UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SERTA SIMMONS BEDDING, LLC and DREAMWELL, LTD.

Plaintiffs.

v.

CASPER SLEEP INC.

Defendant.

ORDER ON MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

Civil Action No. 17-cv-7468-AKH

SOC SDNY

DOCUMENT

ELECTRONICALLY 1111

DOC #:

DATE FILES: 3/22/18

ALVIN K. HELLERSTEIN, U.S.D.J.:

On January 25, 2018, the Court held a hearing in accordance with *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc), *aff'd* 516 U.S. 370 (1996), regarding U.S. Patent Nos. 7,424,763; 7,036,173; and 8,918,935. My rulings are reflected in the Order on Claim Construction issued after that hearing. *See* Dkt. No. 81.

Defendant subsequently moved for Summary Judgement, see Dkt. No. 84, and Plaintiff for reconsideration of my *Markman* rulings, see Dkt. No. 88 (filed February 22, 2018). The parties have now fully briefed the motion for reconsideration, see Dkt. Nos. 111, 114, which, under Local Rule 6.3 and relevant Federal Circuit precedent, I exercise my discretion to review, see Jack Guttman, Inc. v. Kopykake Enterprises, Inc., 302 F.3d 1352, 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

I previously defined "body" as "the entirety of the mattress." On reconsideration, that definition is awkward and causes the balance of the claim not to parse. A better definition is "physical structure," a definition that I believe is accurate, neutral, and a better fit. The construction for "body" that I adopt provides the "ordinary and customary" meaning of the term, see Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303, 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2005), when read in context of the

claims and the specifications. Casper's proposed constructions (either "the physical structure of

the mattress" or "the body of the mattress") lead to an awkward reading of the patent claims and

for the redundancy of the term "mattress."

I also previously held that the term "at least one..." does not require construction, in light

of my definition of "body." In light of my revised ruling on the term "body," I find again that no

construction is necessary for this term. Casper's insertion of additional language ("not an interior

surface") finds no basis in the text of the claims. I also deny as premature Casper's request for

me to find that Plaintiff "disclaimed channels that are centrally disposed in the interior of the

mattress." See Dkt. No. 59, 113.

A chart reflecting the revisions to my Order on Claim Construction, Dkt. No. 81, is

attached as Exhibit A to this order.

In light of the changed definitions, Casper's motion for summary judgment is academic.

It is denied with leave to renew. The parties shall appear for the status conference scheduled for

March 23, 2018, at 11:00 A.M., to regulate the proceedings of this case to follow.

The Clerk shall terminate Dkt. Nos. 84 and 88.

SO ORDERED

Dated:

New York, New York

March 2018

United States District Judge

2

Exhibit A: Amended Claim Construction Order

Ferm	Court's Construction
"channel"	"a long, narrow groove"
('763 patent cls. 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12; '173 patent cls. 5, 6; '935 patent cls. 10, 13)	
"within"	No construction necessary.
('763 patent cls. 1, 4; '173 patent cl. 5)	
"body"	"physical structure"
('763 patent cls. 1, 8, 9; '173 patent cls. 5, 6; '935 patent cl. 10)	
"at least one of the top and bottom surfaces including a plurality of channels"	No construction necessary.
('763 patent, cl. 1)	
"does not entirely fill the channel"	No construction necessary.
('935 patent, cl. 10)	
"assembling the [plurality of] rectangular foam pieces to form the body having a channel in the region"	"assembling the [plurality of] rectangular foam pieces to form the body and to form a channel in the region"
('763 patent, cl. 8; '935 patent, cl. 10)	
order of steps	The methods do not prescribe a sequence of operations.
('763 patent, cl. 8; '173 patent, cl. 5; '935 patent, cl. 10)	