1		
2		
3		
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
5	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
6	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
7		
8	ENTANGLED MEDIA, LLC,	Case No. <u>23-cv-03264-PCP</u> (VKD)
9	Plaintiff,	
0	v.	FURTHER ORDER RE AUGUST 9, 2024 DISCOVERY DISPUTE RE
1	DROPBOX INC.,	DROPBOX INTERROGATORY NO. 5
2	Defendant.	Re: Dkt. Nos. 120, 130
3		

The Court has reviewed the parties' joint status report regarding their respective proposals for resolution of the dispute regarding Dropbox's Interrogatory No. 5. *See* Dkt. Nos. 120, 126, 130. The Court has also reviewed the asserted patents. Both patents claim priority to the same provisional application, and they share substantially the same specification. *See* Dkt. No. 102, Exs. 1, 2.

Given these considerations, the Court orders as follows:

Within three court days of this order, Dropbox may identify five invalidity contention
 charts per asserted patent, each with a single prior art reference per chart (for a total of 10
 invalidity contention charts); however, four of the prior art references must be the same/overlap as
 between the two patents, with only one unique prior art reference per patent.

24 2. Within three court days of this order, Dropbox may identify no more than seven total
25 terms or phrases across both patents for which Dropbox asserts an invalidity challenge under 35
26 U.S.C. § 112.

3. Within 30 days of receiving Dropbox's identification pursuant to paragraphs 1 and 2
above, Entangled Media will serve a supplemental response to Interrogatory No. 5 addressing how

1

1

1

1

14

15

16

17

18

19

1	the asserted claims of the asserted patents are valid in view of Dropbox's identified invalidity
2	contentions and challenges.
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.
4	Dated: August 28, 2024
5	
6	Unigina K. De Marchi
7	Virginia K. DeMarchi United States Magistrate Judge
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	