

1 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
 2 MICHAEL A. JACOBS (Bar No. 111664)
 3 mjacobs@mofo.com
 4 MARC DAVID PETERS (Bar No. 211725)
 5 mdpeters@mofo.com
 6 DANIEL P. MUINO (Bar No. 209624)
 7 dmuino@mofo.com
 8 755 Page Mill Road, Palo Alto, CA 94304-1018
 9 Telephone: (650) 813-5600 / Facsimile: (650) 494-0792

10 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
 11 DAVID BOIES (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
 12 dboies@bsflp.com
 13 333 Main Street, Armonk, NY 10504
 14 Telephone: (914) 749-8200 / Facsimile: (914) 749-8300
 15 STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (Bar No. 144177)
 16 sholtzman@bsflp.com
 17 1999 Harrison St., Suite 900, Oakland, CA 94612
 18 Telephone: (510) 874-1000 / Facsimile: (510) 874-1460

19 ORACLE CORPORATION
 20 DORIAN DALEY (Bar No. 129049)
 21 dorian.daley@oracle.com
 22 DEBORAH K. MILLER (Bar No. 95527)
 23 deborah.miller@oracle.com
 24 MATTHEW M. SARBORARIA (Bar No. 211600)
 25 matthew.sarboraria@oracle.com
 26 500 Oracle Parkway, Redwood City, CA 94065
 27 Telephone: (650) 506-5200 / Facsimile: (650) 506-7114

28 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC.

Defendant.

Case No. CV 10-03561 WHA

**ORACLE AMERICA, INC.'S
 MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 3 TO
 PRECLUDE GOOGLE FROM
 OFFERING EVIDENCE OR
 ARGUMENT THAT THIRD-PARTY
 OEMS CHANGED INFRINGING
 COMPONENTS OF ANDROID**

Dept: Courtroom 8, 19th Floor
 Judge: Honorable William H. Alsup

1 Oracle moves the Court to preclude Google from offering argument or evidence at trial
2 that any changes were made to the infringing components of the Android source code by third
3 party original equipment manufacturers (OEMs). Throughout this litigation, Google has
4 steadfastly denied knowledge of any modifications made by OEMs to the infringing components
5 of Android: (1) In response to Oracle’s Interrogatory 21, Google stated that it had “no direct,
6 specific knowledge with regard to how third parties modify the accused Android source code and
7 documentation”; and (2) Google’s corporate designee, Patrick Brady, testified that he did not
8 know for certain, one way or the other, whether OEMs had changed the infringing components of
9 Android installed on Android devices. Having disclaimed any knowledge of OEM changes to the
10 infringing components, Google should be barred from offering any evidence or argument on that
11 subject at trial.

12 **I. GOOGLE HAS DENIED KNOWLEDGE OF OEM CHANGES TO THE**
13 **INFRINGING COMPONENTS OF ANDROID**

14 Oracle accuses the Android platform of infringing the patents-in-suit through several key
15 platform components: (1) the Dalvik virtual machine, (2) the dexopt component, (3) the zygote
16 process, (4) the dx tool, and (5) Android’s java.security framework (collectively, the “infringing
17 components”). Through an interrogatory (No. 21) and a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition topic (No. 7),
18 Oracle sought discovery from Google regarding its knowledge of any modifications made by
19 third parties to the infringing components of Android. In its interrogatory answer and through the
20 testimony of its corporate designee, Google flatly denied any specific knowledge of whether or
21 not OEMs modify the infringing components of Android to be installed on their Android devices.
22 Instead, Google insisted that OEMs “may freely modify Android source code subject to the terms
23 of [the Apache License],” presumably without Google’s knowledge or oversight.

24 *Google’s Response to Oracle’s Interrogatory 21:* Oracle’s Interrogatory 21 asked Google
25 to “[i]dentify and describe in detail each modification made by third parties to the allegedly
26 infringing portions of Android source code and documentation identified by Oracle’s copyright
27 and patent infringement contentions, including the author of, date of, and basis for each such
28 modification.” (Declaration of Daniel P. Muino in Support of Oracle America, Inc.’s Motions *In*

1 *Limine* Nos. 1 Through 5 (“Muino Decl.”), Exhibit I, Defendant Google, Inc.’s Responses to
2 Plaintiff’s Interrogatories, Set Four, at 10.) On July 29, 2011, Google responded as follows:

3 Subject to the foregoing objections and the General Objections,
4 without waiver or limitation thereof, ***Google states that it has no***
5 ***direct, specific knowledge with regard to how third parties modify***
6 ***the accused Android source code and documentation.*** Google
7 releases Android source code to the public under the open source
8 Apache License, Version 2.0. Any third party may freely modify
9 Android source code subject to the terms of this license.

10 *Id.* at 11 (Google’s objections omitted). To date, Google has not supplemented this response.

11 *Testimony of Google’s Corporate Designee, Patrick Brady:* Topic 7 of Oracle’s Rule
12 30(b)(6) deposition notice to Google sought testimony regarding “[m]odifications made by third
13 parties to the allegedly-infringing portions of Android identified by Oracle’s copyright and patent
14 infringement contentions, including the author of, date of, and basis for each such modification.”
15 (Muino Decl. Exhibit J, Plaintiff’s Notice of Deposition of Defendant Google Inc. Pursuant to
16 Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6), Topics 4-9.)

17 On July 21, 2011, Oracle took the deposition of Google’s corporate designee on Topic 7,
18 Patrick Brady, Director of Android Partner Engineering. [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED]

20 [REDACTED]

21 [REDACTED]

22 [REDACTED]

23 [REDACTED]

24 [REDACTED]

25 [REDACTED]

26 [REDACTED]

27 [REDACTED]

28 [REDACTED]

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

[REDACTED]

But Mr. Brady could not say for certain that changes had been made to the Dalvik virtual machine in that device, and had no knowledge of the specifics of any such changes.

II. GOOGLE SHOULD BE PRECLUDED FROM OFFERING EVIDENCE OR ARGUMENT ON OEM CHANGES TO INFRINGING ANDROID COMPONENTS

This Court has previously ruled that, with respect to evidence admissible at trial, parties “will be held to their discovery answers.” *Doe v. Reddy*, No. C 02-05570 WHA, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 30792, *14-15 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 24, 2004) (Alsup, J.). In *Doe v. Reddy*, the Court granted a motion in limine precluding defendant (accused of sexual relations with an underage girl) from suggesting at trial that plaintiffs (the girl’s parents) knew about the sexual relations. *Id.* The Court noted that defendant’s interrogatory responses had identified no evidence regarding parental knowledge of the sexual relations. *Id.* While the response did refer to certain deposition testimony, that testimony did not establish parental knowledge. *Id.* Accordingly, the Court ruled that “Defendants will be held to their discovery answers” and “at trial no suggestion will be made that the parents knew of the sexual relations.” *Id.*

Other courts in the 9th Circuit have followed this principle, limiting evidence admissible at trial to what is disclosed in discovery. *See Service Employees Int’l Union (“SEIU”) v. Roselli*, No. C 09-00404 WHA, 2010 WL 963707, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 16, 2010) (granting motion in limine to exclude evidence based on defendant’s refusal to provide discovery on that evidence); *Tech. Licensing Corp. v. Thomson, Inc.*, No. CIV. S-03-1329, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24239, at *16-17 (E.D. Cal. June 30, 2005) (limiting evidence at trial to information disclosed in response to interrogatory). In the *SEIU* case, this Court granted a motion in limine to exclude evidence regarding certain activities aimed at obtaining workers’ signatures, on the grounds that defendants

1 refused to answer questions about those activities during discovery. *SEIU*, 2010 WL 963707, at
2 *5. The Court observed, “having avoided disclosing in discovery the materials sought by
3 plaintiffs regarding defendants’ post-trusteeship activities on grounds of relevancy, it would be
4 unfair sandbagging to allow defendants to now assert those same materials as a defense to
5 plaintiffs’ claims.” *Id.*

6 In this case, Google’s interrogatory response disclaimed any specific knowledge of OEM
7 modifications of Android code. Although Google’s response was served after the deposition of
8 Mr. Brady on Topic 7, Google did not incorporate Mr. Brady’s testimony into its response. So
9 Google has disclosed nothing at all in response to Oracle’s interrogatory regarding OEM changes
10 to Android. Accordingly, Google should be precluded from suggesting at trial that OEMs
11 changed the infringing components of Android, since it disclosed no evidence on this subject in
12 its interrogatory response. *Doe v. Reddy*, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 30792, at *14.

13 Furthermore, even if Mr. Brady’s testimony were counted as disclosure on this subject, he
14 too disclaimed specific knowledge of OEM modifications to the infringing components of
15 Android. [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED]
17 [REDACTED]
18 [REDACTED]
19 [REDACTED]
20 [REDACTED]

21 [REDACTED] Mr. Brady’s testimony provides no basis for Google to argue that OEMs made changes to
22 the infringing components of Android.

23 The preclusion of argument and evidence regarding OEM changes to Android should
24 extend to Google’s experts, who should not be permitted to speculate regarding modifications to
25 the Android code without a factual basis. For instance, Google’s expert, David August, stated in
26 his report that “device manufacturers often modify the source code.” (Muino Decl. Exhibit L

27 ¶ 108 (Expert Report of David I. August, Ph.D. Regarding the Non-Infringement of U.S. Patent
28 No. 6,910,205).) Yet, Mr. August offered no basis for this statement other than an excerpt from

1 the deposition of Mr. Brady.¹ (*Id.* Ex. M at 131:2-9.) While Mr. Brady did testify regarding
2 certain OEM changes to the Android code *in general*, he disclaimed any specific knowledge of
3 OEM changes to the *infringing components* of Android. Accordingly, Mr. Brady's testimony
4 provides no basis on which Mr. August, or any other Google expert, may opine on purported
5 OEM changes to the Android code.

6 **III. CONCLUSION**

7 For the foregoing reasons, Oracle requests that the Court preclude Google, its attorneys,
8 witnesses, and experts, from offering any argument or evidence at trial that OEMs made changes
9 to the infringing components of the Android code installed on their devices.

10
11 Dated: September 24, 2011

MICHAEL A. JACOBS
MARC DAVID PETERS
DANIEL P. MUINO
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

12
13
14 By: /s/ Daniel P. Muino

15 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
16 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 ¹ Mr. August acknowledged that he has not examined any third party devices, nor has he
27 conducted any research into how third party manufacturers might modify the source code.
(Muino Decl. Exhibit M at 128:10-129:4, 130:10-19 (September 16, 2011 Deposition of David I.
28 August).)