after the initial Scheduling Conference, each party opposing an assertion of patent infringement shall provide to each party asserting patent infringement the written basis for its “Invalidity Contentions,” for any patents referred to in the opposing party's Paragraph IV Certification, which shall contain all disclosures required by L. Pat. R. 3.3.

(d) Any “Invalidity Contentions” disclosed under L. Pat. R. 3.6(c), shall be accompanied by the production of documents required under L. Pat. R. 3.4(b) and (c).

(e) Not more than 14 days after the initial Scheduling Conference, each party opposing an assertion of patent infringement shall provide to each party asserting patent infringement the written basis for its “Non-Infringement Contentions,” for any patents referred to in the opposing party's Paragraph IV Certification which shall include a claim chart identifying each claim at issue in the case and each limitation of each claim at issue. The claim chart shall specifically identify for each claim which claim limitation(s) is/(are) literally absent from each opposing party's allegedly infringing Abbreviated New Drug Application or New Drug Application.

(f) Any “Non-Infringement Contentions” disclosed under L. Pat. R. 3.6(e), shall be accompanied by the production of any document or thing that each party who is an ANDA filer intends to rely on in defense against any infringement contentions by each party asserting patent infringement.

(g) Not more than 45 days after the disclosure of the “Non-Infringement Contentions” as required by L. Pat. R. 3.6(e), each party asserting patent infringement shall provide each opposing party with a “Disclosure of Infringement Contentions,” for all patents referred to in each opposing party's Paragraph IV Certification, which shall contain all disclosures required by L. Pat. R. 3.1. The infringement contentions shall be limited to the claims identified in L. Pat. R. 3.6(b).

(h) Any “Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions” disclosed under L. Pat. R. 3.6(g), shall be accompanied by the production of documents required under L. Pat. R. 3.2.

(i) Not more than 45 days after the disclosure of “Invalidity Contentions” as required by L. Pat. R. 3.6(c), the party defending the validity of the patent shall serve on each other party its “Responses to Invalidity Contentions” as required under L. Pat. R. 3.4A.

(j) Each party that has an ANDA application pending with the Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) that is the basis of the pending case shall: (1) notify the FDA of any and all motions for injunctive relief no later than three business days after the date on which such a motion is filed; and (2) provide a copy of all correspondence between itself and the FDA pertaining to the ANDA application to each party asserting infringement, or set forth the basis of any claim of privilege for such correspondence pursuant to L. Civ. R. 34.1, no later than seven days after the date it sends same to the FDA or receives same from the FDA.

3.7. Amendments.

Amendment of any contentions, disclosures, or other documents required to be filed or exchanged pursuant to these Local Patent Rules may be made only by order of the Court upon a timely application and showing of good cause. The application shall disclose whether parties consent or object. Nonexhaustive examples of circumstances that may, absent undue prejudice to the adverse party, support a finding of good cause include: (a) a claim construction by the Court different from that proposed by the party seeking amendment; (b) recent discovery of material prior art despite earlier diligent search; (c) recent discovery of nonpublic information about the Accused Instrumentality which was not discovered, despite diligent efforts, before the service of the Infringement Contention; (d) disclosure of an infringement contention by a Hatch-Waxman Act party asserting infringement under L. Pat. R. 3.6(g) that requires response by the adverse party because it was not previously presented or reasonably anticipated; and (e) consent by the parties in interest to the amendment and a showing that it will not lead to an enlargement of time or impact other scheduled deadlines. The duty to supplement discovery responses under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e) does not excuse the need to obtain leave of Court to amend contentions, disclosures, or other documents required to be filed or exchanged pursuant to these Local Patent Rules.

3.8. Advice of Counsel.

Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, not later than 30 days after entry of the Court’s claim construction order, or upon such other date as set by the Court, each party relying upon advice of counsel as part of a patent-related claim or defense for any reason shall:

(a) Produce or make available for inspection and copying any written advice and documents related thereto for which the attorney-client and work product protection have been waived;

(b) Provide a written summary of any oral advice and produce or make available for inspection and copying that summary and documents related thereto for which the attorney-client and work product protection have been waived; and

(c) Serve a privilege log identifying any documents other than those identified in subpart (a) above, except those authored by counsel acting solely as trial counsel, relating to the subject matter of the advice which the party is withholding on the grounds of attorney-client privilege or work product protection.

A party who does not comply with the requirements of this L. Pat. R. 3.8 shall not be permitted to rely on advice of counsel for any purpose absent a stipulation of all parties or by order of the Court.

4. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION PROCEEDINGS

4.1. Exchange of Proposed Terms for Construction.

(a) Not later than 14 days after service of the “Responses to Invalidity Contentions” pursuant to L. Pat. R. 3.4A, not later than 45 days after service upon it of the “Non-Infringement Contentions and Responses” pursuant to L. Pat. R. 3.2A in those actions where validity is not at issue (and L. Pat. R. 3.3 does not apply), or, in all cases in which a party files a complaint or other pleading seeking a declaratory judgment not based on validity, not later than 14 days after the defendant serves an answer that does not assert a claim for patent infringement (and L. Pat. R. 3.1 does not apply), each party shall serve on each other party a list of claim terms which that party contends should be construed by the Court, and identify any claim term which that party contends should be governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112(6).

(b) The parties shall thereafter meet and confer for the purposes of limiting the terms in dispute by narrowing or resolving differences and facilitating the ultimate preparation of a Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement.

(c) This rule does not apply to design patents.

4.2. Exchange of Preliminary Claim Constructions and Extrinsic Evidence.

(a) Not later than 21 days after the exchange of the lists pursuant to L. Pat. R. 4.1, the parties shall simultaneously exchange preliminary proposed constructions of each term identified by any party for claim construction. Each such “Preliminary Claim Construction” shall also, for each term which any party contends is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112(6), identify the structure(s), act(s), or material(s) corresponding to that term's function.

(b) At the same time the parties exchange their respective “Preliminary Claim Constructions,” each party shall also identify all intrinsic evidence, all references from the specification or prosecution history that support its preliminary proposed construction and designate any supporting extrinsic evidence including, without limitation, dictionary definitions, citations to learned treatises and prior art and testimony of all witnesses including expert

witnesses. Extrinsic evidence shall be identified by production number or by producing a copy if not previously produced. With respect to all witnesses including experts, the identifying party shall also provide a description of the substance of that witness' proposed testimony that includes a listing of any opinions to be rendered in connection with claim construction.

(c) Not later than 14 days after the parties exchange the “Preliminary Claim Constructions” under this rule, the parties shall exchange an identification of all intrinsic evidence and extrinsic evidence that each party intends to rely upon to oppose any other party's proposed construction, including without limitation, the evidence referenced in L. Pat. R. 4.2(b).

(d) The parties shall thereafter meet and confer for the purposes of narrowing the issues and finalizing preparation of a Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement.

(e) This rule does not apply to design patents.

4.3. Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement.

Not later than 30 days after the exchange of “Preliminary Claim Constructions” under L. Pat. R. 4.2(a), the parties shall complete and file a Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement, which shall contain the following information:

(a) The construction of those terms on which the parties agree;

(b) Each party's proposed construction of each disputed term, together with an identification of all references from the intrinsic evidence that support that construction, and an identification of any extrinsic evidence known to the party on which it intends to rely either to support its proposed construction or to oppose any other party's proposed construction, including, but not limited to, as permitted by law, dictionary definitions, citations to learned treatises and prior art, and testimony of all witnesses including experts;

(c) An identification of the terms whose construction will be most significant to the resolution of the case. The parties shall also identify any term whose construction will be case or claim dispositive or substantially conducive to promoting settlement, and the reasons therefor;

(d) The anticipated length of time necessary for the Claim Construction Hearing; and

(e) Whether any party proposes to call one or more witnesses at the Claim Construction Hearing, the identity of each such witness, and for each witness, a summary of his or her testimony including, for any expert, each opinion to be offered related to claim construction.

(f) Any evidence that is not identified under L. Pat. R. 4.2(a) through 4.2(c) inclusive shall not be included in the Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement.

(g) This rule does not apply to design patents.

4.4. Completion of Claim Construction Discovery.

Not later than 30 days after service and filing of the Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement, the parties shall complete all discovery relating to claim construction, including any depositions with respect to claim construction of any witnesses, other than experts, identified in the Preliminary Claim Construction statement (L. Pat. R. 4.2) or Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement (L. Pat. R. 4.3). This rule does not apply to design patents.

4.5. Claim Construction Submissions.

(a) Not later than 45 days after serving and filing the Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement, the parties shall contemporaneously file and serve their opening *Markman* briefs and any evidence supporting claim construction, including experts' certifications or declarations ("Opening *Markman* Submissions").

(b) Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, any discovery from an expert witness who submitted a certification or declaration under L. Pat. R. 4.5(a) shall be concluded within 30 days after filing the Opening *Markman* Submissions.

(c) Not later than 60 days after the filing of the Opening *Markman* Submissions, the parties shall contemporaneously file and serve responding *Markman* briefs and any evidence supporting claim construction, including any responding experts' certifications or declarations.

(d) With regard to design patents only, subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall not apply. Where a design patent is at issue, not later than 45 days after the submission of "Non-Infringement Contentions and Responses" under L. Pat. R. 3.2A and/or "Responses to Invalidity Contentions" under L. Pat. R. 3.4A, the parties shall contemporaneously file and serve opening *Markman* briefs and any evidence supporting claim construction. Not more than 30 days after the filing of the opening *Markman* briefs, the parties shall contemporaneously file and serve responding *Markman* briefs and any evidence supporting claim construction.

4.6. Claim Construction Hearing.

Within two weeks following submission of the briefs and evidence specified in L. Pat. R. 4.5(c) and (d), counsel shall confer and propose to the Court a schedule for a Claim Construction Hearing, to the extent the parties or the Court believe a hearing is necessary for construction of the claims at issue.

It is FURTHER ORDERED these amendments are effective this date.

FOR THE COURT:

S/ Garrett E. Brown, Jr.
GARRETT E. BROWN, JR.
Chief Judge