

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

**\*E-FILED 02-28-2011\***

NOT FOR CITATION  
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

C&C JEWELRY MANUFACTURING, INC.,

No. C09-01303 JF (HRL)

Plaintiff,

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND  
DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION TO COMPEL RESPONSES TO  
REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION**

v.

TRENT WEST,

Defendant.

**[Re: Docket No. 112]**

Plaintiff C&C Jewelry Manufacturing, Inc. (C&C) filed this patent action seeking declaratory relief. Defendant Trent West has asserted counterclaims for alleged infringement.

C&C now moves for an order compelling West to respond to Requests for Admission (RFAs) 1-69. In essence, each RFA asks West to admit that particular design and manufacturing techniques or processes were known in certain fields of art. West has responded to these RFAs only with objections, and he opposes the motion to compel. The matter is deemed suitable for determination without oral argument, and the March 1, 2011 hearing is vacated. Upon consideration of the moving and responding papers, this court grants the motion in part and denies it in part.

Preliminarily, this court finds that C&C has sufficiently complied with Civil Local Rules 7 and 37-2. As such, the court declines to deny the motion on this basis.

1 A. Relevance Objections

2 West objects that the RFAs seek admissions about irrelevant “art.” It appears that  
3 roughly half of the RFAs at issue ask about what was known in “the tungsten carbide  
4 manufacturing industry,” and the other half ask about what was known in “the jewelry  
5 manufacturing industry.” (Miller Decl. Ex A). C&C maintains that it is entitled to discovery of  
6 jewelry and non-jewelry applications. Here, plaintiff asserts, and there appears to be no dispute,  
7 that the scope and content of the prior art are questions of fact. See generally Monarch Knitting  
8 Machinery Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GMBH, 139 F.3d 877, 881 (Fed. Cir. 1998). But, West points  
9 out that the court’s claim construction order concludes that the relevant art is not metal working  
10 or material science, but “jewelry finger rings.” (Docket No. 87, July 6, 2010 Order at 4-5).

11 Accordingly, with respect to RFAs seeking admissions about “the tungsten carbide  
12 manufacturing industry” generally, plaintiff’s motion to compel is denied.

13 As for RFAs seeking admissions about “the jewelry manufacturing industry,” the RFAs  
14 shall be limited to “jewelry finger rings.” The remainder of this order concerns only those  
15 RFAs.

16 B. Legal Conclusion Objections

17 West objects to C&C’s RFAs on the ground that they improperly require him to admit  
18 legal conclusions. As noted above, the RFAs essentially ask West to admit that “IT WAS  
19 KNOWN” in fields of art about certain design and manufacturing processes. The term “IT  
20 WAS KNOWN” is defined in the RFAs to mean:

21 that the subject matter of the Request was known or used by DEFENDANT  
22 Trent West, known or used by others in the United States or a foreign  
23 country, in public use or on sale in the United States, or patented or described  
in a printed publication in the United States or a foreign country, prior to  
September 8, 1996, *as these terms are used in 35 U.S.C. §102.*

24 (Miller Decl., Ex. A at 2) (emphasis added). This definition essentially tracks the statutory  
25 language of 35 U.S.C. § 102, which provides that a person shall be entitled to a patent, *unless*  
26 among other invalidating events, “the invention was known or used by others in this country,  
27 or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the  
28 invention thereof by the applicant for patent.” 35 U.S.C. § 102(a). C&C contends that the

1 RFAs at issue seek admissions about underlying facts, or at worst, about mixed questions of  
2 law and fact.

3 An RFA properly may require the responding party to admit “the truth of any matters  
4 within the scope of [Fed. R. Civ. P.] Rule 26(b)(1) relating to facts, the application of law to  
5 fact, or opinions about either.” FED. R. CIV. P. 36(a)(1)(A). Having considered C&C’s RFAs,  
6 this court concludes that they reasonably can be construed as asking West to admit the truth of  
7 the underlying facts—e.g., whether the subject matter was known or used by others in the  
8 United States or a foreign country, in public use or on sale in the United States, or patented or  
9 described in a printed publication in the United States or a foreign country, prior to September  
10 8, 1996—and not the legal conclusion to be drawn from those facts. Accordingly, plaintiff’s  
11 motion to compel as to this issue is granted.

12 C. Objections re Claimed Cumulative and Duplicative RFAs

13 West argues that the RFAs are cumulative and duplicative. However, he asserted no  
14 such objection in response to the RFAs, and the objections therefore are waived. See Fed. R.  
15 Civ. P. 36(a)(5) (“The grounds for objecting to a request must be stated.”). See generally  
16 Richmark Corp. v. Timber Falling Consultants, 959 F.2d 1468, 1473 (9th Cir. 1992) (“It is  
17 well established that a failure to object to discovery requests within the time required  
18 constitutes a waiver of any objection.”) (citing Davis v. Fendler, 650 F.2d 1154, 1160 (9th  
19 Cir. 1981)). Moreover, this court is unpersuaded that the RFAs are unreasonably cumulative  
20 or duplicative. As to this issue, plaintiff’s motion to compel is granted.

21 D. “Subjective Perspectives” Objection

22 West objected to a number of RFAs as vague and ambiguous because the requests use  
23 terms that “are undefined and their meanings depend on subjective perspectives of individuals  
24 which may differ.” (Miller Decl., Ex. B, RFAs 1-71). A responding party cannot object to an  
25 RFA on the ground that the request is ambiguous, unless the request is so ambiguous that the  
26 responding party, in good faith, cannot provide a response. See Marchand v. Mercy Medical  
27 Ctr., 22 F.3d 933, 938 (9th Cir. 1994) (a responding party “should admit to the fullest extent  
28 possible, and explain in detail why other portions of a request may not be admitted”). Here,

1 West simply asserts that reasonable minds could differ, and his objections are therefore  
2 improper. Moreover, the court concludes that these requests are not so unclear that defendant  
3 cannot provide an answer based upon his understanding. Plaintiff's motion as to this issue is  
4 granted.

5 E. Objection re Compound RFAs

6 West objects that the RFAs at issue are compound because they are drawn to more  
7 than one proposition. This court is not convinced that they are. Plaintiff's motion as to this  
8 issue is granted.

9 F. Objections re Defendant's Potential Inability to Answer

10 West objects to C&C's RFAs "[t]o the extent this request requires a response based on  
11 information presently unknown to West, and unavailable to him through reasonable inquiry . .  
12 . ." (Miller Ex. B). West's objection is insufficient to excuse him from responding to the  
13 RFAs. "The answering party may assert lack of knowledge or information as a reason for  
14 failing to admit or deny *only if* the party states that it has made reasonable inquiry and that the  
15 information it knows or can readily obtain is insufficient to enable it to admit or deny." FED.  
16 R. CIV. P. 36(a)(4) (emphasis added). Plaintiff's motion as to this issue is granted.

17 Within 14 days from the date of this order, West shall serve responses to C&C's RFAs  
18 in compliance with the rulings set out above.

19 SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: February 28, 2011

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
HOWARD R. LLOYDE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
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

5:09-cv-01303-JF Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Daralyn J. Durie ddurie@durietangri.com, records@durietangri.com

Dirk Van Ausdall dirk@kingandkelleher.com

Edward Vincent King , Jr evking@kingandkelleher.com,  
dvanausdall@kingandkelleher.com, lana@kingandkelleher.com

Eric Charles Wood eric.wood@solidcounsel.com

John Gregory Fischer john.fischer@solidcounsel.com, dena.lambert@solidcounsel.com,  
pamela.house@solidcounsel.com, sstutsman@stormllp.com, ssutherland@stormllp.com,  
will.hester@solidcounsel.com

Ryan Marshall Kent rkent@durietangri.com, records@durietangri.com

Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel who have not registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.