

Exhibit 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

PATHWAY IP, LLC,
Plaintiff,

v.

The Individuals Corporations, Limited
Liability Companies, Partnerships, and
Unincorporated Associations Identified on
Schedule A to the Complaint,

Defendants.

Civil No.: 1:24-cv-05218

Honorable Franklin U. Valderrama

Magistrate Judge Jeffrey T. Gilbert

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**DEFENDANTS' SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST SET OF
REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION**

Defendants iphotoxx, Lixinshunyi, Photo Guard, RUIHOTOR, catchpiccus, HiFocusiUS, QiHuichang, ShiQiaoShang, VividNWUS, XingBoom, XuanXiuUS, Jinsnow, and ShutterLight (“Defendants”), hereby submit their supplemental objections and responses to Plaintiff Pathway IP LLC’s First Set of Requests for Production as follows:

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Defendants object to any of Plaintiff’s Requests that call for documents or information subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or the doctrine of work-product immunity. Any documents or information withheld on either basis will be identified in a withheld document list that will be exchanged with Plaintiff at a mutually agreeable date. Defendants object to identifying documents withheld on the basis of the attorney-client privilege and/or work-product immunity that were created or prepared after the filing of this lawsuit.

2. Defendants object to Plaintiff’s Requests to the extent they are premature and/or not sufficiently limited or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence

and are, therefore, overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendants are willing, however, to confer with Plaintiff in an effort to resolve any disagreements between the parties relating to the timing, scope, breadth, and relevancy of Plaintiff's Requests.

3. Defendants object to Plaintiff's Requests to the extent that they are repetitive, overlapping, or duplicative.

4. Defendants object to Plaintiffs' Requests to the extent that they are not relevant to the issues raised in any of the parties' pleadings.

5. Defendants object to Plaintiff's "DEFINITIONS" and "INSTRUCTIONS" to the extent that they are inconsistent with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Federal Rules of Evidence, the Rules of the Court, and/or Orders of the Court. Defendants will respond to Plaintiff's document requests to the extent required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Federal Rules of Evidence, the Rules of this Court, and the Orders of this Court.

6. Defendants object to Plaintiff's Requests to the extent they request documents and/or information already in Plaintiff's possession or which are equally available to Plaintiff from other sources.

7. Defendants object to any of Plaintiff's Requests that seek information that is trade secret, proprietary, or confidential.

8. Where a Request includes words and concepts indicative of a legal conclusion, such as "prior art," "scope of any claim," "sale," "obvious," and so on, by providing a response or stating that it will produce or identify documents, Defendants not represent that such legal conclusions apply.

9. Defendants object to Plaintiff's Requests to the extent they seek information "concerning," "referring to," "relating to" (or similar phrases regarding) a general subject matter.

Such Requests are vague and fail to give adequate notice of the category of information to be provided. Such Requests also are overbroad in that they extend the potential scope of the request beyond the scope of relevant discovery. Without a sufficiently specific Request, Defendants may be unable to identify and provide all information “concerning,” “referring to,” or “relating to” a subject matter. Defendants will respond to such Requests to the extent feasible and within the bounds of relevant discovery.

10. Defendants object to each and every Request to the extent that it seeks information that is not in the possession, custody, or control of Defendants.

11. Defendants object to each and every Request to the extent it is vague, ambiguous, cumulative, overbroad, unduly burdensome, not relevant, not reasonable particularized, or disproportional to the needs of the case. Defendants object to the definition of “You,” “Your,” and “Defendant” as being overbroad, unduly burdensome, not proportional to the needs of the case, not reasonably particularized, and seeking information outside of Defendants’ possession, custody, and control or not ascertainable based on readily available information after reasonable inquiry. In responding to the document requests, Defendants will interpret “You,” “Your,” and “Defendant” as referring only to each Defendant, the responding party.

These General Objections apply to all of Defendants’ responses. To the extent specific General Objections are cited in a specific response, those specific citations are provided because they are believed to be particularly applicable to the specific interrogatory and are not to be construed as a waiver of any other General Objection applicable to information falling within the scope of the Request.

RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

REQUEST NO. 2: All documents reflecting revenues, profits, and expenses related to the sale of Accused Products, including profit and loss statements, sales reports, and transaction summaries.

RESPONSE:

Defendants object that this Request seeks information that is not relevant to any of Plaintiff's claims or Defendants' defenses in this action, and therefore is unduly burdensome and not proportional the needs of the case. Plaintiff admits it did not mark its products with the patent until at least June or July 2024 (though Plaintiff has not provided adequate documentary evidence supporting its purported marking). Thus, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 287, Plaintiff is not entitled to any pre-suit monetary damages. Defendants further object to this Request because it seeks documents that are protected from disclosure by applicable privileges and protections, including, without limitation the attorney-client privilege, and work product protection. Defendants further object to this Request on the basis that it seeks information the Plaintiff has already obtained from a third party.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will produce relevant, non-privileged documents responsive to this Request to the extent that such documents exist, are within Defendants' possession, custody, or control, and can be located after conducting a reasonable search. Defendants' answers are subject to further investigation and Defendants reserve the right to rely on facts, documents, testimony, or other evidence that may develop or come to its attention through the ordinary course of discovery in this case.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants identify the bates number NGD00032-43, 190-202. Defendants' answers are subject to further investigation and

Defendants reserve the right to rely on facts, documents, testimony, or other evidence that may develop or come to its attention through the ordinary course of discovery in this case.

REQUEST NO. 3: All documents identifying the gross and net income derived from the sale of Accused Products.

RESPONSE:

Defendants object that this Request seeks information that is not relevant to any of Plaintiff's claims or Defendants' defenses in this action, and therefore is unduly burdensome and not proportional the needs of the case. Plaintiff admits it did not mark its products with the patent until at least June or July 2024 (though Plaintiff has not provided adequate documentary evidence supporting its purported marking). Thus, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 287, Plaintiff is not entitled to any pre-suit monetary damages. Defendants further object to this Request because it seeks documents that are protected from disclosure by applicable privileges and protections, including, without limitation the attorney-client privilege, and work product protection. Defendants further object to this Request on the basis that it seeks information the Plaintiff has already obtained from a third party.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will produce relevant, non-privileged documents responsive to this Request to the extent that such documents exist, are within Defendants' possession, custody, or control, and can be located after conducting a reasonable search. Defendants' answers are subject to further investigation and Defendants reserve the right to rely on facts, documents, testimony, or other evidence that may develop or come to its attention through the ordinary course of discovery in this case.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants identify the bates number NGD000190-202. Defendants' answers are subject to further investigation and Defendants reserve the right to rely on facts, documents, testimony, or other evidence that may develop or come to its attention through the ordinary course of discovery in this case.

REQUEST NO. 5: Documents and things identifying the nature of Your sales operations, including all contracts with distributors, manufacturers, vendors, resellers, retailers, or the like.

RESPONSE:

Defendants object to this Request as seeking information which is not relevant, and as being overly broad, unduly burdensome and not proportional to the needs of this case. First, this request appears to seek information for all time, while Plaintiff only acquired the asserted patent a few months ago. Defendants' sales and manufacturing relationships from one, five, or ten years ago have no bearing on any issue in this case, especially considering the fact that Plaintiff is barred from seeking historical damages due to its failure to mark its products before filing its Complaint. Second, the request ask for documents identifying the nature of sales operations, but then asks for all contracts with Defendants' manufacturers. Defendants' contracts with its manufacturers have no bearing on any claim or defense at issue in this case. Third, this request is not limited to the accused products at issue in this case. Fourth, Defendants' contracts their "all contracts with distributors...vendors, resellers, retailers, or the like," will not resolve issues in this case, as these contracts have no bearing on either Plaintiff's claims or Defendants' counterclaims. Finally, the burden and expense of Defendants providing "all" such contracts, without limitation with respect to time period, scope, or relevant products vastly outweighs any likely benefit to providing this information.

Defendants further object to this Request because it seeks documents that are protected from disclosure by applicable privileges and protections, including without limitation, the attorney-client privilege, and work product protection.

Defendants further object to this request as unduly burdensome, not proportional to the needs of the case, not reasonably particularized, and seeking information outside of Defendants' possession, custody, and control or not ascertainable based on readily available information after reasonable inquiry. The definition of "Defendant" is overbroad.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will produce relevant, non-privileged documents responsive to this Request to the extent that such documents exist, are within Defendants' possession, custody, or control, and can be located after conducting a reasonable search.. Defendants' answers are subject to further investigation and Defendants reserve the right to rely on facts, documents, testimony, or other evidence that may develop or come to its attention through the ordinary course of discovery in this case.

REQUEST NO. 6: All documents identifying any entities or individuals that Defendants rely upon for design, manufacturing, marketing, distribution, or sales of the Accused Products.

RESPONSE:

Defendants object to this Request as seeking information which is not relevant, and as being overly broad, unduly burdensome and not proportional to the needs of this case, because the burden and expense of Defendants providing "all documents" without limitation with respect to time period, scope, or relevant products vastly outweighs any likely benefit to providing this information.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants did not identify any documents responsive to this Request to the extent that such documents exist, are within Defendants' possession, custody, or control, and can be located after conducting a reasonable search. Defendants' answers are subject to further investigation and Defendants reserve the right to rely on facts, documents, testimony, or other evidence that may develop or come to its attention through the ordinary course of discovery in this case.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will produce relevant, non-privileged documents responsive to this Request to the extent that such documents exist, are within Defendants' possession, custody, or control, and can be located after conducting a reasonable search. Defendants' answers are subject to further investigation and Defendants reserve the right to rely on facts, documents, testimony, or other evidence that may develop or come to its attention through the ordinary course of discovery in this case.

REQUEST NO. 8: Documents sufficient to identify all ASINs under which Defendants have sold products that serve the same or similar purpose as the Accused Products.

RESPONSE:

Defendants object to this Request because "serve the same or similar purpose" is vague, ambiguous and lacking sufficient precision to allow Defendants to formulate an appropriate response. Defendants object to this Request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome and not proportional to the needs of this case because Plaintiff had an obligation to obtain Defendants' products and analyze them before filing suit. The products were readily available on Amazon prior to Plaintiff's improperly-obtained TRO, and Plaintiff therefore either already has samples of each

of the accused products, or it failed to comply with its clear legal obligations to conduct an infringement analysis prior to filing its Complaint.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants did not identify any documents responsive to this Request to the extent that such documents exist, are within Defendants' possession, custody, or control, and can be located after conducting a reasonable search. Defendants' answers are subject to further investigation and Defendants reserve the right to rely on facts, documents, testimony, or other evidence that may develop or come to its attention through the ordinary course of discovery in this case.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants refer to the supplemental response to Plaintiff's first set of Interrogatory No. 4. Defendants' answers are subject to further investigation and Defendants reserve the right to rely on facts, documents, testimony, or other evidence that may develop or come to its attention through the ordinary course of discovery in this case.

REQUEST NO. 12: All tax documents or filings reflecting income derived from the sale of Accused Products, including but not limited to federal, state, and local tax returns.

RESPONSE:

Defendants object that this Request as overly broad, burdensome and not proportional to the needs of this case. The relevance and importance of such information—if any—is extremely low, the documents sought will not resolve issues in dispute in the case, and the burden and expense of Defendants producing such documents outweigh its likely benefit. Defendants also objects to this Request because it seeks documents that are protected from disclosure by applicable privileges and protections, including without limitation, the attorney-client privilege, and work

product protection. Defendants further object to this request as unduly burdensome, not proportional to the needs of the case, not reasonably particularized, and seeking information outside of Defendants' possession, custody, and control or not ascertainable based on readily available information after reasonable inquiry.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants confirmed no responsive documents existed.

REQUEST NO. 20: All communications, including emails, letters, or notices, exchanged between Defendants and any third party regarding the validity or invalidity of U.S. Patent No. 7,841,729.

RESPONSE:

Defendants objects to this Request because it seeks documents that are protected from disclosure by applicable privileges and protections, including without limitation, the attorney-client privilege, and work product protection. Defendants further object to this request as unduly burdensome, not proportional to the needs of the case.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants do not identify any non-privileged documents responsive to this Request to the extent that such documents exist, are within Defendants' possession, custody, or control, and can be located after conducting a reasonable search. Defendants' answers are subject to further investigation and Defendants reserve the right to rely on facts, documents, testimony, or other evidence that may develop or come to its attention through the ordinary course of discovery in this case.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants identify the bates number NGD000168-185 in response to this request.

REQUEST NO. 35: Documents sufficient to identify any licenses, agreements, or arrangements under which Defendants obtained the right to register or use any brand names or trademarks in a brand registry.

RESPONSE:

Defendants object to this Request as seeking information which is not relevant, and as being overly broad, unduly burdensome and not proportional to the needs of this case. First, this request appears to seek information for all time, while Plaintiff only acquired the asserted patent a few months ago. Defendants' products from one, five, or ten years ago have no bearing on any issue in this case. Second, this request is not limited to the accused products at issue in this case. Finally, the burden and expense of Defendants providing all documents without limitation with respect to time period, scope, or relevant products vastly outweighs any likely benefit to providing this information. Defendants further object to this Request because it seeks documents that are protected from disclosure by applicable privileges and protections, including without limitation, the attorney-client privilege, and work product protection. Defendants further object to this request as unduly burdensome, not proportional to the needs of the case, not reasonably particularized, and seeking information outside of Defendants' possession, custody, and control or not ascertainable based on readily available information after reasonable inquiry.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants identify the bates number NGD000189 in response to this request.

Date: April 14, 2025

/s/ Wei Wang

Wei Wang, Esq.

GLACIER LAW LLP

41 Madison Avenue, Suite 2529

New York, NY 10010

wei.wang@glacier.law

(212) 729-5073

Attorney for Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned attorney hereby certifies that Plaintiff's counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service are being served with a copy of this document via E-mail on April 14, 2025.

/s/ Wei Wang

Wei Wang