

1 Marla R. Butler, *pro hac vice*  
marla.butler@thompsonhine.com  
2 Two Alliance Center  
3 3560 Lenox Road Suite 1600  
Atlanta, Georgia 30326-4266  
4 Telephone: (404) 407-3680

5 Jeffrey C. Metzcar, *pro hac vice*  
jeff.metzcar@thompsonhine.com  
6 10050 Innovation Dr., #400  
7 Miamisburg, OH 45342  
Telephone: (937) 443-6841

8 Jesse L. Jenike-Godshalk, *pro hac vice*  
9 Jesse.Godshalk@ThompsonHine.com  
10 312 Walnut Street, Suite 2000  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
11 Tel.: (513) 352-6700  
Fax: (513) 241-4771

Andrew Himebaugh, *pro hac vice*  
andy.himebaugh@thompsonhine.com  
20 N. Clark Street, Suite 3200  
Chicago, IL 60602  
Telephone: (312) 998-4247

Jennifer Seraphine (State Bar No. 245463)  
seraphine@turnerboyd.com  
Vyson Hsu (State Bar No. 322336)  
hsu@turnerboyd.com  
TURNER BOYD SERAPHINE LLP  
155 Bovet Road, Suite 750  
San Mateo, CA 94402  
Telephone: (650) 521-5930

*Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaim-  
Plaintiffs Caption Health, Inc. & GE  
HealthCare Technologies Inc.*

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

14 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

15 UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 CAPTION HEALTH, INC.; GE  
19 HEALTHCARE TECHNOLOGIES INC.,

20 Defendants.

Case No. 5:24-cv-03200-EKL

**DEFENDANT GE HEALTHCARE'S  
RESPONSES TO UBC'S THIRD SET OF  
REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION TO  
DEFENDANT GE HEALTHCARE (NOS.  
55-86)**

Judge: Eumi K. Lee

21  
22 Pursuant to Rule 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Defendant GE HealthCare  
23 Technologies, Inc. ("GE HealthCare"), hereby sets forth its responses and objections to Plaintiff  
24 University of British Columbia's ("Plaintiff") Third Set of Requests for Production of Documents  
25 and Things (Nos. 55-86) ("Requests") as follows.

26 GE HealthCare makes these Responses and Objections without waiving any rights,  
27 arguments, positions or defenses, including those available to Defendant Caption Health, Inc.  
28

1 (“Caption Health”). GE HealthCare also reserves the right to revise, supplement, or correct these  
2 Responses and Objections.

3 Without waiver of any of the objections set forth herein, GE HealthCare is prepared to meet  
4 and confer with Plaintiff’s counsel concerning Plaintiff’s requests and GE HealthCare’s  
5 objections.

6 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

7 GE HealthCare asserts the following General Objections, which are hereby specifically  
8 incorporated into each and every numbered response. For emphasis, any particular numbered  
9 response may repeat or refer to all or a portion of the objections contained in these General  
10 Objections, but such repetition or reference is in no way intended to limit the incorporation of all  
11 of the General Objections into such numbered response.

12 1. GE HealthCare objects to each of Plaintiff’s Requests to the extent they seek  
13 additional disclosure of technical details of any of GE HealthCare’s devices while Plaintiff has  
14 still failed to adequately and specifically plead patent infringement as to said device.

15 2. GE HealthCare objects to these Requests to the extent they seek information and/or  
16 documents protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, or any  
17 other applicable privilege or protection. Any disclosure of privileged or work-product protected  
18 information is inadvertent and shall not be deemed a waiver of any privilege, doctrine, or  
19 immunity.

20 3. GE HealthCare objects to these Requests (as well as the instructions and  
21 definitions) to the extent they seek to impose obligations on GE HealthCare not otherwise imposed  
22 by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the local rules, or the orders of this Court.

23 4. GE HealthCare objects to these Requests to the extent they seek information or  
24 materials neither relevant to this action nor proportional to the needs of the case.

25 5. Nothing contained herein shall be construed as an admission relative to the  
26 existence or possession of any document. No response, or document produced in response to these  
27

1 Requests, is an admission as to the relevance or admissibility of any document or the truth or  
2 accuracy of any statement or characterization contained in the Request.

3 6. GE HealthCare objects to each Request to the extent it seeks documents and/or  
4 information already within Plaintiff's possession, already known and/or disclosed to Plaintiff, or  
5 which is equally available to Plaintiff, on the grounds that it subjects GE HealthCare to  
6 unreasonable and undue burden and expense.

7 7. GE HealthCare object to these Requests to the extent they seek documents and/or  
8 information outside of GE HealthCare's possession, custody, or control.

9 8. GE HealthCare objects to these Requests to the extent they are unreasonably  
10 cumulative or duplicative, or to the extent that the information sought may be obtained from  
11 another source in a more convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive manner.

12 9. GE HealthCare objects to these Requests to the extent that they are confusing,  
13 vague, or ambiguous.

14 10. GE HealthCare objects to these Requests to the extent they seek confidential,  
15 personally identifiable information in violation of applicable privacy acts or statutes.

16 11. GE HealthCare objects to Plaintiff's definition of "Related Patents" as irrelevant,  
17 unreasonably broad, vague, unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to the needs of the case  
18 because it includes patents for which Plaintiff has not alleged infringement in this Litigation and  
19 contains the extremely broad qualification of patents that "relate to any of the Patents-in-Suit by  
20 way of subject matter."

21 12. GE HealthCare objects to Plaintiff's definition of "Accused Products" as  
22 unreasonably vague because it is "not limited to" the products listed in the definition. GE  
23 HealthCare further objects to this definition as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and  
24 disproportionate to the needs of the case because it includes the following products and  
25 technologies that Plaintiff has not adequately alleged infringe any claim of the Patents in Suit in  
26 either Plaintiff's pleadings or any version of its Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement  
27 Contentions for which Plaintiff has obtained leave to serve: "'SonoLyst' (e.g. SonoLystlive,  
28

1 SonoLystIR, SonoLystX) including, but not limited to, . . . ‘Voluson’ family of ultrasound  
2 systems, Butterfly iQ+ device with Butterfly iQ app, and Terason uSmart 3200T Plus.”

3 13. GE HealthCare, along with Caption Health, further objects to these Requests  
4 inasmuch as they are unduly burdensome as a result of Plaintiff’s decision to serve separate sets  
5 of similar discovery requests on GE HealthCare and Caption Health, such that Defendants must  
6 review, object to, and respond to two sets of definitions, instructions, and Requests rather than one.

7 14. GE HealthCare objects to Plaintiff’s definition of “Accused Functionalities” to the  
8 extent that it makes reference to the positions that Plaintiff has taken in its Second Supplemental  
9 Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions and that are the subject  
10 of a discovery dispute that the parties have submitted to the Court for resolution.

11 15. GE HealthCare reserve the right to supplement these responses at a later date.

12  
13 **RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION**

14 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 55:**

15 Documents sufficient to indicate when You had knowledge of UBC’s or the individual  
16 named inventor’s work or research on medical image interpretation or analysis including, without  
17 limitation, the first time that You became aware of any publication referring to such work or  
18 research.

19 **RESPONSE:**

20 GE HealthCare objects to this request because “the individual named inventor’s” is vague  
21 and ambiguous. GE HealthCare assumes that it should be “the Patents-in-Suit’s individual named  
22 inventors’.” GE HealthCare further objects to this request because it seeks documents not relevant  
23 to any party’s claim or defense, and the burden of producing the requested documents is not  
24 proportional to the needs of the case. Caption AI is the only accused technology properly at issue,  
25 and UBC accused Caption Health of infringing before GE HealthCare acquired Caption Health.

26 Standing on its objections, GE HealthCare will not produce documents in response to this  
27 request.

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 56:**

2 All records of any changes, enhancements, and/or corrections to the source code and  
3 software for the Accused Products and/or Accused Functionalities.

4 **RESPONSE:**

5 GE HealthCare objects to this request because the term “enhancements” is vague and  
6 ambiguous. GE HealthCare further objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome,  
7 and disproportionate to the needs of the case inasmuch as it seeks “all records.” As noted above,  
8 GE HealthCare also objects to Plaintiff’s definition of “Accused Products” as unreasonably vague  
9 because it is “not limited to” the products listed in the definition. GE HealthCare further objects to  
10 this definition as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to the needs of the case  
11 because it includes the following products and technologies that Plaintiff has not adequately  
12 alleged infringe any claim of the Patents in Suit in either Plaintiff’s pleadings or any version of its  
13 Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions for which Plaintiff has obtained leave  
14 to serve: “‘SonoLyst’ (e.g. SonoLystlive, SonoLystIR, SonoLystX) including, but not limited to, .  
15 .. ‘Voluson’ family of ultrasound systems, Butterfly iQ+ device with Butterfly iQ app, and Terason  
16 uSmart 3200T Plus.” In responding to this request, GE HealthCare will treat “Accused Products”  
17 as limited to the Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan Air SL. GE HealthCare further  
18 objects to Plaintiff’s definition of “Accused Functionalities” to the extent that it makes reference  
19 to the positions that Plaintiff has taken in its Second Supplemental Disclosure of Asserted Claims  
20 and Preliminary Infringement Contentions and that are the subject of a discovery dispute that the  
21 parties have submitted to the Court for resolution. Finally, GE HealthCare objects to this request  
22 as duplicative of Plaintiff’s Requests Nos. 1–8.

23 GE HealthCare will produce, or make available for inspection, documents or source code  
24 sufficient to show changes or corrections to source code and software for Caption AI for use on  
25 Venue and Vscan Air SL.

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 57:**

2 All documents related to negotiations of any patent license produced or identified by You  
3 in this case.

4 **RESPONSE:**

5 GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and  
6 disproportionate to the needs of the case inasmuch as it seeks “all documents.” GE HealthCare  
7 objects to this request because it seeks documents within the scope of the attorney–client privilege  
8 and the work-product doctrine. GE HealthCare will not produce such documents.

9 Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents related  
10 to negotiations of licenses that it has produced in this litigation to the extent these documents have  
11 not already been produced in response to another request.

12 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 58:**

13 All documents related to the circumstances surrounding the negotiation of any patent  
14 license produced or identified by You in this case.

15 **RESPONSE:**

16 GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and  
17 disproportionate to the needs of the case inasmuch as it seeks “all documents.” GE HealthCare  
18 also objects to this request because “circumstances surrounding the negotiation” is vague and  
19 ambiguous. GE HealthCare further objects to this request because it seeks documents within the  
20 scope of the attorney–client privilege and the work-product doctrine. GE HealthCare will not  
21 produce such documents.

22 Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents related  
23 to negotiations of licenses that it has produced in this litigation to the extent these documents have  
24 not already been produced in response to another request.

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 59:**

2 All documents related to any established policy, procedure, or program related to licensing  
3 (in-bound or out-bound) or use of intellectual property by You, including but not limited to out-  
4 bound and in-bound patent licensing efforts and the criteria for licensing a patent.

5 **RESPONSE:**

6 GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
7 proportional to the needs of the case inasmuch as it seeks “all documents” and inasmuch as it seeks  
8 information about policies, procedures, or programs that do not apply to Caption AI software.  
9 Also, GE HealthCare objects to this request as vague as to the term “use of intellectual property.”  
10 GE HealthCare will disregard this language.

11 Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents, if  
12 any, related to any established policy, procedure, or program related to licensing (in-bound or out-  
13 bound) by GE HealthCare that applies to Caption AI software.

14 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 60:**

15 All documents related to Your patent-clearing policies and procedures, as well as policies  
16 and procedures for reviewing potential licensing needs.

17 **RESPONSE:**

18 GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
19 proportional to the needs of the case inasmuch as it seeks “all documents.” Also, GE HealthCare  
20 objects to this request as vague and ambiguous as to the terms “patent-clearing policies and  
21 procedures” and “licensing needs.” Finally, GE HealthCare objects to this request because seeks  
22 to impermissibly discover irrelevant and sensitive information in the form of GE HealthCare’s  
23 broader business practices. The breadth and vagueness of this request make it impossible for GE  
24 HealthCare to respond at this time.

25 Therefore, GE HealthCare is willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding the scope  
26 of this request.

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 61:**

2 All documents relating to any attempts to design around or modify any product to avoid  
3 infringement of any of the Patents-in-Suit.

4 **RESPONSE:**

5 GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
6 proportional to the needs of the case inasmuch as it seeks “all documents” and inasmuch as it seeks  
7 information regarding “any product” rather than specifying a product that Plaintiff has properly  
8 alleged infringes the Patents-in-Suit. Thus, GE HealthCare further objects that this request seeks  
9 to shift Plaintiff’s burden for alleging infringement of specific products to GE HealthCare. GE  
10 HealthCare further objects to this request because it seeks documents within the scope of the  
11 attorney–client privilege and the work-product doctrine. GE HealthCare will not produce such  
12 documents.

13 Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents, if  
14 any, related to Caption AI software that are responsive to this request.

15 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 62:**

16 All documents related to any allegedly non-infringing alternatives to the inventions  
17 claimed in the Patents-in-Suit and the availability, acceptability, and costs of such allegedly non-  
18 infringing alternatives in the marketplace.

19 **RESPONSE:**

20 GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
21 proportional to the needs of the case inasmuch as it seeks “all documents.” GE HealthCare also  
22 objects to this request because it seeks documents within the scope of the attorney–client privilege  
23 and the work-product doctrine. GE HealthCare will not produce such documents. GE HealthCare  
24 further objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the  
25 needs of the case to the extent it seeks information that is equally publicly available to Plaintiff.  
26 Thus, Plaintiff can access the documents from a source, other than GE HealthCare, that is more  
27 convenient, less burdensome, and less expensive. Finally, GE HealthCare objects to this request  
28

1 as premature to the extent that it seeks expert discovery. GE HealthCare will produce such  
2 materials when required to do so under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules, and  
3 the Court's orders.

4 Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents  
5 responsive to this request.

6 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 63:**

7 All documents related to, concerning, and/or describing any instance in which You  
8 considered adopting an asserted prior art system or implementing the teaching of an asserted prior  
9 art reference instead of or as a replacement for the Accused Functionalities in the Accused  
10 Products.

11 **RESPONSE:**

12 GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
13 proportional to the needs of the case inasmuch as it seeks "all documents." As noted above, GE  
14 HealthCare also objects to Plaintiff's definition of "Accused Products" as unreasonably vague  
15 because it is "not limited to" the products listed in the definition. GE HealthCare further objects to  
16 this definition as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to the needs of the case  
17 because it includes the following products and technologies that Plaintiff has not adequately  
18 alleged infringe any claim of the Patents in Suit in either Plaintiff's pleadings or any version of its  
19 Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions for which Plaintiff has obtained leave  
20 to serve: "'SonoLyst' (e.g. SonoLystlive, SonoLystIR, SonoLystX) including, but not limited to, .  
21 . . 'Voluson' family of ultrasound systems, Butterfly iQ+ device with Butterfly iQ app, and Terason  
22 uSmart 3200T Plus." In responding to this request, GE HealthCare will treat "Accused Products"  
23 as limited to the Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan Air SL. GE HealthCare further  
24 objects to Plaintiff's definition of "Accused Functionalities" to the extent that it makes reference  
25 to the positions that Plaintiff has taken in its Second Supplemental Disclosure of Asserted Claims  
26 and Preliminary Infringement Contentions and that are the subject of a discovery dispute that the  
27 parties have submitted to the Court for resolution.

1           Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents, if  
2 any, related to Caption AI software that are responsive to this request.

3 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 64:**

4           All documents relating to any studies and analyses, including any customer surveys,  
5 concerning demand for the Accused Functionalities or the importance of the Accused  
6 Functionalities in promoting sales of the Accused Products.

7 **RESPONSE:**

8           GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
9 proportional to the needs of the case inasmuch as it seeks “all documents” and inasmuch as it seeks  
10 documentation and information on products other than Caption AI software. As noted above, GE  
11 HealthCare also objects to Plaintiff’s definition of “Accused Products” as unreasonably vague  
12 because it is “not limited to” the products listed in the definition. GE HealthCare further objects to  
13 this definition as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to the needs of the case  
14 because it includes the following products and technologies that Plaintiff has not adequately  
15 alleged infringe any claim of the Patents in Suit in either Plaintiff’s pleadings or any version of its  
16 Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions for which Plaintiff has obtained leave  
17 to serve: “‘SonoLyst’ (e.g. SonoLystlive, SonoLystIR, SonoLystX) including, but not limited to, .  
18 .. ‘Voluson’ family of ultrasound systems, Butterfly iQ+ device with Butterfly iQ app, and Terason  
19 uSmart 3200T Plus.” In responding to this request, GE HealthCare will treat “Accused Products”  
20 as limited to the Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan Air SL. GE HealthCare further  
21 objects to Plaintiff’s definition of “Accused Functionalities” to the extent that it makes reference  
22 to the positions that Plaintiff has taken in its Second Supplemental Disclosure of Asserted Claims  
23 and Preliminary Infringement Contentions and that are the subject of a discovery dispute that the  
24 parties have submitted to the Court for resolution.

25           Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents, if  
26 any, related to Caption AI software that are responsive to this request.

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 65:**

2 All documents related to analyses or summaries of customer feedback regarding the  
3 performance of the Accused Functionalities in Your products and Your response to this feedback,  
4 whether formal, informal, public, non-public, or otherwise.

5 **RESPONSE:**

6 GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
7 proportional to the needs of the case inasmuch as it seeks “all documents” and inasmuch as it seeks  
8 documentation and information on products other than Caption AI software. As noted above, GE  
9 HealthCare also objects to Plaintiff’s definition of “Accused Products” as unreasonably vague  
10 because it is “not limited to” the products listed in the definition. GE HealthCare further objects to  
11 this definition as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to the needs of the case  
12 because it includes the following products and technologies that Plaintiff has not adequately  
13 alleged infringe any claim of the Patents in Suit in either Plaintiff’s pleadings or any version of its  
14 Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions for which Plaintiff has obtained leave  
15 to serve: “‘SonoLyst’ (e.g. SonoLystlive, SonoLystIR, SonoLystX) including, but not limited to, .  
16 .. ‘Voluson’ family of ultrasound systems, Butterfly iQ+ device with Butterfly iQ app, and Terason  
17 uSmart 3200T Plus.” In responding to this request, GE HealthCare will treat “Accused Products”  
18 as limited to the Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan Air SL. GE HealthCare further  
19 objects to Plaintiff’s definition of “Accused Functionalities” to the extent that it makes reference  
20 to the positions that Plaintiff has taken in its Second Supplemental Disclosure of Asserted Claims  
21 and Preliminary Infringement Contentions and that are the subject of a discovery dispute that the  
22 parties have submitted to the Court for resolution.

23 Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents, if  
24 any, related to Caption AI software that are responsive to this request.

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 66:**

2 Documents concerning any effect the sale of the Accused Products has had or might have  
3 had on any other aspect of Your business, including sales, revenue, selling price, profitability, or  
4 market share with respect to any other products or services sold by You.

5 **RESPONSE:**

6 GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
7 proportional to the needs of the case inasmuch as it seeks “all documents.” As noted above, GE  
8 HealthCare also objects to Plaintiff’s definition of “Accused Products” as unreasonably vague  
9 because it is “not limited to” the products listed in the definition. GE HealthCare further objects to  
10 this definition as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to the needs of the case  
11 because it includes the following products and technologies that Plaintiff has not adequately  
12 alleged infringe any claim of the Patents in Suit in either Plaintiff’s pleadings or any version of its  
13 Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions for which Plaintiff has obtained leave  
14 to serve: “‘SonoLyst’ (e.g. SonoLystlive, SonoLystIR, SonoLystX) including, but not limited to, .  
15 .. ‘Voluson’ family of ultrasound systems, Butterfly iQ+ device with Butterfly iQ app, and Terason  
16 uSmart 3200T Plus.” In responding to this request, GE HealthCare will treat “Accused Products”  
17 as limited to the Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan Air SL. GE HealthCare further  
18 objects to Plaintiff’s definition of “Accused Functionalities” to the extent that it makes reference  
19 to the positions that Plaintiff has taken in its Second Supplemental Disclosure of Asserted Claims  
20 and Preliminary Infringement Contentions and that are the subject of a discovery dispute that the  
21 parties have submitted to the Court for resolution.

22 Given these circumstances, GE HealthCare is willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff  
23 regarding the scope of this request.

24 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 67:**

25 The unit sales or licenses of SonoLyst software (or at least any of the SonoLyst AI software  
26 tools that were made or sold in the U.S.) to date.

27 **RESPONSE:**

1 GE HealthCare objects to this request because it seeks documents not relevant to any  
2 party's claim or defense, and the burden of producing the requested documents is not proportional  
3 to the needs of the case. GE HealthCare further objects to this request to the extent it is vague and  
4 ambiguous because it seeks "unit sales or licenses."

5 Standing on its objections, GE HealthCare will not produce documents in response to this  
6 request.

7 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 68:**

8 The revenue and gross profits from SonoLyst software sales or licensing identified or a  
9 reasonable estimate if profits are not readily available.

10 **RESPONSE:**

11 GE HealthCare objects to this request because it seeks documents not relevant to any  
12 party's claim or defense, and the burden of producing the requested documents is not proportional  
13 to the needs of the case. GE HealthCare also objects to this request to the extent that it asks GE  
14 HealthCare to create new documents. GE HealthCare will not do so.

15 Standing on its objections, GE HealthCare will not produce documents in response to this  
16 request.

17 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 69:**

18 The unit sales or licenses of Caption Guidance software (or at least Caption Guidance  
19 software products made or sold in the U.S.) to date.

20 **RESPONSE:**

21 GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and  
22 disproportionate to the needs of the case because it seeks documentation and information on  
23 products other than Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan. GE HealthCare further  
24 objects to this request to the extent it is vague and ambiguous because it seeks "unit sales or  
25 licenses." Finally, GE HealthCare objects to this request to the extent it is duplicative and  
26 cumulative of other requests.

1           Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents related  
2 to Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan that are responsive to this request to the extent  
3 they have not already been produced.

4 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 70:**

5           The revenue and gross profits from Caption Guidance software sales or licensing identified  
6 or a reasonable estimate if profits are not readily available.

7 **RESPONSE:**

8           GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and  
9 disproportionate to the needs of the case because it seeks documentation and information on  
10 products other than Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan. GE HealthCare further  
11 objects to this request to the extent it is vague and ambiguous at least because of the term “software  
12 sales or licensing identified.” GE HealthCare also objects to this request to the extent it is  
13 duplicative and cumulative of other requests. Finally, GE HealthCare objects to this request to the  
14 extent that it asks GE HealthCare to create new documents. GE HealthCare will not do so.

15           Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents related  
16 to Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan that are responsive to this request to the extent  
17 they have not already been produced.

18 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 71:**

19           The revenue for Venue and Vscan products sold with or as part of Caption Guidance  
20 software sales or licensing.

21 **RESPONSE:**

22           GE objects to this request because it is vague and ambiguous. GE HealthCare further  
23 objects to this request because, to the extent that GE HealthCare can understand it at all, it appears  
24 to seek documents not relevant to any party’s claim or defense, and the burden of producing the  
25 requested documents is not proportional to the needs of the case.

26           Standing on its objections, GE HealthCare will not produce documents in response to this  
27 request.

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 72:**

2 The unit sales and revenue for Voluson products sold with or as part of SonoLyst software  
3 sales or licensing.

4 **RESPONSE:**

5 GE HealthCare objects to this request because it seeks documents not relevant to any  
6 party's claim or defense, and the burden of producing the requested documents is not proportional  
7 to the needs of the case.

8 Standing on its objections, GE HealthCare will not produce documents in response to this  
9 request.

10 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 73:**

11 Documents sufficient to identify the percentage of Your total sales in dollars and units  
12 attributable to the Accused Products.

13 **RESPONSE:**

14 GE HealthCare objects to this request as irrelevant, unduly burdensome, and  
15 disproportionate to the needs of the case. As noted above, GE HealthCare also objects to Plaintiff's  
16 definition of "Accused Products" as unreasonably vague because it is "not limited to" the products  
17 listed in the definition. GE HealthCare further objects to this definition as overly broad, unduly  
18 burdensome, and disproportionate to the needs of the case because it includes the following  
19 products and technologies that Plaintiff has not adequately alleged infringe any claim of the Patents  
20 in Suit in either Plaintiff's pleadings or any version of its Disclosure of Asserted Claims and  
21 Infringement Contentions for which Plaintiff has obtained leave to serve: "'SonoLyst' (e.g.  
22 SonoLystlive, SonoLystIR, SonoLystX) including, but not limited to, . . . 'Voluson' family of  
23 ultrasound systems, Butterfly iQ+ device with Butterfly iQ app, and Terason uSmart 3200T Plus."  
24 In responding to this request, GE HealthCare will treat "Accused Products" as limited to the  
25 Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan Air SL. GE HealthCare further objects to this  
26 request as unreasonably vague because it seeks information in "units attributable." Finally, GE  
27 HealthCare objects to this request as premature to the extent that it seeks expert discovery. GE  
28

1 HealthCare will produce such materials when required to do so under the Federal Rules of Civil  
2 Procedure, the Local Rules, and the Court's orders.

3 Standing on its objections, GE HealthCare will not produce documents in response to this  
4 request.

5 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 74:**

6 Your projections for sales, revenues and profits from Caption Guidance, including any  
7 projections for increased sales of related products (e.g., Venue products) as a result of the  
8 availability of Caption Guidance.

9 **RESPONSE:**

10 GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and  
11 disproportionate to the needs of the case because it seeks documentation and information on  
12 products other than Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan. GE HealthCare also objects  
13 to this request to the extent that it asks GE HealthCare to create new documents. GE HealthCare  
14 will not do so.

15 Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents related  
16 to Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan that are responsive to this request to the extent  
17 they have not already been produced.

18 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 75:**

19 Any projections or valuations of Caption Guidance done in connection with Your  
20 acquisition of Caption Health, including any materials provided to the GE Healthcare Board in  
21 connection with the approval of the acquisition.

22 **RESPONSE:**

23 GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and  
24 disproportionate to the needs of the case because it seeks documentation and information on  
25 products other than Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan. GE HealthCare also objects  
26 to this request to the extent it is duplicative and cumulative of other requests.

1           Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents related  
2 to Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan that are responsive to this request to the extent  
3 they have not already been produced.

4 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 76:**

5           Your projections for sales, revenues and profits from Voluson products incorporating  
6 Sonolyst AI technology, including any projections for increased sales of related products, as a  
7 result of the availability of Voluson products with Sonolyst AI.

8 **RESPONSE:**

9           GE HealthCare objects to this request because it seeks documents not relevant to any  
10 party's claim or defense, and the burden of producing the requested documents is not proportional  
11 to the needs of the case.

12           Standing on its objections, GE HealthCare will not produce documents in response to this  
13 request.

14 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 77:**

15           Any projections or valuations of the benefits of adding Intelligent Ultrasound's AI  
16 technology into Your products, including without limitation the Voluson products, done in  
17 connection with Your acquisition of Intelligent Ultrasound, including any materials provided to  
18 the GE Healthcare Board in connection with the approval of the acquisition of Intelligent  
19 Ultrasound.

20 **RESPONSE:**

21           GE HealthCare objects to this request because it seeks documents not relevant to any  
22 party's claim or defense, and the burden of producing the requested documents is not proportional  
23 to the needs of the case.

24           Standing on its objections, GE HealthCare will not produce documents in response to this  
25 request.

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 78:**

2 All documents related to the commercial success of the Accused Functionalities and the  
3 Accused Products, and the reason(s) for that commercial success.

4 **RESPONSE:**

5 GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
6 proportional to the needs of the case inasmuch as it seeks “all documents.” GE HealthCare further  
7 objects to this request as vague and ambiguous because it seeks information on subjective  
8 “commercial success.” As noted above, GE HealthCare also objects to Plaintiff’s definition of  
9 “Accused Products” as unreasonably vague because it is “not limited to” the products listed in the  
10 definition. GE HealthCare further objects to this definition as overly broad, unduly burdensome,  
11 and disproportionate to the needs of the case because it includes the following products and  
12 technologies that Plaintiff has not adequately alleged infringe any claim of the Patents in Suit in  
13 either Plaintiff’s pleadings or any version of its Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement  
14 Contentions for which Plaintiff has obtained leave to serve: “‘SonoLyst’ (e.g. SonoLystlive,  
15 SonoLystIR, SonoLystX) including, but not limited to, . . . ‘Voluson’ family of ultrasound systems,  
16 Butterfly iQ+ device with Butterfly iQ app, and Terason uSmart 3200T Plus.” In responding to  
17 this request, GE HealthCare will treat “Accused Products” as limited to the Caption AI software  
18 for use on Venue and Vscan Air SL. GE HealthCare further objects to Plaintiff’s definition of  
19 “Accused Functionalities” to the extent that it makes reference to the positions that Plaintiff has  
20 taken in its Second Supplemental Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement  
21 Contentions and that are the subject of a discovery dispute that the parties have submitted to the  
22 Court for resolution.

23 Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents related  
24 to Caption AI software that are responsive to this request.

25 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 79:**

26 All documents and things concerning Your efforts to promote, advertise, and instruct  
27 customers and potential customers about Your products, including providing a sample of each  
28

1 Accused Product, and any other product, and any associated packaging, instructions, user guides,  
2 or labels for each Accused Product, and any other product.

3 **RESPONSE:**

4 GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
5 proportional to the needs of the case to the extent it seeks “all documents,” to the extent it seeks  
6 documentation and information on products other than Caption AI software for use on Venue and  
7 Vscan Air SL, to the extent it seeks information not limited geographically to the United States,  
8 and to the extent it seeks information that is publicly available to Plaintiff. As noted above, GE  
9 HealthCare also objects to Plaintiff’s definition of “Accused Products” as unreasonably vague  
10 because it is “not limited to” the products listed in the definition. GE HealthCare further objects to  
11 this definition as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to the needs of the case  
12 because it includes the following products and technologies that Plaintiff has not adequately  
13 alleged infringe any claim of the Patents in Suit in either Plaintiff’s pleadings or any version of its  
14 Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions for which Plaintiff has obtained leave  
15 to serve: “‘SonoLyst’ (e.g. SonoLystlive, SonoLystIR, SonoLystX) including, but not limited to, .  
16 .. ‘Voluson’ family of ultrasound systems, Butterfly iQ+ device with Butterfly iQ app, and Terason  
17 uSmart 3200T Plus.” In responding to this request, GE HealthCare will treat “Accused Products”  
18 as limited to the Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan Air SL. Finally, GE HealthCare  
19 objects to this request as duplicative of at least Request No. 14.

20 Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents related  
21 to the promotion, advertising, and instructions for Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan  
22 Air SL in the U.S. to the extent they have not already been produced.

23 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 80:**

24 Documents sufficient to describe Your ownership and ongoing financial obligations to  
25 third parties related to the Accused Products including royalties payable for the sales of the  
26 Accused Products.

27 **RESPONSE:**

1 GE HealthCare objects to this request as vague and ambiguous because it seeks information  
2 on “Your ownership.” GE HealthCare will treat this as though it read “your ownership of.” As  
3 noted above, GE HealthCare also objects to Plaintiff’s definition of “Accused Products” as  
4 unreasonably vague because it is “not limited to” the products listed in the definition. GE  
5 HealthCare further objects to this definition as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and  
6 disproportionate to the needs of the case because it includes the following products and  
7 technologies that Plaintiff has not adequately alleged infringe any claim of the Patents in Suit in  
8 either Plaintiff’s pleadings or any version of its Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement  
9 Contentions for which Plaintiff has obtained leave to serve: “‘SonoLyst’ (e.g. SonoLystlive,  
10 SonoLystIR, SonoLystX) including, but not limited to, . . . ‘Voluson’ family of ultrasound systems,  
11 Butterfly iQ+ device with Butterfly iQ app, and Terason uSmart 3200T Plus.” In responding to  
12 this request, GE HealthCare will treat “Accused Products” as limited to the Caption AI software  
13 for use on Venue and Vscan Air SL. GE HealthCare further objects to this request as cumulative  
14 and duplicative of at least Request No. 10.

15 Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents, if  
16 any, related to Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan Air SL that are responsive to this  
17 request to the extent they have not already been produced.

18 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 81:**

19 All documents relating to communications between You, or anyone acting on Your behalf,  
20 with third parties concerning any of the Patents-in-Suit, or any of the Related Patents, or the  
21 Litigation, or any claim, defense, or remedy in this Litigation.

22 **RESPONSE:**

23 GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
24 proportional to the needs of the case inasmuch as it seeks “all documents.” GE HealthCare objects  
25 to this request because it seeks documents within the scope of the attorney–client privilege and the  
26 work-product doctrine. GE HealthCare will not produce such documents. As noted above, GE  
27 HealthCare objects to Plaintiff’s definition of “Related Patents” as irrelevant, unreasonably broad,  
28

1 vague, unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to the needs of the case because it includes  
2 patents for which Plaintiff has not alleged infringement in this Litigation and contains the  
3 extremely broad qualification of patents that “relate to any of the Patents-in-Suit by way of subject  
4 matter.” Finally, GE HealthCare objects to this request as impermissibly broad and vague in that  
5 it seeks information for “any claim, defense, or remedy in this Litigation.”

6 Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents, if  
7 any, relating to communications between GE HealthCare and third parties concerning any of the  
8 Patents-in-Suit or the Litigation.

9 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 82:**

10 All documents and things relating or referring to the validity, enforceability, or scope of  
11 the Patents-in-Suit.

12 **RESPONSE:**

13 GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
14 proportional to the needs of the case inasmuch as it seeks “all documents.” GE HealthCare objects  
15 to this request because it seeks documents within the scope of the attorney–client privilege and the  
16 work-product doctrine. GE HealthCare will not produce such documents. GE HealthCare further  
17 objects to this request as being duplicative and cumulative of GE HealthCare’s production of  
18 documents accompanying Defendants’ Invalidity Contentions. Finally, GE HealthCare objects to  
19 this request as premature to the extent that it seeks expert discovery. GE HealthCare will produce  
20 such materials when required to do so under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules,  
21 and the Court’s orders.

22 Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents, if  
23 any, responsive to this request to the extent they were not already produced.

24 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 83:**

25 All documents and things identified in, referring or relating to, or consulted in preparing  
26 Your initial disclosures under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a) or used, relied on, or  
27 considered by You in drafting Your initial disclosures.

1           **RESPONSE:**

2           GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
3 proportional to the needs of the case inasmuch as it seeks “all documents and things.” GE  
4 HealthCare objects to this request because it seeks documents within the scope of the attorney–  
5 client privilege and the work-product doctrine. GE HealthCare will not produce such documents.

6           Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents, if  
7 any, that are responsive to this request to the extent they were not already produced.

8           **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 84:**

9           All documents and things relied upon, referred to, or consulted in preparing Your responses  
10 to any of UBC’ s Interrogatories, Requests for Admission, and Requests for Production.

11           **RESPONSE:**

12           GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
13 proportional to the needs of the case inasmuch as it seeks “all documents and things.” GE  
14 HealthCare objects to this request because it seeks documents within the scope of the attorney–  
15 client privilege and the work-product doctrine. GE HealthCare will not produce such documents.

16           Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents, if  
17 any, that are responsive to this request to the extent they were not already produced.

18           **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 85:**

19           Organizational charts sufficient to show the names, positions, titles, duties, and reporting  
20 relationships of all officers, employees, and other personnel involved in the design, development,  
21 operation, manufacture, testing, marketing, or sale of any Accused Product, and any other product.

22           **RESPONSE:**

23           GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and  
24 disproportionate to the needs of the case because it seeks documentation and information on  
25 products other than Caption AI software particularly in that it seeks information related to “any  
26 other product.” As noted above, GE HealthCare also objects to Plaintiff’s definition of “Accused  
27 Products” as unreasonably vague because it is “not limited to” the products listed in the definition.

1 GE HealthCare further objects to this definition as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and  
2 disproportionate to the needs of the case because it includes the following products and  
3 technologies that Plaintiff has not adequately alleged infringe any claim of the Patents in Suit in  
4 either Plaintiff’s pleadings or any version of its Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement  
5 Contentions for which Plaintiff has obtained leave to serve: “‘SonoLyst’ (e.g. SonoLystlive,  
6 SonoLystIR, SonoLystX) including, but not limited to, . . . ‘Voluson’ family of ultrasound systems,  
7 Butterfly iQ+ device with Butterfly iQ app, and Terason uSmart 3200T Plus.” In responding to  
8 this request, GE HealthCare will treat “Accused Products” as limited to the Caption AI software  
9 for use on Venue and Vscan Air SL. GE HealthCare further objects to this request as cumulative  
10 and duplicative of at least Requests Nos. 6–7. Finally, GE HealthCare objects to this request as  
11 duplicative of information provided by GE HealthCare in Defendants’ Initial Disclosures.

12 Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis non-privileged documents related  
13 to Caption AI software for use on Venue and Vscan Air SL that are responsive to this request to  
14 the extent they were not already produced.

15 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 86:**

16 All documents related to Your document retention and/or document destruction policies or  
17 practices, including document retention in response to this Litigation and any documents reflecting  
18 or evidencing whether documents related to the Patents-in-Suit or Your Accused Functionalities  
19 in this Litigation have been deleted, physically destroyed, discarded, damaged, or overwritten,  
20 whether pursuant to a document retention/destruction policy or otherwise, since the  
21 commencement of this case.

22 **RESPONSE:**

23 GE HealthCare objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
24 proportional to the needs of the case inasmuch as it seeks “all documents” and includes no temporal  
25 limitation. GE HealthCare further objects to this request to the extent that it seeks “discovery-on-  
26 discovery” and suggests that GE HealthCare might have destroyed evidence—a suggestion that  
27 GE HealthCare rejects. GE HealthCare further objects to Plaintiff’s definition of “Accused  
28

1 Functionalities” to the extent that it makes reference to the positions that Plaintiff has taken in its  
2 Second Supplemental Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions  
3 and that are the subject of a discovery dispute that the parties have submitted to the Court for  
4 resolution. Finally, GE HealthCare objects to this request because it seeks documents within the  
5 scope of the attorney–client privilege and the work-product doctrine. GE HealthCare will not  
6 produce such documents.

7 Therefore, GE HealthCare will produce on a rolling basis any document retention and  
8 destruction policies in effect from February 2023 to present.

9  
10 Dated: May 27, 2025

/s/Marla R. Butler

11 Marla R. Butler, *pro hac vice*  
12 marla.butler@thompsonhine.com  
13 Two Alliance Center  
14 3560 Lenox Road Suite 1600  
15 Atlanta, Georgia 30326-4266  
16 Telephone: (404) 407-3680

17 Jeffrey C. Metzcar, *pro hac vice*  
18 jeff.metzcar@thompsonhine.com  
19 10050 Innovation Dr., #400  
20 Miamisburg, OH 45342  
21 Telephone: (937) 443-6841

22 Jesse L. Jenike-Godshalk, *pro hac vice*  
23 Jesse.Godshalk@ThompsonHine.com  
24 312 Walnut Street, Suite 2000  
25 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
26 Tel.: (513) 352-6700  
27 Fax: (513) 241-4771

28 Andrew Himebaugh, *pro hac vice*  
andy.himebaugh@thompsonhine.com  
20 N. Clark Street, Suite 3200  
Chicago, IL 60602  
Telephone: (312) 998-4247

Jennifer Seraphine (State Bar No. 245463)  
seraphine@turnerboyd.com  
Vyson Hsu (State Bar No. 322336)  
hsu@turnerboyd.com  
TURNER BOYD SERAPHINE LLP  
155 Bovet Road, Suite 750  
San Mateo, CA 94402  
Telephone: (650) 521-5930

*Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaim-  
Plaintiffs Caption Health, Inc. & GE  
HealthCare Technologies Inc.*

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

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I hereby certify that on May 27, 2025, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document  
3 was transmitted via electronic mail addressed to:

4 Ramsey M. Al-Salam, Bar No. 109506  
5 RAlsalam@perkinscoie.com  
6 Dorianne Salmon, pro hac vice  
7 WSBA No. 60202  
8 DSalmon@perkinscoie.com  
9 PERKINS COIE LLP  
10 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900  
11 Seattle, Washington 98101-3099  
12 Telephone: (206)359.8000  
13 Facsimile: (206) 359.9000

14 Moeka Takagi, Bar No. 333226  
15 MTakagi@perkinscoie.com  
16 PERKINS COIE LLP  
17 3150 Porter Drive  
18 Palo Alto, California 94304-1212  
19 Telephone: (650) 838.4300  
20 Facsimile: (650) 838.4350

21 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
22 *University of British Columbia*

23 */s/ Jesse Jenike-Godshalk*  
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 Jesse Jenike-Godshalk