United States District Court For the Northern District of California

1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
11	COGENT MEDICINE, INC.,	Case No. C-13-4483-RMW	
12	Plaintiff,		
13	v.	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES	FOR
14 15 16	PHYSICIANS INTERACTIVE HOLDINGS, INC., PHYSICIANS INTERACTIVE, INC., AND SKYSCAPE.COM, INC.,		
17	Defendants.		
 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 	Defendants Skyscape.com, Inc., Physicians Interactive Holdings, Inc., and Physicians Interactive, Inc., move for attorneys' fees under 35 U.S.C. § 285. Dkt No. 43. ¹ In their motion, defendants contend that this case is exceptional under 35 U.S.C. § 285 because plaintiff Cogent Medicine ("Cogent") never had any evidentiary basis for its infringement claims against defendants. <i>See</i> Dkt. No. 43, at 4. The court disagrees, for the following reasons: (1) Skyscape asks the court to infer that Cogent had no evidentiary basis for its infringement claims from conduct which complied with the Patent Local Rules; (2) the court construed none of the asserted patent's terms and made no ¹ When filed, defendants' motion was untimely, as plaintiff Cogent Medicine's claims had not yet been dismissed, nor had judgment been entered. However, at the November 14, 2014 hearing on this motion, the parties agreed to: (1) voluntarily dismiss all claims; and (2) entry of judgment for defendants. The court thereafter dismissed all claims and counterclaims in this case and entered judgment in favor of defendants. Dkt. No. 50. ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES Case No. C-13-4483-RMW		
	EDB		Dockets.Justia.c

Dockets.Justia.com

United States District Court For the Northern District of California determination regarding Cogent's infringement claims; and (3) the McCrary declaration submitted
by Cogent is evidence of that Cogent adequately investigated the asserted patent and its
infringement claims against defendants before filing suit. Because the court finds that the totality of
the circumstances do not show this case to be exceptional under § 285, the court DENIES
defendants' motion for attorneys' fees.

Dated: November 14, 2014

<u>AM. Whyte</u>

RONALD M. WHYTE United States District Judge

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES Case No. C-13-4483-RMW EDB