

Douglas E. Lumish

Latham & Watkins LLP | Menlo Park

Lumish—an eight-year veteran of the firm—said two chief factors Mad Dogg Athletics Inc. v. Peloton have boosted his caseload.

"We've never been busier. The pat- Texas, filed Dec. 14, 2020). ent docket is busier than ever and more so," he noted, explaining that courts are scrambling to schedule cases delayed by the pandemic. Also, notable trade secrets case outcomes such as a big settlement over selfdriving car technology in 2018 encouraged lawyers to file more claims, he said.

"Those caught the attention of the after it was filed. trade secrets bar. Uber v. Waymo came at the beginning of that inflection point. And lawyers came to way of avoiding the legal principles LLC. that can slow down patent cases."

Last vear Lumish successfully defended client Peloton Interactive Inc. against a rival's claims that it infringed patents. Just months before a scheduled trial, Lumish moved for dismissal on the grounds that the asserted patents failed to meet sub- ment. RingCentral sued in an effort ject matter eligibility requirements— to extend it. The battle now moves to

sakeyIPtriallawyerforLatham even as the parties moved forward & Watkins LLP, Douglas E. with claim construction, fact and expert discovery and trial preparation. Interactive Inc., 2:20-cv-00382 (E.D.

Over discovery, Lumish's team the trade secrets docket is even gained ground by obtaining key admissions about the technology at issue, assembled evidence of invalidating prior art and produced voluminous expert reports detailing Peloton's non-infringement and the invalidity of Mad Dogg's patents. In September 2021, the judge dismissed the case less than a year

Other Lumish clients include Zoom Video Communications Inc., Velodyne Lidar, Inc., LG Display Co. Ltd., Rivian see that trade secrets claims are a Automotive Inc. and BBB Industries when a law school professor arranged

> For Zoom, Lumish obtained an affirmance at the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals of his earlier win in a relationship termination case with in business together for seven years when Zoom exited the arrange-



a dispute over whether Zoom needs to continue to service existing Ring-Central customers after the end of the parties' agreed sunset period. Zoom Video Communications Inc. v. RingCentral Inc., 21-15792 (9th Cir., op filed Oct. 14, 2021).

Lumish said he got into IP work for him to meet veteran patent litigator Matthew D. Powers, then the managing partner at Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP.

"I wanted to be a trial lawyer and I RingCentral Inc. The two had been thought patent law was boring. But he showed me to my happy surprise that with high-stakes trials, patents can change the world," Lumish said.

John Roemer