

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
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIATWILIO, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
TELESIGN CORPORATION,
Defendant.

Case No.16-cv-06925-LHK (SVK)

**ORDER DENYING TELESIGN'S
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND ITS
INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS**

Re: Dkt. No. 161

Twilio, Inc. (“Twilio”) filed this patent infringement action on December 1, 2016, alleging that TeleSign Corporation’s (“TeleSign”) products infringe its patents. ECF 1. Pending before the Court is TeleSign’s second motion for leave to amend its invalidity contentions. ECF 161. This time around, TeleSign seeks leave based on the Court’s October 13, 2017 claim construction order. ECF 137. Having carefully considered the parties’ submissions, and having had the benefit of oral argument on January 30, 2018, the Court denies TeleSign’s second motion for leave to amend its invalidity contentions for the reasons set forth below.

I. RELEVANT BACKGROUND

TeleSign seeks leave to amend in light of the Court’s construction of the term “REST API” in October 2017. ECF 161 at 6. The REST API term has been the subject of a great deal of discussion by both parties and their experts since at least June 2017. Those discussions in general provide important context for TeleSign’s second motion. There are two references in particular that have figured prominently in the REST API discussions: 1) The dissertation of Dr. Roy Fielding (the “Fielding dissertation”), published in 2000; and 2) The textbook RESTful Web Services by Richardson and Ruby (“the REST Textbook”), published in 2007, which TeleSign now seeks to add as prior art.

A summary of the parties’ attention to the REST API term is helpful.

United States District Court
Northern District of California

1 On June 6, 2017, Twilio served proposed constructions of claim terms on TeleSign,
2 including a proposed construction of REST API. Twilio’s June 6th proposed construction was:
3 “An application programming interface that is operable with the Representation State Transfer
4 (REST) conventions.” ECF 93-8 at 8. As extrinsic evidence in support of its June 6th proposed
5 construction, Twilio listed “Newton’s Telecom Dictionary (22nd Ed. 2006).” Id. Newton’s
6 Telecom Dictionary defines REST as “[a] term coined by Roy Fielding in his Ph. D. dissertation
7 to describe an architecture style of networked systems . . .” ECF 105-14 at 5 (excerpt of Newton’s
8 Telecom Dictionary submitted with Twilio’s Opening Claim Construction Brief).

9 On July 14, 2017, TeleSign filed its first motion to amend its invalidity contentions
10 arguing, in part, that based on Twilio’s June 6, 2017 proposed construction of REST API,
11 TeleSign would need to add its own products as predating technology. ECF 93 at 17-18.
12 TeleSign also argued that “considering Twilio’s construction of ‘REST API’ and ‘URI’ as well as
13 Twilio’s characterization of ‘REST’ in its response to TeleSign’s interrogatory and Twilio’s
14 damages contentions, TeleSign has identified for the first time 35 U.S.C. § 103 arguments that it
15 now includes in [its proposed amendments].” ECF 93 at 17.

16 On August 7, 2017, TeleSign deposed Twilio’s expert, Dr. Kevin Almeroth and used the
17 REST Textbook that it now seeks to add as prior art as an exhibit to the deposition. See ECF 110-
18 2 at 3 (Exhibit 5, the REST Textbook), 40 (questioning of Dr. Almeroth on Exhibit 5). During the
19 deposition, TeleSign referenced a Dr. Almeroth declaration which identified the REST Textbook.
20 ECF 110-3 at 40; ECF 105-8 (Dr. Almeroth’s reply declaration, signed July 27, 2017). The
21 exhibit TeleSign used during the deposition contained the first 105 pages of the REST Textbook,
22 and TeleSign questioned Dr. Almeroth about specific pages in the book. ECF 110-2 at 40.
23 Further, Dr. Almeroth referenced Dr. Fielding’s definition of REST, including the four constraints
24 ultimately adopted by the Court, no less than seven times. See ECF 110-2 at 9, 22-23, 27-28, 30,
25 46.

26 On August 18, 2017, the Court allowed TeleSign to amend its invalidity contentions. ECF
27 109 at 8. The Court found TeleSign had not been diligent in seeking leave to amend its
28 contentions, but because of the early stage of the case and the absence of prejudice from

1 amendment at that time, the Court granted TeleSign leave to amend. ECF 109 at 4-8. In finding a
2 lack of diligence, the Court stated:

3 The Court is not persuaded that Twilio’s preliminary (but not
4 “new”) construction for “REST API” broadens the universe of prior
5 art available to challenge the validity of the ‘376 patent. Rather, it
6 appears that TeleSign had as much support for the challenge before
7 Twilio’s proffered construction as after. At oral argument,
8 TeleSign’s counsel acknowledged that REST is “not as well
9 defined” as SOAP, and that when looking to how people in the art
10 define RESTful and REST, there are competing definitions on
11 whether SOAP can be operable with REST. ECF 106. This is as true
12 today as it was when TeleSign served its contentions on May 1st.
13 Therefore the Court finds that TeleSign has not demonstrated the
14 requisite diligence in support of its amendment.

15 ECF 109 at 7-8.

16 The Court allowed TeleSign to amend its invalidity contentions to include the following
17 contentions about REST and obviousness:

18 Depending on claim construction, and/or to the extent that
19 TeleSign’s early use is found not to expressly disclose “wherein the
20 call router API is substantially a Representational State Transfer
21 (REST) API,” such functionality is inherent to the prior art in that it
22 is necessarily present and would be so recognized by those of skill
23 in the art. In addition, it is obvious that a call router API is
24 substantially a Representational State Transfer (REST) API. Indeed,
25 a skilled artisan would understand that there are a finite number of
26 identified, predictable solutions, namely, embedding zero, some or
27 all state into URIs of a call router to achieve a reasonable
28 expectation of success in responding to an API request directed at
such URIs. Further, one skilled in the art would be aware of various
well-known, potential REST design principles, such as statelessness,
thereby rendering this claim limitation obvious, in addition to other
expert opinions relating to the obviousness of this claim.

ECF 119-3 at 83.

In claim construction briefing the parties submitted competing definitions for REST API:

<u>Twilio’s Proposed Construction</u>	<u>TeleSign’s Proposed Construction</u>
An application programming interface that is operable with the Representation State Transfer (REST) conventions. ECF 105 at 11.	Indefinite Alternatively: A programmatic communication interface using a varying level of statelessness. ECF 110 at 10.

29 In its opening claim construction brief filed on August 14, 2017, Twilio discussed the four
30 constraints from the Fielding dissertation. ECF 105 at 12. On August 27, 2017, TeleSign filed its

1 responsive claim construction brief, arguing that the term REST was indefinite. ECF 110. In
2 doing so, TeleSign cited extrinsic evidence including specific pages from the Fielding dissertation
3 (see ECF 110 at 13; ECF 110-3 at ¶¶ 33, 37, citing pages 4 and 79 of the Fielding dissertation) and
4 the REST Textbook (see ECF 110 at 13-14). TeleSign attached excerpts of the REST Textbook to
5 its brief including pages 16-17 (Chapter 1), 29-31 (Chapter 2), and 79-81 (Chapter 4). ECF 110-5.

6 The Court held a Markman hearing on October 5, 2017, during which the Court indicated
7 it would adopt Twilio’s definition, modified to include the four constraints set out by the Fielding
8 dissertation. ECF 161-3 at 5:7-11. On October 13, 2017, the Court issued its claim construction
9 order defining REST API as follows:

10 [A]n application programming interface that complies with
11 Representational State Transfer (REST) interface constraints, which
12 are: identification of resources; manipulation of resources through
representations; self-descriptive messages; and, hypermedia as the
engine of application state.

13 ECF 137 at 42. In its order, the Court rejected TeleSign’s indefiniteness argument, in part because
14 of the extrinsic evidence cited by TeleSign and its expert in both this action and the inter partes
15 review proceedings. ECF 137 at 19-20. In examining the materials submitted by TeleSign, the
16 Court concluded that rather than proving that REST API is a subjective term that could be applied
17 inconsistently by skilled artisans as TeleSign argued, the evidence and the experts demonstrated
18 that there was a common understanding of REST at the time of invention. *Id.* Specifically, the
19 Court relied on the Fielding dissertation and the REST Textbook. ECF 137 at 19-22. The Court
20 acknowledged Fielding’s four constraints as well as other principles of REST that the parties
21 appeared to agree upon including statelessness, the use of HTTP for transport and operation on
22 resources, and that “REST-based architectures and API’s were well known in the art at the time of
23 the filing of the filing of the ‘376 patent.” ECF 20-21 (citing and quoting Telesign’s expert, Dr.
24 Neilson, in support of TeleSign’s inter partes review petition).

25 TeleSign filed its motion to amend its invalidity contentions on December 22, 2017, over
26 two months after the Court’s claim construction order. ECF 161. Arguing that the Court adopted
27 a new construction of REST API, TeleSign seeks leave to 1) Add an obviousness combination
28 based on the REST Textbook; and 2) Submit new charts for a previously disclosed reference in

1 combination with the REST Textbook. ECF 161 at 4. Specifically, within its proposed charts,
2 TeleSign references the REST Textbook pages 13, 14, 18-19 (Chapter 1), 54 (Chapter 3), 81, 83,
3 84, 86-87, 94-95, 97 (Chapter 4), 217-218 and 221 (Chapter 8).

4 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

5 Pursuant to the Northern District of California’s Patent Local Rules, parties exchange
6 infringement and invalidity contentions early in a case. See Patent Local R. 3. The contentions are
7 not a mere formality but rather a requirement “to eliminate the gamesmanship of hints in favor of
8 open disclosure.” *Largan Precision Co, Ltd. v. Genius Elec. Optical Co.*, No. 13-CV-02502-JD,
9 2014 WL 6882275, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 5, 2014). Amendment of infringement contentions or
10 invalidity contentions may be made only by order of the Court upon a timely showing of good
11 cause. “[A]s a general rule, mistakes or omissions are not by themselves good cause.” *Karl Storz*
12 *Endoscopy-Am., Inc. v. Stryker Corp.*, No. 14-CV-00876-RS (JSC), 2016 WL 2855260, at *3
13 (N.D. Cal. May 13, 2016) (internal citation and quotation omitted). Non-exhaustive examples of
14 circumstances that may, absent undue prejudice to the non-moving party, support a finding of
15 good cause include:

- 16 (a) A claim construction by the Court different from that proposed
- 17 by the party seeking amendment;
- 18 (b) Recent discovery of material, prior art despite earlier diligent
- 19 search; and
- (c) Recent discovery of nonpublic information about the Accused
Instrumentality which was not discovered, despite diligent efforts,
before the service of the Infringement Contentions.

20 Patent Local R. 3–6.

21 Whether a party has been diligent requires a two-step inquiry: “(1) diligence in
22 discovering the basis for amendment; and (2) diligence in seeking amendment once the basis for
23 amendment has been discovered.” *Monolithic Power Sys., Inc. v. Silergy Corp.*, No. 14-1745-VC
24 (KAW), 2015 WL 5440674, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2015). “In considering the party’s
25 diligence, the critical question is whether the party could have discovered the new information
26 earlier had it acted with the requisite diligence.” *Radware Ltd. v. F5 Networks, Inc.*, No. C-13-
27 02021-RMW, 2014 WL 3728482, at *1 (N.D. Cal. 2014). If the court determines that the moving
28 party was not diligent, the inquiry may end there. See *Acer, Inc. v. Tech. Properties Ltd.*, No.

1 5:08-CV-00877 JF/HRL, 2010 WL 3618687, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 10, 2010). However, the court
2 retains discretion to grant leave to amend even in the absence of diligence so long as there is no
3 prejudice to the opposing party. See, e.g., *Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, No. CV 12–00630
4 LHK, 2012 WL 5632618, at *5–6 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 15, 2012); *U.S. Ethernet Innovations, LLC v.*
5 *Acer, Inc.*, No. 10–cv–3724 CW, 2013 WL 5609325, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 11, 2013).

6 **III. DISCUSSION**

7 **a. The Court’s modification of the proposed construction of REST API does not**
8 **provide good cause under the facts of this case.**

9 As a preliminary matter, the Court’s construction of REST API does not automatically
10 provide the requisite good cause that TeleSign urges. While a new construction adopted by a
11 court can provide good cause, here, the Court’s construction of REST API is not new. Rather the
12 Court modified the construction proposed by Twilio by adding clarifying language from a
13 reference well known to and oft-cited by both parties. ECF 137 at 22 (“Having determined that
14 claim 1 is not indefinite, the Court finds that a modified version of Twilio’s proposed construction
15 best reflects the proper construction of ‘REST API.’”) (emphasis added). A modified construction
16 may still provide good cause where the Court inserts new language into a construction. See *Tech.*
17 *Properties Ltd. LLC v. Canon Inc.*, No. 14-3643 CW (DMR), 2016 WL 1360756, at *4 (N.D. Cal.
18 Apr. 6, 2016) (allowing amendment where the court introduced a new phrase into the construction
19 that was never proposed by either party). However, the facts of this case mitigate against good
20 cause to amend notwithstanding the Court’s modified construction.

21 The definition of REST API has long been at issue, and the very language adopted by the
22 Court has been examined closely by the parties and their experts since early in this case. See
23 *supra* Section I. In the face of this evidence, TeleSign argues that it could not have anticipated the
24 Court’s construction and to hold otherwise would require a party to assemble massive variations
25 of contentions, anticipating all conceivable constructions. ECF 166 at 6; ECF 167. TeleSign’s
26 fears are overblown, particularly in light of the specific facts in this case, examined more closely
27 below. Indeed, far from having to amass countless potential contentions, TeleSign merely had to
28 look to its own briefs, evidence, and expert’s opinion to address the Fielding constraints in a

1 timely fashion.

2 **i. The Fielding Dissertation**

3 TeleSign argues that it should be permitted to amend its contentions in light of the four
4 “new” constraints added by the Court’s construction of REST API. See ECF 161 at 9-10. These
5 four constraints adopted by the Court come, verbatim, from the Fielding dissertation which states:
6 “REST is defined by four interface constraints: identification of resources; manipulation of
7 resources through representations; self-descriptive messages; and, hypermedia as the engine of
8 application state.” ECF 137 at 19 (the Court’s claim construction order quoting from page 82 of
9 the Fielding dissertation). In TeleSign’s first motion for leave to amend, TeleSign pointed to
10 Twilio’s June 6th proposed construction of REST API. See ECF 93 at 10, 17. Twilio’s June 6th
11 proposed construction referenced “Newton’s Telecom Dictionary (22nd ed. 2006),” which
12 explicitly relies on the Fielding dissertation in defining REST. ECF 93-8 at 8; ECF 105-14 at 5.
13 In its reply brief, TeleSign complains that a reference to the Fielding dissertation alone could not
14 have been enough to put TeleSign on notice regarding the four constraints because the Fielding
15 dissertation includes 150 pages on the topic of REST. ECF 166 at 9.

16 However, the Court’s construction is not the first time these particular constraints were
17 brought to TeleSign’s attention. At the August 7, 2017 deposition of Dr. Almeroth, Twilio’s
18 expert identified Dr. Fielding’s four constraints as the four “principles” that define REST and
19 proceeded to mention those four principles in response to several questions on how to identify
20 REST. ECF 110-2 at 9, 22-23, 27-28, 30, 46. The four constraints were again identified by
21 Twilio in its opening claim construction brief (ECF 105 at 12), and then referenced by TeleSign in
22 its response (ECF 110 at 15). TeleSign’s expert Dr. Nielson also closely examined the Fielding
23 dissertation, including a citation to a page in the same chapter as the identification of the four
24 constraints. Compare ECF 110-3 at ¶ 37 (citing Chapter 5, page 79 of the Fielding dissertation)
25 with ECF 105 at 12 (citing Chapter 5, page 82 of the Fielding dissertation for the four constraints).
26 The Fielding constraints inserted by the Court have been the focal point of REST API contentions
27 and argument since Twilio first pointed to them in June 2017 and are not new to this case or to
28

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

TeleSign.¹

ii. The REST Textbook

Similarly, the “newly identified” prior art that TeleSign seeks to add to its invalidity contentions is not art that TeleSign identified as a result of the Court’s construction. Troublingly, TeleSign does not state when it first discovered the REST Textbook, published in 2007. TeleSign has been in possession of the REST Textbook, and closely examined it, at least as early as preparations for the deposition of Dr. Almeroth on August 7, 2017. See ECF 110-2 at 40 (TeleSign used the REST Textbook as an exhibit during Dr. Almeroth’s deposition). TeleSign relied on the REST Textbook in its claim construction briefing submitted on August 28, 2017. ECF 110 at 13. Significantly, in its claim construction brief, TeleSign included excerpts from the same chapters of the REST Textbook that it now seeks to add to its charts. Compare ECF 110-5 (TeleSign’s Exhibit D to its claim construction brief with pages from Chapters 1 and 4) with ECF 161-10 (TeleSign’s proposed amendment to invalidity chart citing pages from Chapters 1 and 4).

In light of the foregoing, this Court is not persuaded that the Court’s modified construction of REST API provided a new light in which to view the REST Textbook. Instead, it appears that TeleSign, by its motion to amend, is seeking to correct its failure to timely recognize the significance of the REST Textbook, which is insufficient to establish good cause for amendment. See *Icon-IP Pty Ltd. v. Specialized Bicycle Components, Inc.*, No. 12-CV-03844-JST, 2014 WL 5361643, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2014) (denying leave to amend where the party had possession of the documents it sought to add but did not recognize the significance of the documents until later).

//
//
//

¹ It appears from the record in this case that TeleSign’s objective in focusing on the Fielding constraints was to argue that the term REST API is indefinite. But whatever TeleSign’s purpose, it was well aware of precisely the constraints adopted by the Court long before the Court issued its claim construction order.

1 8), here, discovery closes in three months. Because TeleSign has not been diligent in seeking
2 amendment, the Court does not reach the question of prejudice but acknowledges that it is late in
3 the case to be seeking amendment of invalidity contentions. Therefore, the Court denies
4 TeleSign's second motion to amend its invalidity contentions.

5 **IV. CONCLUSION**

6 Given this history of the term REST API in this case, TeleSign has not established good
7 cause for leave to amend its invalidity contentions. Furthermore, TeleSign has not been diligent in
8 seeking its amendment or discovering the basis for the amendment. As such, the Court denies
9 TeleSign's request for leave to amend its invalidity contentions.

10 **SO ORDERED.**

11 Dated: February 6, 2018

12
13 
14 _____
15 SUSAN VAN KEULEN
16 United States Magistrate Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28