1		
2		
3	UNITED STATES D	ISTRICT COURT
4	NORTHERN DISTRIC	
5	OAKLAND I	DIVISION
6	SPEEDTRACK, INC.,	Case No. 4:09-cv-04479-JSW
7	Plaintiff,	IDDODOGEDI HIDCMENT OF NON
8	VS.	[ <del>PROPOSED]</del> JUDGMENT OF NON- INFRINGEMENT
9	AMAZON.COM, INC.; BARNES & NOBLE BOOKSELLERS, INC.; J & R ELECTRONICS, INC.; DELL INC.; BESTBUY.COM, LLC;	
10	SYSTEMAX, INC.; NA TECH DIRECT, INC.; POCAHONTAS CORP; SYX NORTH	
11	AMERICAN TECH HOLDINGS LLC; NA TECH COMPUTER SUPPLIES INC.;	
12	OFFICEMAX, INC.; MACY'S, INC.; MACYS.COM, LLC; OVERSTOCK.COM,	
13	INC.; RECREATIONAL EQUIPMENT, INC.; EVINE LIVE, INC. (f/k/a VALUE VISION	
14	INTERNATIONAL, INC., DBA	
15	SHOPNBC.COM); B &H FOTO & ELECTRONICS CORP.; HP INC. (f/k/a	
16	HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY); RETAIL CONVERGENCE.COM, LP, DBA SMARTBARGAINS.COM,	
17	Defendants.	
18	Defendants.	
19	/	
20	The Court having considered the Parties' Joi	nt Stipulation and [Proposed] Judgment Of Non-
21	Infringement ("Joint Stipulation"), and finding good	cause thereon, hereby finds as follows:
22	1. On November 8, 2019, the Court ente	ered its Claim Construction Order construing
23	"[category descriptions] having no predefined hierar	chical relationship" as:
24	The category descriptions have no predefine	d hierarchical relationship. A hierarchical
25	relationship is a relationship that pertains to a which components are ranked into levels of s	a hierarchy. A hierarchy is a structure in
26	one, or more subordinates; and no componer	at has more than one subordinate
27		1- [ <del>PROPOSED]</del> JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT
28		
	4851-6522-4886	

	component.	
1		
2	(ECF 383 ("Claim Construction Order") at 5-9.)	
3	2. On January 10, 2020, SpeedTrack sought clarification from the Court regarding its	
4	construction of "[category descriptions] having no predefined hierarchical relationship." (ECF 387.)	
5	3. On February 26, 2020, in response to SpeedTrack's motion for clarification, the Court	
6	issued an Order modifying its construction of the phrase "[category descriptions] having no	
7	predefined hierarchical relationship," and modified it to mean:	
8	The category descriptions have no predefined hierarchical relationship. A hierarchical relationship is a relationship that pertains to hierarchy. A hierarchy is a structure in	
9	which components are ranked into levels of subordination; each component has zero, one, or more subordinates; and no component has more than one superordinate	
10	component.	
11	Category descriptions based on predefined hierarchical field-and-value relationships are disclosized. "Predefined" means that a field is defined as a first step and a value	
12	are disclaimed. "Predefined" means that a field is defined as a first step and a value associated with data files is entered into the field as a second step. "Hierarchical relationship" has the meaning stated above. A field and value are replied into lougle of	
13	relationship" has the meaning stated above. A field and value are ranked into levels of subordination if the field is a higher-order description that restricts the possible meaning of the value, such that the value must refer to the field. To be higher-order	
14	meaning of the value, such that the value must refer to the field. To be hierarchical, each field must have zero, one, or more associated values, and each value must have at most one associated field.	
15	at most one associated neid.	
16	(ECF 412 at 12.)	
17	4. The Court further stated that "[a]s used in the construction, the terms 'field' and	
18	'value' mean nothing more complicated than 'a category' and 'an example of that category' (e.g.,	
19	'language' and 'French')." (ECF 412 at 12:1-3).	
20	5. In view of the Court's modified construction of the phrase "[category descriptions]	
21	having no predefined hierarchical relationship" and Plaintiff's determination thereon as set forth in	
22	the Parties' Joint Stipulation, none of Defendants' accused products or services infringe, either	
23	literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, any claim of the '360 Patent as Defendants' accused	
24	products and services use field-and-value relationships, as those terms are used in the Court's	
25	modified construction.	
26	6. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above in Paragraph 5, Defendants' accused	
27	-2- Case No. 4:09-CV-04479-JSW [PROPOSED] JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT	-
28		

4851-6522-4886

1	products and services do not infringe, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, any claim of US	
2	Patent 5,544,360 under the Court's modified construction of the phrase "[category descriptions]	
3	having no predefined hierarchical relationship."	
4	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED as follows:	
5	JUDGMENT of non-infringement of United States Patent No. 5,544,360 is entered in favor	
6	of Defendants for the reason that Defendants' accused products and services do not infringe, literally	
7	or under the doctrine of equivalents, any claims of US Patent 5,544,360 under the Court's modified	
8	construction of the phrase "[category descriptions] having no predefined hierarchical relationship."	
9	Final judgment is hereby entered in favor of Defendants and against Plaintiff on Plaintiff's	
10	claims for infringement of the '360 Patent.	
11	The Clerk is directed to enter this final judgment.	
12	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
13 14	Date: March 6, 2020	
14	Under States District Judge	
15		
10		
17		
10		
20		
20		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27	-3-	
28	Case No. 4:09-CV-04479-JSW [PROPOSED] JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT	
	4851-6522-4886	